

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**42nd Day**

**Wednesday, April 15, 1970.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**ELECTRICIANS ON STRIKE AT AUDITORIUM**

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher** (Premier): — I wish to inform the House today that the electricians are out on strike at the auditorium. I am informed by the contractors that if they remain out more than perhaps another 24 hours, the opening will have to be postponed. I am going to look into the matter today and make a final statement tomorrow. It is likely that if we cannot proceed the Centre of the Arts will have to be closed until some time around September 1. I much regret this action on the part of the unions, because we have His Excellency the Governor General to perform the opening on May 4, or officiate at it. We have many contracts with performers that could cost the taxpayers about \$100,000 in lost revenues, but we will have no choice unless the workers are back tomorrow but to postpone the whole project.

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — May I ask the Premier one question? What contact has been made with the employers and what steps has the Government taken to make sure that the offers are all that they might be and should be?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We are investigating that matter today. Thus we will not make a final decision until tomorrow. We have discussed this matter with the employers. They tell us that we need about 20 to 25 electricians at the auditorium every day between now and May 4 to finish it. Even if that takes place, there will be problems. Of course the contractors say that if there are any slowdowns whatever, there is just no way that they can complete it by May 4. Likely we will have no choice but to postpone the opening until next September, but I shall make a final decision tomorrow.

**QUESTIONS**

**SAW-MILL AT MEADOW LAKE**

**Mr. G.R. Bowerman** (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Premier. In the Government's announcement of the proposed forest industry complex you announced the location of a sawmill for Meadow Lake area, Mr. Premier. I am wondering if you can advise some more detail with respect to the location of the saw-mill, that is, with respect to the forest reserve from which you propose to extract the 50 million board feet a year of annual production?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — No, I cannot give you those details. I can only say that the sawmill will be at the industrial park at Meadow Lake

which, if my memory serves me, is four or five miles to the east. They will be given timber rights extending throughout that whole area. If the company does not proceed with the pulp mill, part of the timber rights will revert to the Crown.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Is it correct that you said that the complex was going to be located some four or five miles east of Meadow Lake?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The sawmill will be.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — The sawmill will be. I understand as well then the Premier announced that the sawmill located at Big River was not a suitable site because of the fact of its relation in respect to timber reserves. I can't understand, Mr. Premier, how a sawmill located four or five miles each of Meadow Lake will be any closer. In fact it will be further from timber reserves than the Big River location.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I am informed that this is not correct. We took a very hard look at Big River to see whether or not it made sense to proceed with the sawmill. Both our departmental experts and Parsons and Whittemore say there is not enough lumber to proceed economically in the Big River area. We do, as I indicated, intend to take a very close look in the months ahead to see what kind of an operation we can put in Big River to keep the people employed there, but we are not yet in a position to give you any final answer as to what we can do.

## SECOND READINGS

**Hon. D.G. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer) moved second reading of **Bill No. 86 — An Act to amend The legislative Assembly Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in planning the redistribution that is detailed in this Act, I had the help of a committee composed of MLAs from all parts of Saskatchewan, including the Hon. Allan Guy (Athabasca), the Hon. Cy MacDonald (Milestone), Mr. McPherson (Regina), Robert Heggie (Hanley). Hon. Members will find that we have taken into consideration population changes and at the same time recognized the rural nature of our province and the large area covered by some constituencies.

The major changes include the addition of one constituency, bringing our Provincial total to 60 seats and giving Regina and Saskatoon each one new constituency.

We have combined the three constituencies of Melfort-Tisdale, Kelsey and Kinistino in the two seats to be known as Melfort-Kinistino and Tisdale-Kelsey.

In 1960 the population of Regina was 109,000 and they had four province members in one single constituency. By 1964 the population of Regina had risen to about 125,000 and they had six members in four constituencies. Regina now has 143,000 people and I am sure both sides of the House will agree they are entitled to at least one more member, bringing their total to seven.

In Saskatoon we find a similar situation has developed over the years. In 1960 Saskatoon had a population of 90,000 and

**April 15, 1970**

three members in one constituency. In 1964 it had grown to 124,000 and had five members still in one constituency. Now the population of Saskatoon is about 130,000 and we feel it should have another member in this Legislature, for a new total of six.

I would remind the House, mps that all city ridings are now single member constituencies, something we tried to get the Socialists to do for many years. I ask Members to keep this in mind when those opposite rise to cry about their representation as they have been doing in the Press and no doubt will do in this House. When they were the government, literally thousands of Regina and Saskatoon citizens who did not support the Socialists were in fact disenfranchised. Twenty or thirty thousand people who voted Liberal in both those cities lost their vote, the CCF dumped them into one pot and used their overall majority to elect all the Members in all major cities. In spite of the fact that we urged the CCF Government year after year to change this, it ignored both our demands and the demands of justice and forced these people to vote in huge blocks for their own benefits.

I would also ask the House to take note of the statement made by Henry Baker, NDP, MLA, and Mayor of Regina on television, Tuesday, April 14, to the effect that this redistribution would not hurt the NDP, they would in fact win five out of the seven seats in Regina.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, I thank the mayor, and the Hon. Members opposite for this testimonial to the fairness of the Act that we are now considering.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I also note that Henry is going to run in Regina North East, the constituency now held by Walter Smishek. I would hate, Mr. Speaker, to see either of these Hon. gentlemen knocked out in a mere nominating convention. I would suggest that they both run in the same seat in the next election and let all the voters decide. With any luck they will both be retired.

Mr. Speaker, while Regina and Saskatoon have in fact about 30 per cent of the population of the province, we will still have only about 21 per cent of the Members in this House. This is more equitable than it has been and I suggest it is about the proper percentage. It is about the percentage that is reasonable in an agricultural province such as Saskatchewan. the scales should be tilted to some degree in favour of rural Saskatchewan. Agriculture is still the backbone of our economy and it is vitally important to maintain a strong rural voice in this Legislature. As well, rural constituencies cover much greater areas than city ridings and there should be a limit on their size wherever it is practical.

As a result of our desire to keep rural representation at a high level, we are suggesting the elimination of only one rural seat. Melfort-Tisdale was chosen for two reasons: first, the general layout of the bordering constituencies made the division of this riding relatively straightforward and gives both new seats a strong vigorous urban centre. Secondly, the fact that

the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. George Willis) had announced his intention to retire meant we would not be taking away the constituency of a sitting Member who might still want to serve in this Legislature.

As the Members opposite can see, we are all heart.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Just because the Members opposite have no feeling for their old Members, I want them to know that the Members on this side do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — And I would like to pay a tribute to the Hon. George Willis that obviously the Members opposite are not prepared to pay, for his long service to this House and to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, before moving second reading of this Bill I want to point out that this redistribution has been developed for the next election not the last one. Members opposite are already criticizing the difference in the number of voters in various constituencies. But let me point out that they are using figures from the 1967 enumeration, figures that will soon be three years old. The NDP mounted the same attack when we made changes to some constituencies in 1966. I'll tell you the new ones. For example, Mr. Lloyd, the Leader of the Opposition stated on April 5, 1966 in a debate on a redistribution Bill and I quote:

May I draw attention to the fact that the constituency of Regina South is made up of some 7,500 voters.

The Leader of the Opposition was complaining because Regina South and some other ridings appeared to have a relatively few number of voters. He was using figures from the 1964 enumeration, figures that were over three years old. He was ignoring the fact that these were among the fastest growing areas of the province. I hope the Opposition won't repeat that error in this debate. I ask them to raise their sights and look to the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.H. Wooff** (Turtleford): — We will!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Bob, I don't think you should look to the future, your looks dull and grey.

At that time we pointed out to the Opposition that we were planning ahead, that this Government plans ahead and that by election day there would be at least 10,000 voters in Regina South. We pointed out that it was a growing area, part of the growing Saskatchewan. The truth is that we were proven right. There were over 11,000 voters in Regina South on election day in 1967. and this is also true in the present redistribution. Moose Jaw North has already grown considerably beyond the population taken during the fall of 1967 and it will continue to grow in spite of its representation.

**April 15, 1970**

The discrepancies that the Opposition attempt to show do not in fact exist since they are using figures already 2 ½ years old. This is true as well for Prince Albert West, the Regina seats of Albert Park, Wascana and Whitmore and some of the Saskatoon constituencies. These are growth areas. They have already outgrown the population shown in the 1967 enumeration and they will continue to show rapid expansion.

For example, in Regina Albert Park there are over 300 suites in five new high-rise apartments and hundreds of new homes all built and occupied since the 1967 enumeration on which the Opposition will try and hang their case of population discrepancies.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken into consideration the changing population trends in our province as well as its agricultural character in developing this redistribution. We have looked ahead and recognized growth areas and we have tried to accommodate them. I will be prepared to go into detail during the Committee of the Whole. I commend this Bill to Members on both sides of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, if I hadn't known the Provincial Treasurer so well I would have been completely amazed and astounded at that speech. But knowing him as I do, there is of course no excuse for anybody being amazed or astounded at anything the Provincial Treasurer would say.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I thought he made one interesting comment to begin with. He said that in drawing up this Bill he had the help of MLAs from all parts of Saskatchewan. He didn't say from all parties in Saskatchewan. This of course he didn't need to say because as one looks at it is quite obvious that the help he had was from one party in Saskatchewan. He named, the members of that committee. You know, if I were one of those members I would feel like suing him because I suspect they would be much happier if they hadn't been named. I recall, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Provincial Treasurer, a story which the last Bob Edwards once told. He had been invited to a banquet in honour of R.B. Bennett and Bob Edwards and R.B. Bennett were sworn enemies, particularly when R.B. Bennett was representing the Canadian Pacific Railway. Somebody, the chairman, asked Bob Edwards if he would ask the blessing at that particular banquet. Bob said, "No, I won't because on this occasion I would rather not have the Lord know where I am at," and I suspect that some of his colleagues who were on this committee might have felt that same way.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I said if I hadn't know the Provincial Treasurer I would have been amazed. may I add that if I hadn't known in advance that this Bill was drawn up by the Government opposite I certainly would have known once I saw the Bill because it becomes very obvious as one looked at it. The amazing thing about the Provincial Treasurer's comments is that he really didn't try to explain the basis on which the constituency

boundaries are being presented. He really didn't try to justify, except for some vague reference to recognizing certain growth areas, any principle on which these new boundaries are being recommended.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: that this Bill by itself is sufficient justification for the defeat of the Government that sits opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — This Bill represents, as did the previous Bill on redistribution, a misuse of public authority by the Government. It is misuse and abuse of public authority for political purposes. And this is done by a Government that represents approximately 45 per cent of the electorate in Saskatchewan and that is about the same proportion of people that this party on this side represents.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The principle of representation by population is ignored. The principle of community interest in drawing constituency boundaries is largely overlooked. The only principle which is asserted is that of an alleged divine right of the Liberal party to govern. I will admit what the Provincial Treasurer said in criticism of my remarks in 1967 and include his anticipation of my criticism today. It is quite true that we used at that time the statistics from the previous election. It is quite true that I am going to use today the statistics from the 1967 election. That is all we have to use because this Government has refused to give us any up-to-date statistics and I can't understand that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — the Provincial Treasurer has indicated this morning that he had those figures available to him and...Well, if you didn't have them, what in the world were you quoting? Why bother to quote? Why pretend you have them and quote figures when you weren't quoting them? And yet the Government has refused to give to the rest of us in the Legislature these kind of figures on which to base our comments and our conclusions.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — As a result, Mr. Speaker, I must use the only authentic statistics available to me and that is the figure from 1967. I make no apology for that and I submit the conclusions would be the same whether one used the up-to-date ones of 1970 or those of 1967. It is hard to understand why the Government, if it has those figures, didn't make them and wasn't willing to make them available to Members on this side of the House.

In support of those conclusions, Mr. Speaker, let me draw the attention of the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan to just a few examples in this proposal before us. Let us take to begin with the constituencies of Redberry and The Battlefords,

side by side. Now if one were using the Provincial Treasurer's measuring stick, one would have assumed that Battleford would be the constituency that would grow in size because it has a city area within it and cities as we know are growing — and would have suspected that they would have left some room to accommodate this growth in the future. At the same time one might anticipate, given the bulk of the programs of this Government and the Federal Government, that Redberry being largely a farm area would decrease in size. but just look at what actually happened. The Battlefords constituency previously had 2,000 voters more than did Redberry. One might have expected since Battleford was going to grow that the transfer would have been from The Battlefords to Redberry but was that what happened? Indeed it wasn't. It was the exact opposite that happened. The transfer is from Redberry to North Battleford so that we end up, using 1967 statistics, with The Battlefords having 4,500 voters more than Redberry now. It had some 2,000 voters before. It now has 4,500 voters more and the trend of the future is that it will have more of a larger amount in the future. The Battlefords ends up with some 10,500 voters, Redberry with some 6,000 and guess why? The only principle asserted is the hope that this will make something happier for some Liberal politician in the future. In the process the principle of representation by population is denied and mutilated.

Let's look secondly then at the constituency of Kelvington, one which the Liberals loved but lost in the by-election of June of last year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The old Kelvington constituency had some 7,400 voters on the list. That wasn't large in terms of population for rural constituencies. It was unduly large in terms of geographical area but the new proposal for Kelvington ends up with about 1,000 fewer for the voters' list, some 6,30. Mr. Speaker, there is one less rural constituency than there was before and in the face of that one might have assumed that the rural constituencies would get a little large in population. That was a reasonable expectation, I should think, but Kelvington gets not larger but gets smaller to the extent of 1,000. Now why does it get smaller? It is certainly not because of application of representation by population. It is certainly not because of application of any community interest factor. One looks at the map and sees that the community interest in this constituency is ignored and mutilated entirely. The answer, I suggest, lies in the fact that the New Democratic party won the by-election in Kelvington and that answer reveals the desperation of the Liberals in their attempt to regain that constituency in a general election some time later.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Thirdly, let's see where some of these Kelvington voters went to. If we are observing representation by population, this is an interesting example, because some of the area from Kelvington was transferred to Wadena. Now was Wadena as a rural seat small than the average before? No, it wasn't. Was Wadena too small? Certainly it wasn't. Previously Wadena had 9,500 voters, about 3,000 more than Kelvington. After this proposal goes into effect, if it goes into effect, Wadena will have about

11,000 voters which is about 5,000 more than Kelvington. And the Provincial Treasurer talks about recognizing growth areas. Well, this simply does not add up with any kind of logic, sense, or decency, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, to make use of that kind of argument in support of this kind of move.

The reason here is simply this was already larger than the average and is already much larger and was larger than Kelvington and is now much larger still. The reason for shifting some of these votes for making Kelvington smaller and Wadena larger is simply that in the 1967 election our majority in Wadena was about 1,000. On the basis of the new constituency it would be something over 1,600. Wadena is considered to be a safe repository for some additional New Democratic party support and so it went against the logical trend and becomes larger. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what principle was followed in that particular decision?

Fourthly, let's look at Last Mountain constituency. Last Mountain constituency previously had some 6,700 voters. Now that surely is not too large. There has been a little growth there admittedly but the fact there wasn't the fact of size. It isn't the fact of community. the fact is that the principle that was applied is that the margin of the Liberal win in Last Mountain was just too close for comfort so far as the Liberals are concerned. That margin remember was 26. Here you have a constituency of 6,700 voters. Was it made larger? No, it wasn't It was made smaller. It was reduced to about 5,700.

Fifth, I want to refer to the constituency of Humboldt because here the rules are changed again. let's look at it for a moment. Redberry was considered too large when it had a voters' list of 6,800 and so it was reduced. Kelvington was considered too large. It had a population of 8,700 so it was reduced. Last Mountain was considered too large. It had a population of 6,700 so it was reduced. Now surely then Humboldt with a population of 8,700 should also be considered to be too large and be reduced. But the other principle was applied here, whatever the principle is, and Humboldt instead of getting smaller as the others did in fact gets larger. And again the decision is not made on the basis of any constituency with the other constituencies.

I want to refer to two urban constituencies because here it is that the way in which the Liberal finger writes becomes even more plain. I admit what the Provincial Treasurer said about there being some growth in some parts of the city more than in other parts, but certainly not enough to justify the kind of extremes that we find. I sue again 1967 figures because those are the only ones available to us. Let's look at the extremes in the city of Regina. on the basis of these 1967 figures, we have the constituency of Albert Park with 3,500 names on the voters' list. We have the constituency of Regina Centre with 18,000 names on the voters' list. Does the Provincial Treasurer for one moment suggest that that 3,500 in three years or in the next 10 years is going to expand so that it comes anywhere close to the 18,000 in Regina Centre/ I submit that isn't the reason at all. What he has done is to create a little picket borough out in that part of Regina.

Let's look at some of the extremities in another way when we look at the constituencies in terms of geographical location. Whitmore Park in the southeastern part of the city had 6,000 names



**April 15, 1970**

on the voters' list. North Establishing represented by my colleague, Mr. Smishek, had 14,600 names on the voters' list. let's move to the other side of the city where Albert Park again had 3,400 names on the voters' list and North West represented by my colleague, Mr. Whelan, had 133,500 names on the voters' list. No amount of pious attempts on the part of the Provincial Treasurer or his committee is going to make the people of Regina and the people of Saskatchewan believe that those lines were drawn on anything other than straight political considerations. It is the only possible conclusion to come to. If you look at the population in the three constituencies across the north you will find there a total population of more than 46,000; if you look at the population of the other four constituencies 31,000 or 15,000 less than in the three northern ones.

But it's really when we move to Moose Jaw that this fine Machiavellian hand of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stewart) becomes most apparent. Now Moose Jaw North had on the old voters' list, 8,000 people and this was made, I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of statistics which the Government had at that time. At that time Moose Jaw North had 8,000 people. Moose Jaw South had 11,400. Now 8,000 was small for an urban centre and much smaller as I said than Moose Jaw South. One would expect Moose Jaw North to get larger. But does it? No. It emerges with some 6,200 voters according to the proposed boundaries. It has dropped in size. It was already smaller by far, it got smaller by far, it got smaller by far much more. Moose Jaw South on the other hand was 11,400, as I have stated. It instead of getting smaller to equalize the size of the two constituencies gets larger; gets larger up to 13,400 and emerges with approximately twice as many voters as in the case of Moose Jaw North. And again no amount of argument and ranting and raving is going to make the people of Moose Jaw believe that that line was drawn in anything other than the crudest of political basis.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take the time of the House to give additional evidence that some of my colleagues will be supplying and which we will be discussing when we get into Committee of the Whole.

I might just remind the Government of this. We are in this Bill now proposing just to change the boundaries on a map. In fact what the Government in this Bill is doing is manipulating the people of this province. In fact what the Government in this Bill is proposing is to obstruct Government by consent of the people. In fact what this Government is doing in this Bill is to abuse public power and make use of it for political ends. In fact what the Government is doing in this Bill is to deny the principle of representation by population. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will resist and will resent being used as pawns in an attempt by the Government to determine who is going to represent them. It is their privilege to decide who is going to represent them. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we in this House should defeat this Bill because it deserves defeat. I submit that if we don't defeat it then the people of Saskatchewan should defeat this Government because it deserves defeat on the basis of this Bill alone.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank** (Saskatoon Mayfair): — I intend to move an amendment and the purpose of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to highlight a principle that is involved in this Bill that I am sure we will feel ready to endorse once I have finished speaking on the matter. The amendment wording will be as follows:

That all the words after the word “that” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

People living in Saskatoon Nutana south constituency remain within the bounds of the constituency, specifically, those people which it is proposed by Bill No. 86, 1970 to include in the rural constituency of Hanley.

I think there is a very important principle involved there, Mr. Speaker. I quote a number of people who spoke very strongly on a previous debate in this House on that principle only a short while ago. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the following Members spoke in the Legislature and they let be known, in regard to the rural constituency of Hanley, that there were certain irregularities in a previous Government Bill and they felt that some changes should be made in accord with the principle. One of the first people to speak in that debate, Mr. Speaker, was Mr. D. Boldt, the Member for Rosthern. He said:

People living in Saskatoon were forced to vote in Hanley constituency and protested most violently.

That is a direct quotation. Mr. Boldt said that he wouldn't be able to go along with the Bill unless that was corrected. Mr. McFarlane who is unfortunately not with us today said:

I think the point expressed by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt was well taken.

Mr. D. Steuart, who I believe is still with us:

I see no reason why the people that live in some parts of Saskatoon should be forced out of Saskatoon just to give the Hanley Member a safe seat. I will support the amendment.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You convinced me!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Hon. A.H. McDonald spoke strongly in favour of the amendment to put urban areas of Hanley into the urban constituency of Saskatoon.

**An Hon. Member:** — Which McDonald?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — This is the one that went to the Senate in case there is any doubt. That's No. 1 McDonald, not No. 2 Macdonald. One is a Mc and one is a Mac, that's the difference between them.

**An Hon. Member:** — He tries harder!

**April 15, 1970**

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, he tries harder, yes. The Hon. A.H. McDonald was opposed to the fact that the Government of the day was putting urban voters of Saskatoon into the rural constituency of Hanley.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to what I refer to as the piece department resistance as far as I am concerned in this debate. I hesitate to even mention, Mr. Speaker, the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission because that is not the topic under consideration. However, the next person to speak in support of the amendment was none other than W.R. Thatcher, Leader of the Opposition, whose opening comment was:

I think this whole debate indicates one thing very clearly, redistribution in this House or any other House should be done by an impartial committee and not by a political body which makes political decisions as this Government has done.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher** (Premier): — This is just as impartial as the one you had...

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — There was no qualification in your quotation, Mr. Premier. Your quotation could not be misconstrued about the relativity of impartiality.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Let's talk about this time, don't worry about...

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that that quotation may become the classic illustration of the Premier's contention that some politicians talk one way when out of office and a different way when they are in office. Just so that all the Members have that impressed indelibly on their minds, I want to repeat it.

I think this whole debate indicates one thing very clearly, redistribution in this House or any other House should be done by an impartial committee and not by a political body which makes political decisions as this Government has done.

Mr. Thatcher continued in the debate:

We want this amendment passed for one reason, because we know the citizens of Saskatoon who live in Saskatoon, want to vote in the constituency of Saskatoon and not in the constituency of Hanley. I am quite sure if this matter is before the House much longer there will be representations made along these lines from the Saskatoon City Council and the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce...

So the Premier took a firm stand on the issue there and I thoroughly expect he will today too.

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

That's the end of the Premier's comments.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner from Melville, a ghost of this House, was the next to take up the cudgel on behalf of the Saskatoon citizens

in Hanley constituency. He said:

I want to say a word or two on this particular amendment. I think it is one that should receive the support of everyone in this House. I think it is a reasonable amendment and I think it is only reasonable to expect that the residents of the city of Saskatoon would sooner be represented by Member s from the city of Saskatoon rather than part of another constituency. I don't think that needs much argument.

Mr. W. Erb from Milestone made a contribution in the debate of 1963.

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Who was he?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Walter Erb from Milestone, the illustrious predecessor of the present Member of Milestone. and this particular quotation may have a current application and I am sure, therefore, that all Members will want to hear it:

The very fact that The Legislative Assembly Act has come to the Legislature at this time is the admission on the part of my former colleagues that their days in office are numbered.

I think that has a current application Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — what are you worried about?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I'm not worried, you're the ones that should be worried. I am sure all Members on both sides of the House are convinced of the worthiness of my amendment and consequently will give it enthusiastic support. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are nine Members across the way who enthusiastically debated and voted in favour of this important principle in 1963. They are Thatcher, Barrie, Cameron, McFarlane, Guy, Boldt, MacDougall, Gallagher, Steuart, who is the sponsor of this Bill before us, and does not wish to transgress that principle he held so strongly only a few short years ago. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale, Mr. Romanow, this amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### **RULING BY MR. SPEAKER**

**Mr. Speaker:** — We have before the House an amendment moved by the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) seconded by the Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). I draw your attention to the rules and regulations governing a reasoned amendment and I quote from May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th edition, page 526:

It is competent for a Member who desires to place on record any special reason for not agreeing with a second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a "reasoned amendment". This amendment is to leave out all the words in the main question after the word "that" and to add other words . . .

A reasoned amendment is placed on the paper in the form of a motion and it may fall into one of several categories:

1. It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principle, policy of provisions of the bill.
2. It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.
3. It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.

And I quote further:

The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee.

It seems to me that the amendment moved by the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair seeks changes in the provisions of the Bill. It is not a motion in opposition to the principle of the Bill but seeks changes which should in the opinion of the Chair be moved in Committee of the Whole. I draw your attention to the wording of the motion:

People living in Saskatoon Nutana South constituency remain within the bounds of that constituency, specifically, those people which it is proposed by Bill No. 86, 1970 to include in the rural constituency of Hanley.

Those in my view are amendments which could be moved in Committee of the Whole. I, therefore, find the amendment out of order.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, could I speak on a point of order with regard to your ruling?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Perhaps I should have allowed Members to speak on a point of order before I did. I am willing to hear Members from both sides of the House. I will listen to the Member who made the motion first.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I was following a citation in Beauschesne No. 277-382. This particular citation was offered by the Premier in 1963 in order to get an amendment very much similar to this one. I had thought when I prepared this amendment since you were the mover of a motion in that debate very much similar to the one that I put forward, seconded by Mr. McDonald, that it would be quite in order to put that motion forward and have it voted on in this Chamber. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a definite principle involved here with regard to keeping the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South urban and the constituency of Hanley rural and I would appeal for some further consideration on this particular point.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The number of the citation from Beauschesne. What was it?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Beauschesne 277-382.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I mean the page of the citation.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, this is what Mr. Thatcher cited in the debate in 1963.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Very well. It's page 277. Go ahead.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Page 277, that's correct. Mr. Speaker, - 382. It was cited by Mr. Thatcher in 1963 in order to get the matter on the floor.

**Mr. G.G. Leith** (Elrose): — The Member ought to realize that his proposed amendment is particular and refers to a particular Section of the Bill, and I think it should be considered in Committee of the Whole. If he had phrased his amendment in a more general way so as to say that all urban seats be separated from any part of rural seats, I think the amendment might have been more in order. I submit that it is not in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What the House is discussing on second reading is the principle of the Bill and not the provisions thereof. The principle of this Bill as I see it is whether or not there shall be an electoral redistribution in the Province of Saskatchewan. The question as to how it should be done is a matter that should be discussed in Committee, singularly, clause by clause and section by section. I think that the view that I expressed previously still holds good and I further believe that the citation from May is the appropriate one in connection with this matter. Again I quote:

The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee.

The question concerns the electoral boundaries in Nutana South constituency and their relationship to the boundaries of the constituency of Hanley. In my view these are matters which can be discussed and amendments made in regard thereto in Committee of the Whole. I haven't changed my mind in connection with the ruling that I made in regard to the fact that the motion is out of order and could be better moved in Committee.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, with regard to what you have just said and what the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) has said, the motion which was put on the floor in 1963 referred specifically to Saskatoon and the constituency of Hanley and was moved on second reading at that time and it was accepted by the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Here we have the reference in the Journals to which the Member refers. It was on Tuesday, April 2, 1963. It was moved by the Premier at that time:

That Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act be now read the second time.

**April 15, 1970**

A debate arising an amendment thereto was moved by Mr. Thatcher, seconded by Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):

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

I would consider that that amendment would be an amendment which would be adverse to a principle of the Bill.

A point of Order having been raised that the amendment was worded as an substantive motion and therefore not in order as an amendment, Mr. Speaker, ruled the amendment out of order.

Thereupon, Mr. Thatcher altered his amendment to read;

This House is of the opinion that the three cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw should be divided into single Member constituencies.

That motion was accepted, the question being put on the amendment...

And so and so forth. I have to concur with the ruling of the Speaker which was made at that time in regard to the original amendment that was moved.

A Point of Order having been raised that the amendment was worded an substantive motion and therefore not in order as an amendment, Mr. Speaker ruled the amendment out of order.

Well, I think he was being a little rougher than I am being now. Let me put it that way. And I stay with my original decision.

**Mr. F. Meakes** (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose Bill 86, not to object so much for what it does to my constituency as to the whole philosophy of the Bill. Touchwood was safe with the New Democrats before these proposed boundary changes so the added area only makes more certain that Touchwood will remain New Democratic and be on the Government side of the House after this Government gets up enough courage to call an election. But in my humble opinion this is the most disgraceful Bill ever to come before this House. Looking at the constituency of Last Mountain, it's a dilly. And to use the arguments of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) when he talked about it considering growth, all the growth in the Lanigan area of Last Mountain was there prior to 1967, since all the people are leaving that area or a lot of them are.

When you look at this constituency, the shape of this new constituency of Last Mountain on the map, it reminds me of the origin of the word gerrymander. There was a man by the name of Gerry who had a very long, thin, crooked riding. I believe it was in England and it looked like a salamander. From that word the word gerrymander came about. When you look at the shape of Last Mountain on a map, it wanders around like a salamander. Look at the number of voters in Last Mountain under the new figures, it will be about 5,700 voters under the 1967 figures. Touchwood will have under those same figures, 10,229. Touchwood has nearly twice as many. And the Provincial Treasurer says

there should be some pure elation between us. I stopped and wondered why this was being done. Then I suddenly realized you know that the Government realized that I was a so much better representative than the Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) that I could easily represent two voters to his one.

**Hon. A.R. Guy** (Athabasca): — Twice as big!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Yes, but I suggest that I should be able to vote twice to his one because I will be representing two people to his one. If you are going to base this on the democratic procedure.

Last night I listened on the late news to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and I listened closely to what he said. He stated that it was a fair Bill. I really marvelled at him. Here this morning he kind of smiled, but you know he had a very straight face on the camera. He didn't look straight into the camera when he did it though. As far as I am concerned I will say again this Redistribution Bill is a shame to a supposed democratic society. Touchwood had 52 townships in the last redistribution. I will not receive another 26 townships, half again as big. According to the last figures the population, the voters' list of 'Touchwood was 7,335. Last Mountain had 6,743. Under this new basis, this Bill, Touchwood will have 10,229 and Last Mountain will have 5,700. And the Hon. Provincial Treasurer calls it a fair Bill.

My constituency will be 100 miles long...

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall** (Souris-Estevan): — Look down in the mines!

**Mr. Meakes:** — There is nobody down there anyway. I can quote even a worse example. City Park under the new basis on the same figures has even less than Last Mountain, about 5,500. Talk about the rotten boroughs that they used to talk about in Britain, this is a rotten borough. I say again this: the Provincial Treasurer stands in the House, stands in front of the TV cameras and says distribution Bill brought in by a previous government. I challenge him to produce population differences like I have produced. Traditionally there have been more people in the city ridings than in the rural and I have often wondered if this was justified. When I see a city riding with only half as many people as a rural constituency, then I call it a shame and a disgrace. I say that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and those people across the way should hang their heads. I notice that they are not looking too bright about this. Especially that committee that worked on it.

This Redistribution Bill is a dying attempt by this Government to stay alive. Anything, anyway to retain power. It is a concession that this Government would go down to defeat even if the Bill wasn't changed, and I still say that it is going to be defeated. This Bill will do them no good. They are in the throes of death.

The Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan), yes, where is he? I noticed that he has not been in the House for many days. If he is sick I give him credit for it. If I had my constituency cut down to that kind of a figure I wouldn't appear in this House. He is where?



**April 15, 1970**

**Mr. Guy:** — In London.

**Mr. Meakes:** — London, Canada?

**Mr. Guy:** — No, London, England.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Oh! I take it back. I will apologize, Mr. Speaker. I didn't realize he had gone already.

Regarding that Last Mountain constituency, look at the boundaries in 1964 and then look at what happened to it in 1967. They took off a bunch more New Democrats and he still only won by 57. He thought that he was going to win by a lot. And then this other big chunk is taken out of the centre of the heart of that constituency. Why? So the Government hopes that he can still get represented-elected. But I tell you that he is not going to. When the next time comes around, Gordon McMurchy will beat him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — The people of Saskatchewan traditionally believe in honesty and integrity. And this Bill to me radiates the opposite. I presume this Bill will pass second reading. I can assure this House that I will be moving some amendments in Committee. as far as I am concerned I am ready to debate this Bill until July. There are many more things that I could say, Mr. Speaker, but they are better said in Committee.

I can assure you that I will be opposing this second reading of this terrible Bill.

**Mr. D.M. McPherson** (Regina South West): — Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the committee there are several words that I would like to say about the many, many meetings that we had in solving all of the problems in the Province of Saskatchewan.

But the first thing that I did before I went on the committee I read *Hansard* from 1951. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) spoke very glibly this morning that we should have an impartial body. Well in 1951 Clarence Fines brought the Bill in and I will read you what Clarence said:

We will do whatever we want with the seats. We are the Government.

This was your leader, Clarence Fines. Now that's not very nice. Now we talk about impartial governments. I have heard the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) when he spoke in the Electoral Committee about this. He spoke very well. I have heard many of the Members, but I don't think that we should talk about this. And he also said, "This is the abuse of public power." Well you want to go into *Hansard* of 1951 and see how Clarence Fines handled redistribution. He was the only member on the committee. He didn't even have enough nerve to put the rest of you fellows on there and that's the way it turned out.

Now I would like to deal with Regina, Mr. Speaker, where I think that it is good for the citizens of Regina to increase the number of seats. I would like to have seen probably one more seat in the city of Regina. Let's look at Regina South first.

This was the largest area that was made up and this was held by the Hon. G. Grant, Minister of Public Health, and something had to be done to break up this area. There also was a large expanding area directly west which is called Albert Park and he could not handle this whole thing. A new seat was set up and this will be a large area in a very short number of years, because it is an expanding area right down to No. 1 Highway.

Now we look to the north, which is Henry Baker's seat. Henry only won by 432 votes as you all know. It was very close. So the committee thought that we should give Henry a little help and they have. They have helped Henry out quite a bit and now apparently he doesn't want to run there. He wants to run with the Member for Regina North East. Anyway we helped Henry out and it is a good seat and he is now on the lake and he can communicate with the ducks and do whatever he wants over there and get along very well.

Then we move on to the portion of Mr. Whelan's seat. Now Mr. Whelan needed a little help there so we enlarged his seat. It is an expansion seat and he is getting along very well over there. But Education is one of the Members that was brought in by Mr. Douglas many, many years ago and has been on the public payroll right up to 1964. But we wanted to help Education and that is what happened. We made it so that Education would be there for a long, long time.

Then we come to the new Leader of the Opposition, who is gaining strength every day, Allan Blakeney. We enlarged Allan's by taking a little of Henry's and this will make Allan safe there. But all in all it is not like the NDP used to do. At least we have areas for Members to run. They put us all in one pot and that is the way they handled it.

Then we come to the Regina North East and Walter Smishek. Walter needed a little help there so we gave him a little of Henry's. So all in all it is certainly going to help Regina. I would like you all to read what happened in *Hansard* in 1951. I feel that the citizens of Regina will be satisfied with this Bill and I am going to support it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Matsalla** (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, in debating Bill No. 86 that is before us, I will confine my remarks to clause 5, the clause which provides for changes in constituency boundaries.

I might say that I haven't read all of the fine print in this clause, but if the new map is correct, I have a pretty good idea what the fine print contains. Comparing the constituency map of 1967 with the present one, some Hon. Members can hardly recognize their own constituencies. Some Members find themselves right out of their constituencies and our rural Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) is in fact witnessing the disappearance of his constituency.

The present job of gerrymandering, Mr. Speaker, is one of the last ditch attempts by the Liberal Government to win the next election. The Government knows that its policies are losing popularity with great rapidity. The people of Saskatchewan are losing whatever faith they may have had in Liberals. There is a definite turn away from the Liberals. Selkirk in the by-election of last Monday proved this point.

**April 15, 1970**

The Liberal Government has now come to the last in their bag of tricks, that is the trick of manipulating boundaries strictly for its advantage. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that this is the third time in six years that this Government has used the gerrymander technique in an attempt to gain seats. One in 1966, another in 1967 and now the third time. Surely the provision in The Legislative Assembly Act wasn't meant for this kind of boundary manipulation. The provision is one which is to be used with respect and to carry out the purpose of fair and equitable representation. Surely it wasn't meant to make boundary changes without logic and without rhyme or reason and without regard to principles underlying democratic procedures and fairness of representation.

But the way the provision is taken advantage of by this Liberal Government illustrates disrespect of purpose and unscrupulousness. The Government's primary objective is to gerrymander in a manner to win as many seats as possible for the sake of power and glory. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in his remarks made mention that the reason for changing boundaries at this time, and in the manner as was done, was to keep up with the times of shifting population and to provide fair representation.

When I look at our new boundary set-up I find various shapes and sizes. Some quite regular in shape and some most irregular. Some the doglegged kind with many corners. Some small in size and some large. When I examine the population of voters in constituencies I am convinced that in the Provincial Treasurer's remark there is very little, if any, shred of truth. My constituency of Canora, under the new set-up, will have nearly 9,000 voters as compared to Pelly which was reduced to some 6,500 voters. Prior to this manipulation Canora and Pelly had very nearly the same number of voters. Why the change, I ask the Provincial Treasurer? Are you trying to save the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) from getting beat? That's your objective I say and no other. That is your primary and only reason for manipulating boundaries the way that you have.

What about the Kelvington constituency? It makes one wonder whether the job was done by a drunk who waddled from side to side not knowing where he was going. The job in this constituency illustrates very vividly the purpose of this Bill. It is a deliberate job of a skilful and an unscrupulous manipulator. It was an all-out effort job aimed at defeating the New Democratic Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) and nothing else.

I want to say that the present legislation on boundaries is antiquated and out of step with the times. In all fairness and for the sake of justice, Saskatchewan should be moving towards modernizing our electoral system rather than falling into political exploitations and unfair practices.

Let us use foresight and look to the future to improve our democratic process of government. It is time that we recognized that the electorate must be provided with the most fair and the most democratic process for the purpose of electing their representatives and in effect their Government. The fact that present legislation provides for electoral boundaries at the pleasure of the government invariably results in irrational changes which are primarily geared towards political expediency. The contents of this Bill before us very glaringly illustrate this point. To overcome the danger of injustices in our present

system, the establishment of boundaries should definitely be taken out of the realm of politics. This work and responsibility should be put into the hands of an independent body that could carry out its function in a non-partisan and unbiased manner.

The independent body, Mr. Speaker, could be an electoral boundaries commission as referred to in the amendment moved by my colleague, Mr. Brockelbank, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair. Now because of independency of this body the Government would save itself from embarrassment of charges of unfair practices, selfishness and destruction of an important function of our democratic system, that is, the function of electing representatives under conditions that are fair and just in the eyes of our society.

Now, Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta along with our Federal Government have seen fit to remove the responsibility of redistribution from the hands of the Government in favour of independent bodies. With the Redistribution Bill before us and the hodge-podge manner in which the constituency boundaries were set up there is every reason to conclude that there is an urgent need to take the responsibility of setting up boundaries out of the hands of the Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Heggie** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, first let me say that the Redistribution Bill is not all bad as my hon. friends opposite would have us believe.

First it strives to give representation by population as far as is practicable. This is borne out by recognizing that the two main cities of Saskatchewan have grown significantly in population and, therefore, have been given increased representation namely: one new seat in each case. Saskatoon with a population of approximately 130,000 now has six Members instead of five. When Saskatoon had five Members the average was 26,000 population per Member. With the addition of one seat representation is down to about 22,000 per seat. In Regina six seats in a population of approximately 140,000 means about 23,000 people to one seat. Now with seven seats Regina is down to 20,000 per constituency.

The city average of course is far above the rural average of about 15,000 population per seat. however, it is well known that a city Member can service many more people than a rural Member, so that the disparity in population is offset by the compactness of city voters. Further, Saskatoon and Regina have a combined population of some 270,000, almost one-third of the provincial total. Until this Bill was introduced this one-third of the population had approximately 20 per cent of the representatives in the Legislature. Now with increased representation Regina and Saskatoon with one-third of the population have approximately 22 per cent of the Members. Not too big an increase, but it points in the direction of better representation by population.

Secondly, the Redistribution Bill leaves many of the seats unchanged, especially in the area below the South Saskatchewan River and the Qu'Appelle Valley. This points to the stability of the population in the rural areas of Southern Saskatchewan. These farms here are old and well established and there is little

or no mobility of population. In the central and northern part of the Province, some constituency boundaries have been changed. Now the Opposition are likely to complain that the boundaries are not bounded by straight lines or natural geological boundaries. I agree that range lines and township lines are a handy rule of thumb for setting constituency boundaries. but there is no magic in straight lines. Availability to trading centres and ease in crossing rivers and geographic barriers are much more important.

Some of the Members opposite claim that Last Mountain, Wadena and Kelvington have been changed a great deal. True, these seats have undergone some boundary changes and their boundaries are not exactly symmetrical. But, Mr. Speaker, does the constituency have to be square, rectangular, circular, hexagon or a parallelogram to be represented? I think not, Mr. Speaker. It is the Member who counts and not the shape. I would say that Kelvington as a converted capital 'Liberal' can be just as properly represented as if it were a square or another shape.

Now we are likely to be accused of gerrymandering. The Opposition has been using this word loosely this morning. Now my hon. friend from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) is always quoting history. This morning...I beg your pardon — it was the session before last that he gave Napoleon the credit for weeping at the loss of Calais when, if he would check his facts, it was Mary the First of England who wept when Calais was lost, the last English possession on the coast of France.

Now this morning in his speech my hon. friend, who I think reads history (But I wish he would get his facts straight) says that a seat was gerrymandered somewhere in England and this is where the term came from. Well how wrong can he be! And for his information the precise meaning of gerrymander comes from the redistribution of Essex County, Massachusetts, by Governor Elbridge Gerry (1744 to 1814). Some editor said it looked like a salamander and some wit dubbed it a gerrymander and the phrase stuck.

Gerrymandering is as old as democratic government. Elbridge Gerry went on to be Vice-President of the United States under Madison for the information of my hon. friend from Touchwood. Sir John A. MacDonald used an expression "Hive the grits". Sir John believed that getting all the grits in one hive would assure the Conservatives of four or five surrounding seats. The process is not new. all political parties including the NDP opposite have resorted to it and thereby change the political course at that time. But what I want to impress on this House is that the system has always worked and generally worked well. No Government in Canada or Saskatchewan has stayed in power any longer than the people wanted it regardless of redistribution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heggie:** — If a government oversteps the bounds of propriety in redistribution the electors will speak out with firmness. Don't let the Hon. Members opposite say in this House that an independent Electoral Boundaries Commission could do a better job. The Federal Electoral Readjustments Act appointed two professors and a judge of The Court of Queen's Bench as a Saskatchewan Boundaries Commission to redraw the boundaries of the

Federal seats in Saskatchewan. Their task was to reduce the Federal seats from 17 to 13. In their work the commissioners appeared to put extreme emphasis on representation by population and ignoring many other important features.

Swift current ended up the size of Western Australia, an impossible riding to represent. Assiniboia ended up not much better. Further, the cities of Regina and Saskatoon were split down the centre from north to south and lumped in with large rural areas. What kind of nonsense is this to split a city into two parts and amalgamate it with a large rural area whose interests, economic outlook and culture are quite different.

The commissioners were just as guilty as any other body of creating a jigsaw puzzle, cutting trading areas in two, crossing rivers where no bridges existed and side-stepping areas as small as townships in order to reach population uniformity. Regina East includes the town of Wynyard, a town which has little or no communication with Regina. Regina West includes Watrous and Young whose citizens trade in the Saskatoon area. The Moose Jaw seat runs up to within 12 miles of Saskatoon. An utterly ridiculous boundary in terms of proximity to central trading areas.

So it can be seen that what is set up as an impartial commission makes final boundary changes which are far less realistic than those made by the Legislature, which has the real understanding of the needs of the electors.

Is there precedent for irregular shaped constituencies, Mr. Speaker? I say there is. Consider Bengough constituency. In 1920 it was almost rectangular; in 1932 the Anderson Government, presumably for political advantage, narrowed the base and pushed out the top until it resembled a sort of a capital T. In 1938 the Liberal Government altered Bengough, again pushing it westward at the top until it had a narrow waist and bulges to the north and south. In 1951 the CCF Government still further narrowed the waist and that is now how Bengough remains today. There are other examples, too numerous to mention.

Now let me turn to the constituency of Hanley set out in the new Distribution Bill, where Hanley is favoured with a small part of southeast Nutana, the area east of Arlington and south of 8th Street. Some will ask: why put a piece of Saskatoon back in the rural seat of Hanley? Let me remind the House that Hanley once constituted the whole new suburban areas of Saskatoon as well as a rural area. My predecessor in office, Mr. Robert Walker, former Attorney General, told me at the time of the Hanley by-election in 1964 — and I was the Returning Officer in that election — that Hanley was almost the perfectly constituted seat — partly urban, partly rural — a nice balance between workers and farmers — a seat that represented a broad spectrum of the electorate.

This Government believes in restoring a little of that balance and hence has reorganized the seat to include a small portion of urban voters in Saskatoon. Let me remind the House and especially the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) that this Member has withstood many jeers and taunts that he represented a seat with a small population. In 1967 Hanley had 5,300 voters whereas most seats had 7,500 to 8,000. The addition of this portion of Saskatoon will raise the population of the Hanley seat so that it will have approximately 7,000 voters and with normal growth it will some reach 7,500 to 8,000.

**April 15, 1970**

And apropos of this, Mr. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair, let me remind the House that Saskatoon's residential growth is pointed to the southeast and will eventually require a brand new seat, carved out of southeast Saskatoon and Hanley rural. The Bill merely lays the foundation for this new constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Bill taken as a whole is fair and reasonable and its merits far outweigh its demerits, therefore I enthusiastically support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky** (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I was following last year's speech of the Hon. Member and he has practically repeated everything that he said last year. I am surprised that the people opposite were laughing once again. They laughed last year and they laughed this time. This is found on page 1432, March 26, 1968. I could quote you a line or two to show the Hon. Member repeated what he said then.

"The greatest gerrymanderer that Canada ever had," he repeated. He talked about the grits and John A. MacDonald. He doesn't change as we go along. It is the same old speech as I have pointed out. I wish that he would prepare some new ones and give some life to his speeches.

However, I must say this, Mr. Speaker, that I stand up to oppose this Bill simply because it is lacking in social justice and political morality. I can say in a word or a phrase which may be Churchillian, "That never before has so much harm been done to so many." This Bill essentially and legally disenfranchises thousands of voters by its gerrymanders. Many thousands of people association with certain definite political parties are now being grouped into large constituencies and others into small constituencies a, strictly a political deal.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this is not only a disgrace to the Liberal Party but it is a disgrace to this Legislature, it is a disgrace to democratic functioning. This Bill represents a gerrymander for political purposes. I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that all the Hon. Members opposite can agree with such a vicious and unfair practice. Surely to goodness when we look at the world today and see everybody talking about finding ways for survival and when we talk about social justice, then this is not the time for a bill like this. It may have been in the past that these kinds of practices were carried out, but surely to goodness in 1970 we should discontinue such a practice.

I think that governments, Mr. Speaker, have more responsibility than to just look at their own personal and selfish interests. Surely, if democracy is to sustain itself we must not bring in legislation which will only bring about decay.

Now having said these things in general let's take a look at what is happening in my part of the Province of Saskatchewan. Here is the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who sat on the electoral committee. He was supposed to consider the interests of all the people of Saskatchewan. He has one of the smallest constituencies in the province, with only three or four communities, small urban communities. His vote in the 1967 election was only

2,780 votes. All the voters he has on the list number 3,911. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that if we are considering representation by population that something should have been done in that constituency. I think on a previous occasion I have suggested that. I have suggested that that constituency be enlarged, maybe brought right down to Prince Albert and relieve some of the pressure there. There are many Liberals there supporting the party. But no, this Member who sat on this committee wanted to protect only himself in a cute little corner of Northern Saskatchewan in Lac LaRonge, Pelican Narrows, Uranium City, that's all he's got. there has been absolutely no change there. Then you come down to my own constituency, which is Prince Albert East-Cumberland. Everybody recognized this area as two constituencies before. It is not going to be so now, it is going to be one called Prince Albert East. It is a city constituency, but what a city, Sir. I represent the largest part of the said city of Prince Albert and my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer, has a smaller part. According to this map it is like a postage stamp. My seat of Prince Albert East extends to the pulp mill, 12 miles, and officially that's where the boundary of the city ends. But that isn't enough for the committee. they have got to go way up to Creighton and Flin Flon, 250-300 miles and give it to Bill Berezowsky because they are all New Democrats up there. But don't change anything for the Member for Athabasca.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Say thank you, Bill!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I am not selfish like you are. To prove that, I told you last time to take out Cumberland House and add it to Nipawin, knowing all the time that there was a majority of 89 Liberals in that community. I was willing to give up these votes to Nipawin in order that the people could be better served and I believe that this is my job in this Legislature, not to be selfish but to look after the interests of the people. You have made this change and for that I give you credit whether it elects the Member for Nipawin or not. I am sure he is not going to get elected in spite of what has happened. But I give him votes under this distribution, an 89 majority in Cumberland House for Nipawin. Fine! But what have you done in return? You are still not satisfied with those 89 votes that might give the Liberals a majority. No, they have to transfer to me all that area between Smeaton and Garrick which is essentially New Democratic voters for Bill Berezowsky or to the constituency of Prince Albert East. Let's take a look at some figures. In the last election in my constituency which is 300 miles long from one end to the other, we had 7,344 voting. there were 10,296 people on the voters' list, much less than in the constituency of Athabasca, about three times as many as a matter of fact, much less than in Nipawin, very close to what there was in Prince Albert West. So now they add another four, five or six townships of people, that's fine, I am assured of election or whoever is going to run for the New Democratic party. We are assured of election in my constituency. Does not that prove the point that I made at the beginning, that you have created large constituencies because of certain political factors there, then you created other small constituencies because there is another political factor there. This is essentially what you have done. But that isn't all, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Prince Albert West said a year ago at a party, "Bill has done such a good job, we'll have to give him more of Prince Albert City." He's done that, I could welcome it but I think it is a selfish thing on his part. He has added two blocks and other areas to my



**April 15, 1970**

constituency. I haven't even counted them. I am sure there must be 1,500 — 2,000 voters between Third Avenue and Fifth Avenue East through the city of Prince Albert from the River south as far as 36th Street East and everything east to the original boundaries, much of which was in his constituency previously. Why did he do it? For the simple reason that basically there is a majority of New Democratic voters there which he didn't want.

**An Hon. Member:** — The only way you had any hope, Davey!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And to assure himself of victory in Prince Albert West this is what he had to do. I am sorry he didn't go as far as Central Avenue. As a matter of fact he should have given me the whole city of Prince Albert and run in Regina, because we are going to win it anyway in both constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, another point. It means that when the Hon. Provincial Treasurer gives me 2,000 votes he is going to drop from 12,160 on the list on the basis of the last election, down to about 10,000. I have a constituency 300 miles long, with Creighton and other places, and I am going to have 14,000 voters reversing the figures. But even at that I don't complain. I heard the Member for Hanley who sat down saying that in Saskatoon the average Member represents 22,000 people. In Regina the average Member represents 20,000. What does the Member for Prince Albert represent? 10,000 people. He represented 12,000 but that was too much, instead of going up to 20,00, he is going down to 10,000. I'll tell you he is going down the river, way down that stagnant river into Hudson's Bay.

**An Hon. Member:** — He can't even represent ten!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now I regret very much that this whole business had not been decided by an independent commission. I think the city of Prince Albert should have two Members representing 10,000 or 20,000 each. The fact is it is growing and it is going to grow. The people in the North at Creighton probably should have had a seat there of their own. This is what I have said all along, I think it is proper and timely. A commission would have done just that, an independent commission, not a Liberal commission, Mr. Speaker. As to Athabasca, the way things are now it could probably have been wiped out, there could have been two northern seats, one of the west side and one on the east side right up to the Territories, while the city of Prince Albert could be represented by two members which I think they should have, just like Moose Jaw and other places. These, Sir, are some of the criticisms I make but the main criticism, Mr. Speaker, is this, that this Government has failed to accept its representative for democratic functioning and it has played a game of politics with this Bill and I can't support it.

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, first I wish to thank my fellow Member from Regina South West for the enthusiastic and sincere attempt he made to represent the city of Regina on the committee. I was pleased that he had the audacity — and that is the only word for it — to stand on his feet in this House and say that he was going to deal with the Regina situation. He said the

Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) the Minister of Public Health, couldn't handle this whole thing — he was referring to his seat — although Regina South was the smallest seat in the whole city of Regina. I don't think that is a very complimentary thing to say about the Hon. Member for Regina South. I had a great deal more respect for his ability than that. I thought since he had the smallest riding he certainly should have been able to handle that.

Now speaking of my own riding, it is a growing constituency and it doesn't have 13,500 people. Recently we did a mailing to the constituency, it took 8,000 envelopes, so I would say now there are probably 17,500 people living in the constituency. The reason my constituency is not being reduced in size, I suggest, is because the way they think politically. The Hon. Member, in making his representation to the committee, said he took into consideration that I had done a good job in my riding, I wish to thank him very much for that, an excellent compliment that any Member certainly appreciates. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that my riding has got to know me. They don't care whether I came to Saskatchewan in 1941 or whether I came in 1960 or whether I worked for the Co-op, or whether Tommy Douglas brought me or what else. What they really want is representation, that's what they really want in my constituency. I am suggesting that this Government daveymandered me before, you know, they did a real job of daveymandering me. Look at the score, look what happened after their last attempt to daveymander. Now I suggest to the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) that, if you look at this Bill and you look at what has happened to Regina South West, he's pretty well aware of his chances. He knows pretty well what's going to happen, he knows what his constituents think of him. You bet he does! Frankly I question whether he can reduce his riding enough to win at any time. This Bill proves that he knows his popularity and his ability and his record of representation in his constituency, he knows his efforts. His conscience speaks clearly in this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Now some of the people from Regina North West will be in to help in his campaign, help with his popularity I suggest. I made the same promise to the former Member for Melville in 1966. The Hon. Member for Hanley who just spoke was also a Member of the highly secretive political committee. this committee will go down in the records of this Legislature as a secretive committee that spawned rotten boroughs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I think we should strike a postage stamp to commemorate the daveymander expert. This postage stamp should have on it a pirate with a skull and cross bones holding his hand over a ballot box. I think it is particularly apt because: 1. some of the ridings look like a postage stamp, Mr. Speaker; 2. stamps are generally thrown away in the wastepaper basket after they are used once; 3. sometimes stamps are lost in the mail and cause the originator embarrassment. I predict that's what will happen to this Government.

This is not exactly a symbol of democracy. If you look at what has happened in my constituency, I had what was known as the Grey Nuns' Annex without explanation. I got to know these people, they began to become a part of the representations that I made in the Legislature. I am very sorry to lose them. I want to say that I regret they are no longer a part of my

constituency. I believe that the communication between a Member and the people that he has been representing has been lost in the introduction of this particular Bill in the House. They say that there are 60 seats now, and each one of them single seats, they are now single member constituencies. The explanation for this was that before, there were thousands of people in Regina and thousands of people in Saskatoon that were never represented. What they are doing in this Bill is saying that about 20,000 people in Regina will not elect 60 per cent of the Members, if they can possibly get away with it. There is no limit on size and there is no explanation for a seat with 17,000 or 18,000 voters and another seat with 5,000. It has made a mockery of democracy. To include a tribute to George Willis — George Willis has served this House well — when he is going to retire as an explanation for what has happened in Melfort-Tisdale, I think is sort of dirtying George Willis' name.

Look at my own area when you talk about areas, look at the area in my constituency when you talk about areas that are growing, growing districts. They talk about Albert Park, they talk about Whitmore Park, they talk about these districts expanding in size. Look at the constituency that I have, Normanview, Dieppe, Mount Royal, Angus Road, CPR Annex. On Angus Road alone there are 1,200 new suites that have been built since 1967. This has not been taken into consideration in the redistribution. This committee had no statistics. I suggest that the committee that worked with the Hon. Member had no conscience either. The names of the Hon. Member for Regina south West, the Hon. Member for Athabasca, the Hon. Member for Milestone, the Hon. Member for Hanley, will go down in the records of this Legislature as a secretive political committee, not as a committee that worked with statistics. The fear of the voter guided their judgment, their faith in their own judgment wrote the Bill, their policies will write a footnote after the next election. The footnote will be, "We underestimated the general public."

You know, Mr. Speaker, in every corner of Kelvington in the last by-election that we held, the recount was an issue. I found this over and over again when I canvassed. In every riding where there is a daveymander, this will be an issue in the next election and these people can bet on that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — You know, the young people lose faith in democracy. Look at this Bill. Why shouldn't they? A vote in Regina Centre is worth one-third as much as a vote in Albert Park. Why shouldn't these people lose faith in democracy? Equality under the law, that's a laugh.

Let me conclude with this. This Bill will inscribe in the most unworthy manner the names of the authors of the Bill. History will never forget them. Political scientists will compare it with Manitoba and Alberta and students for generations will study this as the most nefarious legislation setting out the distribution of seats in the history of any province in Canada. I am opposed to the Bill.

**Hon. A.R. Guy** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of this just and fair committee. I think we all recognize that redistribution takes place at regular intervals with every government of Canada. So

said Clarence Fines in 1951. This is one of those times in Saskatchewan when redistribution is required to provide fair and just representation in our Legislature. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at some of the criticisms opposite. One would think that the CCF never brought in a redistribution Bill. We hear words like gerrymandering, disenfranchisement and others. Well, I want to give you a few examples today of what happened in 1951 when they brought in a major redistribution Bill that emasculated every seat in this province.

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — What year was that, Allan, '51?

**Mr. Guy:** — The one in 1951, before the young pup from Saskatoon was born probably! There was one of the most vicious gerrymanders that this country, let alone this province has ever seen. In 1944 the CCF swept into power with 47 CCF Members and 5 Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — A lot of good guys were fighting.

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, there is a lot of truth in that too, Mr. Speaker.

Prior to the 1948 election, although no redistribution had taken place for 10 years, and one was badly needed due to the change in population, the CCF did not see fit to do so because in view of their success in 1944, no change in boundaries was necessary for political reasons. But in 1951, however, the situation had changed. In the 1948 election the CCF numbers decreased from 47 to 31, while Liberal strength increased from 5 to 21. The writing was on the wall as seven years of Socialism had disillusioned the majority of Saskatchewan people. The only answer the CCF could find to save their necks was redistribution like this Province has never seen before. The success of this gerrymander was shown in 1952 when the CCF with completely new constituencies elected 42 CCFs and only 11 Liberals. In 1951 there was total redistribution with only eight seats left untouched. In this Bill before us today, well over half of the area of the province has been left untouched. 25 seats are completely unaltered, and another 23 seats were forced to be altered to accommodate the two seats in the cities and the rural seat that would be deleted. Compare this, Mr. Speaker, with the eight seats that were left untouched in 1951 and any reasonable person can see that this Bill is most reasonable and is not in any way an attempt to gerrymander. If we had wanted to gerrymander the seats of this province, we would have changed them all. We don't have to gerrymander. After all, we came back on 1967 with an increased majority over 1964, and it looks today if we called an election this year we would sweep the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — However, in fairness to our city people and to the shift in population in our rural areas, it was decided that there had constituencies were not affected by these factors, they were left as is. Members opposite have raised some question regarding differences in population. This always occurs when

redistribution takes place. You can never because of geographical factors and others have every constituency equal in number.

This was the same in 1951 and I only want to give one or two examples. In 1951, prior to the redistribution, Biggar constituency had 8,523 voters, while Rosthern had 9,516. So although Rosthern had 1,000 more voters than Biggar prior to redistribution, two polls with Liberal majorities were taken off Biggar and added to Rosthern, so the disparity increased even further after redistribution. Yet Mr. Fines said this was just and fair. It is not difficult to see why this action was taken, when one considers that in 1944 the MLA for Biggar, the present Leader of the Opposition had a majority of 1,500 votes, but in 1948 it had dropped to 70 votes. The CCF wanted to save the skin of their Minister of Education, so the transfer of polls took place, even though this was completely opposite to Mr. Fines' statement of principle that an attempt was made to equalize the population in each constituency. This pattern of trying to protect their Members from defeat was consistent during the redistribution of 1951. I am only going to give a few of the most glaring examples. Melfort-Tisdale, with a Liberal majority of 30 in 1948, had its boundaries redrawn on the 1948 election return, so that there would be a CCF majority of 530, and as a result, Melfort-Tisdale went CCF in 1952, and they have held it ever since.

**Mr. G.C. Willis** (Melfort-Tisdale): — 1,500, my friend!

**Mr. Guy:** — Good. In this Bill you will notice that Melfort-Tisdale has disappeared, as the result of the treatment afforded the Member for Melfort-Tisdale by his own party and also in view of his announced retirement. It appears very fitting that this constituency of Melfort-Tisdale is being retired from the wars. The Member for Regina North West said that this wasn't fair to the sitting Member. Well, I ant to just suggest to him that the way they have treated that Member since this Legislature stated, when they embarrassed him in front of his constituents, if there is anyone that has been unfair to a man that has made a contribution to this House, as the Member for Melfort-Tisdale has, it is certainly his own party, one that certainly we in the Government do not condone.

Now I would like to take a look at The Battlefords. the by-election in 1950 gave a Liberal majority of 138 votes, but after redistribution, the CCF majority was 386 based on the 1950 election figures. Shellbrook had a CCF majority of 175, but they added enough territory to increase it to 388. There was no decision here regarding population, it was strictly on the basis of political advantage. Kelvington was mentioned today. In 1948 the CCF majority was 352 but before the next election, even that was not considered enough, and the boundaries were changed to make that majority 597. Watrous had a CCF majority of 139, they fixed it up to a majority of 496. Touchwood, a CCF majority of 168, it was increased to 413. Hanley had a CCF majority of 51 where the Attorney General, Mr. Walker was. They decided he would never be able to win with that majority so they raised it by 210 by juggling the boundaries. I would remind Members opposite that the only way they could get that increased majority was to take in part of the city of Saskatoon, which today they say is terrible, unfair, unjust. It wasn't unjust when you wanted to save Bob Walker on your side of the House.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why don't you grow up!

**Mr. Guy:** — Why don't you shut up! You don't like it? The only reason he doesn't like it, he's afraid that the Member who was nominated for Melfort-Tisdale will move into the western part of the seat and take it away from him. I wouldn't doubt it either, because I understand he is a pretty intelligent young man which would give him something over the present Member.

These were only a few examples of how two Liberal seats were changed to CCF majorities and CCF seats with slim majorities were made more safe by redistribution. Mr. Speaker, before taking my seat, I wish to refer to the most dastardly attempt to gerrymander two sitting Members out of their seats this country has ever seen. I refer to the attempt in the 1951 redistribution Bill of the CCF to completely eliminate the two Northern Members who represented the Liberal party in this House. What was even worse, they tried to disenfranchise every fisherman, trapper, miner and everyone else in Northern Saskatchewan. I don't know what the Member from Cumberland has said today because he is suggesting that we go back to the same principle that they tried to bring in in 1951 and he should be ashamed of himself.

In 1938 the Liberal Government established the two seats of Athabasca and Cumberland because we felt that Northern people needed representation in our Government. Both these seats were composed of Northern people with similar interests, which provided a contrast to the other 50 seats that were agriculturally oriented. Because these Northern people could not tolerate the compulsion and the arrogance of the CCF officials that flooded the North, they continuously voted Liberal, and as a result the CCF tried to eliminate the representation of these Northern people in the following manner. In 1948, Athabasca and Cumberland each had 1,200 voters, people of similar interests. The CCF took 800 from Athabasca and put them in Meadow Lake with 6,000 farm voters who had agricultural interests with the rest of the province, so they effectively silenced the voice of Northern interests from Athabasca.

**Hon. D.V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Who did that? Fines?

**Mr. Guy:** — That was Fines who did that, yes. the remaining 400 were put in Cumberland, thus eliminating the Northern seat of Athabasca altogether, and a representative who would represent these people. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that had been all they had done, it would have been bad enough, but at least the people of Athabasca and Cumberland had similar interests, so if Cumberland had been left it wouldn't have been so bad, even though one Northern representative was eliminated. But they didn't stop there, they took the 400 from Athabasca, the 1,200 from Cumberland and put them in a new seat with 4,500 farmers around Prince Albert. So with two strokes of the pen, the two Northern Members had been eliminated and Northern interests were subordinated to the agricultural interests of the rest of the province. Now thank heaven, Mr. Speaker, the CCF were forced to back down from this proposal. Thank heaven this was never allowed to happen. The Liberal Opposition, the Press, every fair-minded citizen in this province started writing and phoning and making statements and eventually they had to back down. The turning point in the debate came when one of their own Members bolted the CCF party and made the following speech. You can check this in volume 38, Debates and Proceedings, March 12, 1951, page 37. Here is what Mr. Benson, the CCF Member for Last Mountain had to say about the tactics of his CCF friends. He said:

But I do not think that the redistribution in the North is fair to people of this province. It seems to me it is a real gerrymander up in the Northern areas. I am quite sure that even though the vote has been changed to work to the advantage of the Government at the present time, the Government will find it will work to its disadvantage when the election comes.

These were the words of their own Member, their own CCF Member for Last Mountain in regard to the gerrymander which was taking place in Northern Saskatchewan.

Then the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland today stands up and suggests that we return the boundaries to what they were under that 1951 redistribution. He said that the lines should go north and south so that they can bring in the agricultural region. The only reason he suggested that is that without the agricultural vote in Cumberland that man would never have seen the inside of this House. He never had the vote from Northern people. He relied entirely on farmers from the southern part of his seat who outnumbered the Northern people by about 10 to 1 and he got into this Legislature and that's the only way he ever made it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Now he complained today about the size of Athabasca. Anyone who was ever up there knows that this takes in almost one-half the total area of this province. Now he says he wants to make it bigger. I don't care how big he makes it, they will still return a Liberal Member to this House because they cannot stand the wheelings and dealings of the NDP and the Socialists. Go ahead, come up there and run any day of the week.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Come and run, come and run. The way you move, the election would be over before you ever covered the polls.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — So, Mr. Speaker, this shows the attitude of Members opposite towards redistribution. All the tears and the crying and the accusations that they are making here today will have not one ounce of consideration by the people of this province when you weigh it against what they tried in 1951.

It is evident that this Bill that we have before us is in the best interests of the cities, farms and rural areas of this province and it gives me a great privilege and a great feeling of satisfaction to support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.E. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I first of all want to say that I'm glad that the Provincial Treasurer identified the butchers and the carvers. It is good to know who were the masters in this play. The truth is that

the whole Liberal side of the House must be accused of guilt. I am also very pleased that the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) is in the House because of some of the things I intend to say. He may be very interested in my remarks and I hope that he does stay in his seat. I am glad that he was identified in the original debate because I think the people of Regina will want to remember the Hon. Member for Regina South West for what he has done to the city of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to point out that of the Members of the Legislature who were elected in 1967, the Liberal Members on the average represent 8,500 voters, the NDP Members on the average represent 10,200 voters. What this means is that every NDP Member in the Legislature represents 25 per cent more voters than every Liberal Member. My guess now is that the numbers of voters to be represented by a Liberal will drop to about 7,500 whereas the NDP will rise in excess of 12,000. This is the Liberal basis of proportionate representation by population.

Mr. Speaker, our democracy, our system of government has been formed on the principle of proportionate representation. It has been based on some reform of representation by population. But in this gerrymander or daveymander as it was described this is thrown away. I think the people of Saskatchewan will take that into account when the day of the election comes.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to direct my remarks in the main to the city of Regina, which I know best. I first of all welcome that there are going to be seven seats in the city of Regina in place of six. Regina City has grown according to the Provincial Treasurer but he is trying to inflate figures. He has told us that since the last gerrymander they had it has grown by 18,000. Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the seats and the population in the city of Regina, then the voting population as I see it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 85,000 to 86,000. That's the total. Regrettably but true many people are moving out of Regina because of the economic conditions the Liberals created and perhaps the population will drop some more. On this basis, Mr. Speaker, every Member, or every constituency should have on the average 122,300 voters in the city of Regina.

Let us first of all take a look at what was the representation before. In Regina North East, the constituency that I had the privilege of representing, according to the voters' list in 1967 there were 14,350 voters; North West, 13,000; South East, 15,300; South West, 13,600; Centre, 10,100; South 11,400. This was bad enough. There was a good deal of imbalance then. But let us take a look at what they are proposing now regardless of the argument that the Provincial Treasurer and the Hon. Member for Regina South West tried to use of the population growth. The truth is that in Regina we have not had that spectacular growth but the important thing to look at is what they have done. Take the case of Regina North East based on the shift and using the 1967 voters' list, 14,700 voters. But I know in Regina North East the population has grown quite a bit and I'm sure that the number of voters has increased. We have had considerable growth in Uplands, this is in Poll No. 1, it has doubled in size. We have had considerable growth in Regina North. We've had growth in Glen Elm, in both south and north and in Glen Cairn. It is safe to assume that in Regina North East there will be well over 16,000 voters. Take Regina North West, that constituency had about 13,500 voters. The Hon. Member for Regina North West



**April 15, 1970**

(Mr. Whelan) has estimated that constituency will now be well over 16,000 votes. Take Regina Centre, it was one of the smallest seats in the city of Regina, it had 10,100 voters and it will now be in excess of 18,000 voters, Mr. Speaker. Now let us take a look at the southern constituencies as they are proposed in the cities. Wascana, according to the population is less than 11,000; Regina Lakeview again will be less than 11,000 voters; Whitmore Park, less than 6,000 voters; Regina Albert Park, 3,400 voters, Mr. Speaker. I want you to take note, the new constituency Regina Albert Park is one-fifth the size of Regina Centre. Mr. Speaker, I know we had a little bit of growth but I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are no more than 5,000 voters at this stage in that proposed constituency. All right, then produce figures.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Where did the Member get the figures on Wascana, Lakeview, Whitmore and Albert Park?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now the Member rose on a point of order and asked if he could ask the Member a question. If the Member is prepared to receive the question, he will take his seat. If he isn't prepared to receive the question we'll keep on speaking and that's the end of the matter until the end of his speech.

**Mr. Smishek:** — The Member for Regina south West feels very guilt today. But I'm prepared to answer him. These are taken from the polls for 1967. I know e had some growth and I wish you would listen. Don't be that touchy, Mr. McPherson. You have a guilt feeling today.

**An Hon. Member:** —Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — I'm not playing with figures. You are the one who is playing with figures. Mr. Speaker, these are the 1967 figures. I'm using the Provincial Treasurer's population growth figures not just in the south part of Regina but there's been population growth all over and you know it, Mr. McPherson.

**Mr. McPherson:** — I tell you you're wrong.

**Mr. Smishek:** — All right produce the figures, produce your real gerrymander so that we can have the basis of assessment. I did not interrupt you and I hope you will have the courtesy and the decency, Mr. Hon. Member from Regina South West, to give me my opportunity to speak.

**An Hon. Member:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — That's right. You know the Hon. Member for Regina South West is a big man but really when it comes down to performance in the Legislature he has proven to be somewhat of a lightweight. I note the little Regina Albert Park constituency he has created for himself had 3,400 voters in 1967, perhaps it has grown to 5,000 by now. Mr. Speaker, I want you to contrast this big man but a lightweight as compared with the Hon. Member for Regina Centre who is not built large in stature, but really has proven himself to be a big man in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — He has proven himself to be a real heavyweight in this Legislature, so much of a heavyweight that the Liberals have said let's double his number of voters. That's what they have done and I'm sure that the Hon. Member for Regina Centre can carry the weight he has carried plus the additional weight. He has proven to be a very able representative of the people of Regina.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — I'm sure he is going to be one who is going to carry that seat with a large majority, if he gets a nomination there, and I hope he does. Mr. Speaker, so there we have the big man proved to be a lightweight and a person who is not that large in size proven to be a heavyweight. He is going to represent four or five times the number of people in the city of Regina as compared to what my friend, Mr. McPherson wants to represent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Regina South West has a saying — he and I really do get along quite well. He often says, "You know me," we know you, we know exactly what you have done. We can see your handwriting in this Bill that is before us. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member when he spoke said, "The citizens of Regina will be satisfied." Mr. Speaker, I submit to him that the people of Regina will not be satisfied, and if you want to test it why don't you discuss it with the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. Let's submit this question of your redistribution to a plebiscite to the people of Regina and see how satisfied they will be.

Mr. Speaker, there is need for additional representation in Regina but what should have been done is fair redistribution on the basis of our population, approximately 12,000 voters for each constituency but not a redistribution where in one constituency there will be no more than 5,000 voters and in another constituency 18,000 voters. This the people of Regina will resent. This is the kind of redistribution that the people of Regina will oppose and I'm sure they will indicate their objection in opposition on election day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to my constituency of Regina North East.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Henry is not here.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Don't get excited, Ross. You'll have some troubles in Morse, don't get excited, that's providing you even decide to run there. I think one of these little gerrymandered seats in the city of Regina is something that you are trying perhaps to carve out for yourself.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I'm not...

**Mr. Smishek:** — I'll answer that in a minute.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What are you shaking for?

**Mr. Smishek:** — I'm not shaking. The Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) said that in this redistribution he tried to help me. I want to thank him very much. Now what has happened to my constituency is about 20 per cent of the voters were taken out from the downtown area. I think 17 polls were affected, and 13 ½ polls were then added from Regina South East. In terms of the population and adding the natural growth it is going to be one of the larger constituencies. I've had good support from Regina North East. I had the good fortune of getting a majority of almost 2,600. I propose to run in Regina North East, that is, seek the nomination there. Our people are going to determine that. The people in our New Democratic party are going to resolve that. We don't need your assistance. Thank you very much.

The constituency of Regina North East is a constituency that perhaps is one of the toughest to represent. I say this from experience. People living here have many personal problems — in proportion to the total city we had the largest number of welfare cases who need assistance. They need advice and this takes up a good deal of the MLA's time. We have a large number of senior citizens. They require a good deal of attention. They want information. We have people who have language problems. We have many pensioners who require assistance in making applications for pensions. Very often there the applications at times get hung up. This requires a good deal of attention. We have a lot of people who do have economic problems. In regard to deterrent fees there's hardly a day that passes by that somebody doesn't phone me because of a difficulty they have in regard to deterrent fees that this Government has created. We have a number of blind persons. We have a lot of unskilled workers who are subject to unemployment. This last year hardly a day passed by that I did not get a phone call or a visit or a direct contact asking for information. They have problems with unemployment insurance, problems with workmen's compensation. Many of these problems are created by the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was any justification to create a small constituency, I submit that Regina North East could have probably been the smaller constituency so that the Member of the Legislature would be able to devote more time to the care and attention these people need. But I'm not complaining. I have had over 15,000 people before, the constituency has grown some.

I expect our organization will soon hold a nominating convention. I have already indicated to the Press and I say it here, I intend to seek the nomination. Questions have been asked in this regard. The Hon. Members opposite deliberately tried to create a difficult situation for us. Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Regina will remember this. May I remind them that the people of Regina will remember this. May I remind them that the Hon. Member for Regina South East, His Worship Mayor Baker, has had the good fortune of commendable majorities in this city. If he decides to run as a candidate in some city constituency I am sure that the people of Regina will again give him the kind of endorsement they have given him before and they will keep in mind what the Liberals tried to do to him.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is really a sad indictment on the Government Members on the committee that was established. It completely ignores, it completely flies in the face of representation by population, it flies in the face of democracy. It tells the true story of the contempt the Liberals have for this Legislative Assembly. I cannot support this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois** (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose if anybody should be dying of a bleeding heart in this House now as a result of this redistribution Bill it should be myself. When you look at the very beautiful Liberal seat of City Park-University and find that it has been cleft right in half, it is a great pity. I can see my heart bleeding and running down the South Saskatchewan River which is now the dividing line for the two new seats. But I think instead of crying my eyes out over this redistribution I would rather be a good sport about it and face the thing in a factual manner. I would like to commend our Government in the changes that are proposed in this Bill. I would like to commend the Government for recognizing the need for more representation for our major urban centres. In these centres we have witnessed a continuous and steady growth in population, and I think a good example is the fact that the face of Saskatoon has changed considerably during the last two years. There has been a steady growth in population. At the end of 1967 the figure was 120,562 and at the end of 1968 it was 125,630 — an increase of 4,000 people — and at the end of 1969 it was 129,500. This is again a very pronounced effect on some parts of the city more than on others. Certainly the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University has been affected as much as, if not more than, any other in the city of Saskatoon.

**Mr. Meakes:** — What about the mountain?

**Mr. Charlebois:** — Was that remark in order, Mr. Speaker?

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we have had somewhat phenomenal growth, particularly — and I'm referring here now to the present constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University — but here we have had a phenomenal growth particularly on the east side of the constituency, the Nutana side where we have had a very large new subdivision known as College Park. This has filled in a very substantial area east of Circle Drive between Highway No. 5 and Eighth Street. Then at Cumberland and Fourteenth Street we have the three new high-rise apartments that are being built and near completion for the University of Saskatchewan students and more of these facilities are to be built in the near future. Now the University itself continues to grow and Sutherland has new apartment blocks and a condominium development that is taking place with another one proposed. So we see that this Nutana side is now a much larger area than it was two years ago and the population density is now much more pronounced than it was at that time.

Then to go to the downtown side which is proposed now to be one of the new seats, on the downtown side of the South Saskatchewan River, we have a similar growth story and a population area with very specific needs, somewhat different from those on the Nutana side. The residential areas, speaking again of this side of the River, the residential areas to the north have had a very substantial growth. This growth is continuing; and in the downtown section we have seen one high-rise after another going up. This is creating a population density and the specific problems that occur in an area of this kind.

**April 15, 1970**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am indeed in favour of this Bill and I am sure that it will be appreciated by the citizens of Saskatoon. The new boundaries for our city have been drawn in a completely fair and sensible manner and will result in a better representation for our people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

the Assembly recessed at 12:30 p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before the debate resumes I wish to introduce the following groups of students and others situated in the Speaker's gallery: students from the Regina Vocational Centre from the constituency of Regina South East represented by their Member, Mr. McPherson, they are under the direction of Mrs. Thomas; students from Scott Collegiate, the grade 12 students, under the direction of Mr. Gerla, they are from the constituency of Regina Centre represented by Mr. Blakeney. I am sure all Members of the Legislature would wish to extend to them an extremely warm welcome and express the very sincere hope that they will find their stay here educational, interesting, and wish to each and everyone of them a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted Debate on Bill No. 86 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, at the offset I must say that I will not support the Bill. I have given it some consideration in the short time we have had it before us. After what we have heard this morning I can understand when there is a difference of a couple of thousand between constituencies. That can be excused for geographic locations, and so on. But when I get to my constituency which had a big chunk added to it and see the constituency of Melfort that has 10,000 names on the voters' list, legislated out of existence, you begin to wonder. There is the town of Melfort with a population of 4,800, the town of Star City with 620 in that area; they were entitled to a seat, someone to be a little closer to home. Yet in the city of Regina, as it was said this morning, seats with less than 4,000 names on the list and about one mile square for the fellow who sits on the corner. If this is what we call justice, it is using the word "justice" quite loosely.

In my constituency we have the town of Wakaw, the town of Kinistino and the town of Birch Hills. A few years ago I referred to the redistribution Bill as a drunk caterpillar walking on a sheet of paper and it was drawing lines. I think this caterpillar this time had at least .08 and there wouldn't be any question about it.

In order to solve the situation I would like to direct my remarks to the Member for the small constituency of Prince Albert West. If he wanted to alleviate the pressure on the Member for East Cumberland, it was not by adding more. He has the biggest part of northern Saskatchewan the way it is and if you see any justice in that, I can't see it. You could have

added to the constituency of Kinistino the portion between the two Saskatchewan rivers. That's plenty of logic. It would have given Kinistino a little more population and perhaps alleviated Prince Albert a little bit. But, no, it seemed to be more practical for the Liberal party to legislate one seat out of existence. Just take one seat like that. When you consider the population, they have a voters' list of 10,000. Kinistino had between 7,000 and 8,000 still bigger than some of these that you have here in Regina.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shameful! A disgrace!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I don't want to take too much time but I think it is a display of political immorality and arrogance. It brings disrespect down upon this democratic system of ours. When you ask our young people to understand this there is no logic when Regina Albert Park, one mile square, with 3,408 names on the voters' list — that's according to 1967 — can have one representative. Then if you multiply this by five, it will not amount to the constituency of Regina Centre that has names on the voters' list almost amounting to 18,000 people. I hope the Press will make a point of letting the people of Saskatchewan know about this.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, I doubt it, Art, if we can trust them.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Oh, I trust them that they will and we are going to make a point of exposing this. I could expect something like this from the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and oh, even the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), but when I see people who want to be promoted to the Bench and want to talk about justice, it is a little bit saddening. What do they know about justice when they get behind and make themselves a part of this Bill? They make themselves a part of this and there should have been a little bit of justice which they are not displaying this morning. The excuses that you have provided are so childish. I am sure that the students in the galleries, if you had given them that job today and said go and distribute the seats in Saskatchewan, would have done a much better job than what you have done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — At least I think they would have been just, and that is something that you are a stranger to.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — Yes, Sir. As I said a moment ago, it brings disrespect on our parliamentary system. They have used the argument this morning that somebody in the past has done this so It justified you to do it also. This is that argument that we have had. We are not here to live by the past. We are dealing with the present and if mistakes have been made in the past, we are not here to continue these mistakes. We are here to rectify them and to legislate for the future. We are not in the Model T Ford days. We are here in the time when many things are different. I wish

**April 15, 1970**

the people of Saskatchewan today could sit in these galleries and see the performance. I tell you we wouldn't have to campaign at all. That Government across the way would be legislated out of office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — It's going to be out of office anyway, Art.

**Mr. Thibault:** — We are committed to do away with some of these mistakes and that is what I am here for. I have come here from my constituency and I said that I would represent all my people. The remarks were made this morning that perhaps I wouldn't be back. Well, that's the least of my worries. When I leave here I will be able to look back and feel that I have tried to be fair,...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — and have tried to represent all the people of my constituency. It does not worry me how long I will be here. That is up to my people to decide. I am doing to tell you I will accept the decision happily regardless of what they do. If someone comes to represent Kinistino, I know it is going to be a New Democratic Member.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — I know that our organization will see to it that we have a good Member to represent Kinistino and Melfort. Lately I have been asked to speak at graduation exercises. I have been asked as guest speaker. The topic that I was planning on using was "Democratic Government". But when we see a performance such as we have here today, I call it a blasphemous performance, nothing short of it, in this day and age. If it were 100 years ago, in the time of the Stone Age, I could accept it but today we are in the '70s and I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan will not appreciate what you have done. It brings upon the democratic system nothing but disrespect and the political party that sits across the way has contributed to the destruction of democratic government, and you are a part of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — When we hear the things that are being said, that government is irrelevant, you are the kind of people that make people talk that way. Let us take that Bill out of the House and come in with something that we can be proud of. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.T. Snyder** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a very few remarks to those that have already been spoken with respect to this 1970 Redistribution Bill and I will confine my remarks particularly to the Moose Jaw situation because I think other Members are covering the other areas of the province in a very adequate fashion.

I want to recall for just a moment the 1966 gerrymander. I recall at that time it was introduced by the now Senator A.H. McDonald and I stood in my place at that time, Mr. Speaker, and I complained rather bitterly about the difference in voting strength between Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South. There was a disparity between Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South of approximately 4,000 voters at that time with 4,000 more in Moose Jaw South than in Moose Jaw North. At that time the Member who was responsible for the Redistribution Bill, the Hon. A.H. McDonald, said, "Well, you know the way we have reconciled this whole thing is because of the rapid growth that is going to take place in the north area of Moose Jaw and the northwest section in particular, and after a very few years this will all equalize and as a result there will be 4,000 more people in the north than there were before and the south is going to remain fairly static." Well, of course we know that this in effect hasn't happened, particularly in the constituency that I represent. Moose Jaw has suffered some rather severe economic problems and not the least of these has been the fact that we have had a Liberal Government in power in Saskatchewan and the population generally has been dropping at a very rapid rate. Far from being a rapid growth area in the northwest, it has been a no-growth area and actually we have seen a decline in population as of the last census.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the disparity in voting strength in 1966 as I said was around 4,000 voters. the old constituency of Moose Jaw North had 8,275 voters on the list. Now with this redistribution, if we can use as polite and dignified a phrase as that, some 2,000 odd voters have just been sliced out of the constituency of Moose Jaw North and placed in Moose Jaw South, reducing it even further in number to 6,207 voters, Mr. Speaker. Now this means that this additional 2,000 voters will be added to Moose Jaw South, making a total number of voters on the most up-to-date figures that we have at our disposal of some 13,466. Now just get the picture, Mr. Speaker. Here we have one constituency lying adjacent to another constituency, side by side with all of the opportunity in the world to divide it equally either horizontally, vertically or diagonally, any way they wish to bring about an equal distribution of voters. So what does the Provincial Treasurer and his band of cut-throats do, Mr. Speaker, but divide seats in such a fashion that the voting strength is actually more than two to one, 6,207 voters in the constituency of Moose Jaw North and 13,466 in the constituency of Moose Jaw South. I think this has to represent the most barefaced piece of gerrymandering that has ever been undertaken any place in Canada or any place in the free world, Mr. Speaker.

I think this redistribution Bill that is presently before the Legislature, which takes approximately 2,000 votes from Moose Jaw North and places them in Moose Jaw South, has to represent one of the worst kinds of gerrymandering that we have ever seen. This represents about a quarter of the total number of voters in the whole of the Moose Jaw North constituency. And as a result, as I have said, Moose Jaw North will have 6,200 voters left while Moose Jaw South will have more than double that poll 25 have been gerrymandered into Moose Jaw South with no logic other than apolitical logic to support it. No effort has been made to provide any kind of equal representation between the two constituencies and this has to indicate, I think, the worst violation of representative democracy that we have ever seen in Saskatchewan.



I suppose I should offer a word of thanks to the Provincial Treasurer because when he reached up and clawed that chunk of Moose Jaw North and put it into Moose Jaw South, he took with that gerrymander six of my executive members of Moose Jaw North and placed them in Moose Jaw South and so along with those 2,000 people, Mr. Speaker, he has made it relatively easy for me to come to a decision in allowing my name to come before the Moose Jaw South nominating convention on April 29. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.M. Michayluk** (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose Bill No. 86 for numerous reasons and particularly for the fact that in spite of what the Provincial Treasurer had mentioned in his initial statements, in introducing the Bill on second reading, I think neither one of the criteria used by him does not apply to the Redberry constituency as it is constituted under this Bill.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the 1966 redistribution a portion of The Battlefords constituency, the extreme southeast portion of The Battlefords constituency, comprising the municipality of Great Bend, the town of Radisson and the village of Borden were added to the Redberry constituency. They were added at that time on the premise and on the justifications made by the Members on the Government side that the constituency of The Battlefords was a large constituency population-wise, that in The Battlefords was incorporated the city of North Battleford and that because of the declining population of the rural area, it was necessary for the Government to take away from The Battlefords constituency some 1,000 voters and add them to the Redberry constituency. This move I welcomes at that time, Mr. Speaker. It was about the same time that the Diefenbaker homestead home was removed from the area. I disapproved of that move, so that in the Redberry constituency, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the figures — in 1964 there were some 6,710 names on the voters' lists. In The Battlefords constituency for the same election year, Mr. Speaker, there were 10,599 voters on the voters' lists.

I mentioned at the offset, Mr. Speaker, that during the 1966 redistribution some 1,000 voters were added to my constituency so that in 1967 in the election of 1967 the total number of voters' names appearing on the voters' lists was 6,815, while The Battlefords constituency in the 1967 election showed some 9,763, that is about 1,000 less than in the 1964 election.

In one of my former debates in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that the population of the rural areas of my constituency in particular had declined by considerable numbers. I too made the statement to the effect that in the municipalities, the villages and towns, which are wholly or in part within the Redberry constituency, had decreased by 2,300 people. Assuming, Mr. Speaker, that half of these were eligible voters, therefore, at this time the voting population of the Redberry constituency would probably be in the vicinity of 5,500. What did the Government, or this electoral boundary commission that is so independent as they claim to be, do in the 1967 davey— or gerrymander? there is no rationale at all, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Provincial Treasurer, for your move to take a slice off the Redberry constituency. If there is any reason and motive it is mainly political.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — What did you do? What are you doing in the Redberry constituency by this redistribution? You are taking out some eight townships, marked in red — if you can see, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. You are taking out eight townships marked in red. You are taking out polls 9, 10, half of poll 11, poll 17, poll 18 and poll 19. This is exactly equivalent to the area which in 1966 you added to the Redberry constituency. I mentioned at the offset that this area comprises the R.M. of Great Bend and the town of Radisson and the village of Borden. In other words, you added eight townships in '66, you have taken out eight townships in 1970. In other words...

**Mr. Guy:** — Too much work for you!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Well, I will still be doing this work whenever the Government calls an election, Mr. Minister of Public works.

What is the motive, Mr. Speaker, for doing this? Why take some 1,000 voters into The Battlefords constituency? Where is your 1966 rationale? Where is your justification of redistribution constituencies on the basis of population? There is not equity. You are motivated by fear. I want to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, and to the Hon. Members why this is being done. It is very evident by the polls that are being removed from my constituency. I will give you the voting pattern for the areas, but before I do this, may I give you the voting pattern of the area which was added to my constituency in the 1966 redistribution. There was only a difference of some 39 votes between the New Democratic party and the Liberal party vote in that portion in the R.M. of Great Bend, the town of Radisson and the village of Borden. but if we take the area now being removed the picture is different. In the vote in that portion which is taken from the Redberry constituency at this time there is no such balance between the New Democratic party and the Liberal and the Conservative. Let's take poll No. 9, Mr. Speaker. In this poll the New Democratic party in the 1967 election had 106 votes, the Liberals had 75 and the Conservatives 13. In poll No. 10 the New Democratic party, Mr. Speaker, had 81 votes, the Liberals had 61, in poll No. 17 the New Democratic party 68, the Liberal party 15. And in poll No. 19 the New Democratic party had a 59 vote to the Liberal 26.

Mr. Speaker, the total of all the New Democratic party votes and if I would include with this, Mr. Speaker, half of poll No. 11, which voted in the village of Hafford it would be something like this: total Liberal in the area 285, total New Democratic vote 446, Conservative 62, a difference of 223 votes. If we subtract the 22-vote majority that I had in the 1967 election, the Hon. Treasurer has spotted his Liberal candidate some 200 votes. This is one of the reasons why this was done.

Mr. Speaker, various reasons have been given by the Hon. Member from Hanley, by the Provincial Treasurer, by the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University and may I at this time say the shouting Member for Athabasca, Allan Guy. Mr. Speaker, this redistribution is not motivated by justice, by equity, by representation by population. This is connived by a committee which stands up and says, "Well, we have done a good job. This is

fairly done.” It is in the name of fear and not equity that this Government like the Government in the Bahamas where only 21 per cent of the vote controlled the Government. Mr. Speaker, this is a deliberate slap in the face to the people of Saskatchewan, because it completely ignores the right of the majority to govern. Mr. Speaker, may I make this point, the New Democratic Members according to this gerrymander may represent more than 50 per cent of the voters, and yet they may be sitting in the Opposition. That’s democracy! It ignores representation by population. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned that in 1967 the Redberry constituency had some 6,800 people. The constituency is now losing about a 1,000 voters. The total number of voters in the Redberry constituency may be probably 5,000 voters or less. Where in the name of justice is representation by population? It is an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to strangle democracy, by making more in many cases than another person’s vote? For example, the constituencies in Regina have about 18,000 to 20,000 votes to only about 5,500 in Redberry. Mr. Speaker, is it the last move of a government devoid of ideas and a bankrupt government which has failed the people in every other respect and is now desperately trying to hand on to office? Or is it comparable to what Liberals did prior to the 1944 election, when they tried to hand on to the government for six years instead of five, as provided by law. You might ask the Attorney General, who is not in his seat, who claims to be such a champion of justice, how he can justify voting for this type of a Bill, or any other Member on your side of the House, for that matter. The Bill, Mr. Speaker, — if I am in order — is as crooked as some of the boundaries in the constituencies which you have drawn up, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. Attempts being made by the Provincial Treasurer to claim this Bill is trying to even out representation are gross misrepresentation of the facts. Certainly more seats could be justified in Saskatoon and Regina because of increased population, but there is no justification, Mr. Speaker, for the differences in size, for instance, between a Member representing 20,000 and a Member representing, as my hon. friend, the Member for Regina North East said, 3,500 or probably 4,000 or 4,500 when the election is called.

It was amazing that the Provincial Treasurer gave the names of other members of the committee. It is obvious he was in a cowardly way trying to spread the blame around. Look at how non-partisan the committee was, Mr. Steuart, Mr. Don McPherson, Bob Heggie, Cy MacDonald, and last but not least, the fair-minded gentleman who always makes his non-partisan speeches, Mr. Allan Guy, the Hon. Member from Athabasca. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is an admission by the Liberals that they cannot defeat the NDP by any other means so they are thumbing their noses at democracy. Once again, Mr. Speaker, it reveals the astounding arrogance of the Liberals who think that only they have been given the divine right to govern and that the end justifies the means. The Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, says in usual fashion, “You did it too,” he says. The Minister of Public Works says, “You did it too in 1951.” meaning that the CCF Government also changed boundaries. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk the directories of Saskatchewan Ministries and Members of the Legislative Assembly from 1905 to 1953. There have been redistributions from 1908 to 1966 so that governments when populations of cities grew necessitated redistribution, but never in the history of redistribution was the criteria used which the present Government is using, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, we changed boundaries, but we didn’t gerrymander. I want to talk about Redberry, Redberry from 1944 went

to the CCF, in 1948 went to the Liberals, in 1952 went to the CCF, in 1956 went to the Liberals. The people of Redberry have been fortunate, and I with them to have been elected three times by the good people of Redberry, but just because the people were represented-electing me, it doesn't mean that you have to try shoot and candidate from the back, from the front without giving him a fair chance.

Honest attempts were made in the pre-Liberal days to give constituencies roughly the same number of voters. Even so, Mr. Speaker, we have called for an independent boundaries commission on several occasions and this House and the Liberals each time have turned it down. does the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, suggest that he also believes in the principle that two wrongs make a right? I deny, Mr. Speaker, that the former Government gerrymandered boundaries, but even if there were small differences that were questionable, does the Provincial Treasurer forget that he and his colleagues are now the Government? Surely you could rectify that situation being in the position you are, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. He seems to forget, Mr. Speaker, he spends a great deal of time bragging about how his Liberal ways are better and then with every action proves how much worse Liberal ways really are. Then when he can't prove he is any better, he whines, "You did it too," like a six-year old child fighting in a sand box.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, besides showing that the Liberals endorse these other two sayings, 'The end justifies the means' and 'Two wrongs make a right' this Bill firmly proves another adage which the Liberals believe in, 'Figures don't lie!' But sometimes one can figure out that liars figure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to leave this message with the Government. I mentioned several moments ago that the people of my constituency had given me the honour of representing them in this Legislature for three terms. I said in one of my previous speeches that the Premier made it a point to hold some four meetings and a coffee party in the Redberry constituency prior to and during the 1967 election. Mr. Provincial Treasurer, you danced on the main street of Blaine lake. Gas was brought in. You held three other meetings in my constituency. You had practically every Minister, including Senator Hammy McDonald in my constituency, I couldn't get away from Ministers, Mr. Speaker. There was a Minister to the right of me, a Minister to the left of me and a Minister behind me and in front. Whenever I scheduled a meeting for a community for a Saturday, some Cabinet Minister was scheduled to follow me in several days, Alex Cameron speaking in Edam on a Tuesday or George Trapp in Rabbit Lake, or the Minister of Labour wearing his boots out going house to house in the village of Borden. Well, the Premier went in the hole in Redberry in the last election, he lost a wager. He lost a hundred bucks I am told. Well, I am going to get some fellows to wager with you, Mr. Premier, I am going to make some money on you again this time. Regardless of what has been planned to mutilate, to butcher, and to take the Redberry constituency away to assure the Premier, the Provincial Treasurer and this committee just to remember what happened a few days ago in the Federal constituency of Selkirk. You want to remember what has happened in other constituencies that Liberals have held in Saskatchewan in the past by large majorities.

**An Hon. Member:** — Talk about Kelvington!

**Mr. Michayluk:** — Oh, yes, in Kelvington constituency you don't even need a highway you can step across the border with one step because of its width. I have the same thing in Redberry, a distance of only 18 miles across and in the southeast portion on 24 miles across. The village of Hafford is only 13 miles from my home, a village that has always been in the Redberry constituency since 1908. Do you know what they did to this town? It is not in The Battlefords constituency. The Government has done this to Redberry constituency hoping that by some miraculous factor it may win. the same logic was applied in the Last mountain constituency. Redberry constituency is 18 miles wide from east to west and from north to south but the Last Mountain constituency goes 18 miles from top to bottom. This is how pressed you are for areas. Pretty soon you will be reducing constituencies to stamp size on a map. Mr. Speaker, I want to leave this with the committee, that gerrymandering or the daveymandering committee, with the Premier, that regardless of what you have done to Redberry constituency you may rest assured that I will be back if my health stays with me and I will not be sitting on this side. I will be to your right, Sir. I will oppose the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.H. Wooff** (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to support the Bill. I gave this Bill due consideration before I left home, just in case it came up, and the Liberal Government and the Bill have justified my judgment, Mr. Speaker. If ever the Liberal party displayed its fear, certainly the Member for Athabasca did just that this morning when he was speaking to the House. Mr. Speaker, so far as the Liberals are concerned it's the old case of your slip is showing. The remarks of the Hon. Treasurer were also delivered in that same tenor and high-pitched level of fear so evident in the final product, Bill No. 86 now before the House. The pure unadulterated effrontery and the unmitigated gall by which Government Members have presented the Bill is even astounding to old-timers like myself. For as long as there has been a Turtleford constituency the North Saskatchewan River has formed a portion of its southern boundary. The North Saskatchewan River is a natural geographic boundary with different community centres on either side. To make the excuse that now we have a bridge is simply begging the question. At some seasons of the year, the bridge will be the only crossing which of course means many extra miles of driving. The areas on the south side of the River naturally centre in Lloydminster, that is where they belong and where they wish to stay, where they do their shopping, the social events, and there they "politic". Just how hard-pressed is this Government for votes? Let's take a quick look at it. In its anxiety to try and make Turtleford a sure Liberal seat, it gave Turtleford constituency four polls from across the River, thus making these people drive almost 100 miles to what is recognized as the political centre of the constituency and where nearly all parties hold their conventions, instead of anywhere from 12 to 15 miles into Lloydminster. In the 1967 election these four polls gave the Liberals plurality of 78 votes, subtract from these my landslide win of 1967, a majority of 27 and this leaves the Liberals with a majority of 51 votes. This tells the story. The Government is running so scared of its policies, its taxes, its general conduct, that it will take a four-poll area out of its natural setting and away from its natural centres. This is the grey area that the Provincial Treasurer told me was mine in

Turtleford. Let me say, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, the grey of early dawn again for the NDP. May I remind the Government that after the narrow defeat by devious methods in 1960, we won Turtleford by 108 majority in '67. You can just play around with those figures, Mr. Treasurer, and you will see where you come out. This kind of gerrymandering just doesn't get you anywhere. I do just want to make one suggestion to the Government and ask one small favour. It has drawn a line between Townships 50 and 51, from the Alberta border to the bank of the Saskatchewan River. In here it has trapped about eight or nine sections of land, I am requesting if there are residents there, that it cut the constituency off at the bend of the River between Ranges 23 and 24 and allow these people to stay in Cutknife constituency, otherwise they will have to drive through Cutknife constituency to get to them. You did this to the four pools in the Cutknife constituency but you did nothing for the Barthel and Sandy Ridge areas that have been asking to be transferred to the Meadow Lake area. You have still left these people exactly where they were.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the start, I prejudged the Bill. The Liberal party has lived up to my judgment and I cannot support the Bill as it is at the present time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald** (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words on this Bill on redistribution in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I want to do it on the point that for the first time in the history of Saskatchewan, the urban centres of our province have finally received the kind of justification and treatment that they deserve.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald** — Mr. Speaker, the one thing that does both me is how all of a sudden since 1963 the Socialists have developed a conscience in relation to redistribution. Mr. Speaker, it is like the greatest discovery since Christopher Columbus or like Cortez when all of a sudden he saw the Pacific or perhaps Sir Frances Drake when he sailed around the world. They have discovered two words in the English language, "justice" and "equality" in relation to redistribution. Let us compare the justice and equality of the redistribution of the seating of the urban centres in the Province of Saskatchewan prior to 1967. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let's compare the city of Saskatoon with all rural seats in the Province of Saskatchewan. To most people, representation by population means that one person gets one vote for one Member. The majority of all the constituencies in this province were treated in that fashion, but not the city of Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. We had 130,000 people in the city of Saskatoon. Did they elect one Member? Did they elect two Members? No, Mr. Speaker, they elected five Members. Each man voted for five people. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) would say if he represented 130,000, instead of 14,000 people or 13,000 people. Mr. Speaker, what was the reason for giving to the city of Saskatoon five Members for every single individual who voted. Mr. Speaker, let me remind you of what Mr. Fines, the former Provincial Treasurer said, "There are no natural Boundaries in the city of

Saskatoon.” Mr. Speaker, there is a river going through the city of Saskatoon and I don’t know whether you can swim across it, jump across it or take a boat across it, or jump in, but I have never seen a natural boundary any more obvious than this. what was the reason for it, Mr. Speaker, because in one corner of the city of Saskatoon there was a Socialist concentration that was big enough to win the whole five seats in the city of Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, this area now belongs to the Member for Riversdale and the Member for Mayfair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how did they treat the city of Regina? The exact opposite situation existed there. In Regina South there was enough Liberals in 1964 to elect all the Members in the city of Regina, all the Members. We wouldn’t have the Member from Regina Centre today, we wouldn’t have the Member from Regina North West, had they left the city of Regina similar to the city of Saskatoon. so what did they do? They drew a line, Mr. Speaker, right across the top of the city of Regina and called it Regina South. The Minister of Health won that one by something like 7,000 votes, that was his majority. It was enough, Mr. Speaker, to win every single constituency in the city of Regina had it been left the same as the city of Saskatoon. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they decided not to divide Regina up into single constituencies because if they did there would be two more seats that would go to the Liberals, so they called it Regina West and Regina East and made them dual constituencies, because there was enough concentration of Socialists in the north of both of those constituencies to elect or defeat the Liberal candidate from the southern part. Here we have, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina completely opposite distribution systems or voting systems, completely for the benefit of the Socialists. They would have been defeated in 1964 had they given equal electoral distribution. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine almost 300,000 people, when you consider the city of Saskatoon, the city of Regina, the city of Moose Jaw in plural constituencies, 300,000 people in this province that were used as the tool of the Socialists in order to elect their government. Mr. Speaker, today every single voter in the city of Saskatoon, the city of Moose Jaw and the city of Regina, votes for one Member for their representative.

**An Hon. Member:** — Fair and just!

**Mr. Macdonald:** — Fair and just, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to have representation by population, surely if we are going to have equality in city seats, one of the most important things is to see that each area of cities which have a major portion of the population of this province, receives fair treatment.

I would like to comment on a couple of other things that were mentioned by Members of the Opposition. First of all the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) said, “You know my seat is getting so big I have a very difficult time representing it.” Well I happen to have the figures, Mr. Speaker. He said it was a great population growth area, even with the added area, Mr. Speaker, there are about 250 more voters in his constituency. Most MLAs, including myself, enjoy representing their people, they enjoy the work that is involved. Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell the Member from Regina North East that if he is a little tired, or a little weary, he doesn’t have to worry because Henry is going to represent them. Then, if he does

happen to beat him in the nomination, he doesn't have to worry anyway because Henry will run as an Independent NDP and the Liberals will win the seat.

**An Hon. Member:** — We'll all get a bag of flour!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition turned to a rural constituency. He said you know in the seat of Kelvington there are just thousands...

**An Hon. Member:** — How about Milestone?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — There is no change in Milestone, and there is a reason for it, Mr. Speaker. I would like to talk about Milestone. Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand Milestone in any way, shape or form, because they are all Liberal areas around my constituency. I know that it comes up as a rural seat, it comes right up to the boundaries of Regina, right up to the boundaries of Moose Jaw, right up to the boundaries of Weyburn, right up to the boundaries of Assiniboia. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we can expand Milestone even though they are all Liberals that surround it. We are too fair to do a thing like that, Mr. Speaker. Not only that I want to say that as a Member of the committee, once again I support this very fair and equitable distribution.

But I wanted to refer to the Leader of the Opposition's remark about Kelvington. He said we removed a thousand votes from that constituency. Mr. Speaker, we didn't remove any, maybe a hundred or two. He should go back and add up his figures. Then the Member for Regina North East talks about Regina Albert Park, Regina Whitmore. He said 3,500 votes. Mr. Speaker, our estimation is close to 7,000. You take Regina Whitmore. This is where the University housing project is going to be built. This committee attempted to look at the city of Regina, the city of Saskatoon, as a projected growth area. We felt that the constituencies of the Members for Regina North West, Regina North East, had populations that were stagnant, or almost stagnant. Here in Regina South, the area of the southern part of the city is where the great growth area is in the city of Regina. I want to say we are looking ahead, Mr. Speaker, because we don't hope to do this redistribution again for some years.

I also wanted to say a word about the Member for Melfort. When a football player retires, they hand up his cleats; when a hockey player retires, they hand up his sweater. When Gordie Howe retires, I am sure the Detroit Red Wings will take that number 9, they'll place it in the dressing room and never again will a hockey player wear it. What we are doing now with Melfort, Mr. Speaker, is we are retiring the banner of the Member for Melfort for his long years of outstanding and great service to Saskatchewan. A real tribute to him. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that if there is one thing about redistribution in 1970, it is taking the urban centres of this province, giving them more representation, giving them fair and just and equitable representation.

**Mr. W.G. Davies** (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind listening to the fallacious mathematics of the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). We



**April 15, 1970**

have heard them before in other speeches that he has made in this House. But when he brings to this House the statement that equality and fairness and justice are brought for urban voters, this is really rubbing the nose of the Saskatchewan voters in a frightful Liberal mess, in my opinion.

Let him come and tell my people in Moose Jaw that justice and fairness have been achieved there, where in one constituency we have 6,200 voters and in the other constituency 13,400, the one over double the number in the other constituency. Just let him try and make a case for fairness and justice in that constituency. He will find out what my people will tell him.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill before us shows us nothing has to this time the fear that the Liberal party have for the retribution of the voters when next they go to the polls in a provincial election. My colleagues have already said that this Bill is nothing more or less than an attempt to distort the workings of democracy at the polls by an outrageous kind of manoeuvring and warping of constituency boundaries.

I think that it is a flagrant piece of political opportunism, a cynical piece of Liberal devilry that we haven't seen for many years, even from them. When I look at the boundaries of Moose Jaw and Moose Jaw South they are much like the contortions of the Moose Jaw River. They owe nothing whatsoever to reason or rationality. They are there for nothing more than to try and achieve a Liberal victory in at least one of the constituencies.

Back in 1966 the Liberals changed the boundaries in Moose Jaw in a desperate effort to elect that one Liberal Member. At that time there were 8,275 voters in Moose Jaw North and about one-third more in the one constituency that I represent than in the case of the other. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I warned the Liberal Members of what would occur, that Moose Jaw voters would justly resent what had taken place. And the election in 1967 proved this and my colleague, Mr. Snyder, was elected in Moose Jaw North. I prophesy that in spite of another outrageous piece of gerrymandering the same thing is going to happen in the next election. In the first instance, I want the House to know that people of Moose Jaw do not want to have two constituencies. The Minister of Welfare can say all he wants about Regina and Saskatoon. I want to remind him that a Liberal Government itself placed Regina as a two-member seat back at a time when there was 47,000 or 50,000 citizens in Regina. There is absolutely no basis for the splitting of Moose Jaw into two constituencies. There has never been to my knowledge one single organization that has called for two constituencies in Moose Jaw. So as well as the split in the two constituencies being distorted and unfair no one wants it.

In my city area people want the candidates to represent the whole city area. There is not yet a large enough urban area that they want two seats and it really doesn't serve any purpose. So as well as the people having resented the unfair way that the Liberals have gone about dividing the city into constituency boundaries, they have resented the fact that it was divided at all. Now if the 1966 split was unfair and unjust it is very apparent that the new constituency boundaries are grossly unfair and unjust and in every way a piece of unabashed political roguery.

We have a situation now where with over 13,000 voters in Moose Jaw South and 6,207 approximately in Moose Jaw North, there is a logical basis for the creation of another constituency. If it is fair to say that 6,207 voters can elect one member in Moose Jaw North then why is Moose Jaw South not split into two constituencies. The situation now of course is that Moose Jaw South has more than double the number of voters by this Bill as in the case of Moose Jaw North.

The position is that the Liberals have again tried to carve out an area to foist Liberals on Moose Jaw voters. And I say that they will fail now as they failed in 1967 because the people of Moose Jaw have said that the whole basis on which the constituency has been divided is an entire abuse of all the principles of electoral democracy. I think that the Government should be thoroughly ashamed of the way that this Bill has proceeded so far as Moose Jaw is concerned.

I feel that even the Moose Jaw Liberal Party Association will be hanging their heads in shame over this gerrymandering and this new division. I have never found anyone that defended it in the ranks of the Liberals even in the last election. No doubt the Government in 1966 conferred actively with the Moose Jaw Liberal Association to find out the choices as to the pieces of the constituency that could be misshapen into some kind of boundary for the present Moose Jaw North. Whatever the situation I have not found anyone that puts up a very active defence of what this Government has done. I say that the great part of Moose Jaw Liberal Party Association membership I think will hand their heads over the actions that have taken place in this Bill.

I once again want to say to the Government that you defend the basis of double the number of voters in one of the Moose Jaw constituencies to the other. If you defend that basis there is only one rational way in which you can answer criticism and that is to create three seats within the boundaries of Moose Jaw. I don't really have any optimism that the Government will proceed in that fashion. I say that I would like an answer from anyone of the Members across the way as to how they could rationally function in any other way if the approach is as the Minister of Welfare claims one of fairness and justice.

Just one final word on the Moose Jaw boundaries. I will put it to you this way. If you believe that I am wrong in my assumption that the Moose Jaw voters don't want these two constituencies, and I claim that they want to vote for two Members across the board in the constituency area, place this as a question in the next Provincial election or before for that matter. I have no doubt whatsoever that they will reject the two constituencies in favour of one with two Members.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill is an abuse of the whole system of electoral democracy. I shall not support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall** (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, today surely must be the day of the righteous. I have listened to Members opposite talk about this redistribution Bill and the Member that gave me the “mocus” worst of all is that pious, righteous, sanctimonious Member from

Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). Mr. Speaker, mocus is a sort of lower stomach disorder. You understand, Bill. It might hurt him. I am not kicking about the redistribution Bill because I represent roughly 16,000 voters or more. It is one of the larger seats, I think, in the province.

The last time that Souris-Estevan was doctored up fairly and honestly with no political thoughts in mind was in about 1959. Mr. Speaker, what was the criterion? The Member for Kinistino was sitting with the pure and the fair, and the brave, and the ruthless at that time, but what was the criterion for changing the boundaries of Souris-Estevan? Did that particular Member who stood here an hour or so ago talking to the young people up in the gallery, did he complain about the way that they carved up Souris-Estevan with jogs, dips and doodles and for what reason? No, his voice was not heard but maybe he was not bilingual then and he didn't understand what was going on. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the cutting up of Souris-Estevan in about the year 1959, shoving the Lampman area and all that good Liberal territory up into Cannington, surely must have been for CCF political reasons.

They knew that by removing the 500 good solid votes from Souris-Estevan and putting them into Cannington would make Souris-Estevan more safe for my old friend, Kim Thorson. I again ask the Kinistino Member (Mr. Thibault): where was your example to the youth of Saskatchewan in those days? I don't think you even got up and spoke. And you must have been in the House at that time. You must have been in the House because you were here before I came here. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I can't bleed too much for the kind of answers which I have heard over here today and I fully intend to support the Bill.

**Mr. J.A. Pepper** (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I was not going to participate in this debate since I am one of the Members for whom no changes have been made in the boundaries of the constituency which I have the honour of representing. But in listening and after closer examination of the revised constituency boundaries — and might I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this is the third time since the Liberals were elected in 1964 that they have revised the boundaries — it becomes very clear and more obvious to me as to the real purpose of this Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. the reason becomes very clear for the drastic changes that it creates in some of the constituency boundaries.

I agree that the increase in urban population in our two larger centres may require a stronger representation in the Legislature. and that one more seat in each centre is necessary according to the population to represent them fairly. But I ask, Mr. Speaker, have the constituency boundaries within our large urban centres been drawn up so there is a more equitable population in each urban constituency? I say that they have not.

I will take for example the city of Moose Jaw, a city where prior to this redistribution Moose Jaw South constituency had already by far the greater population in voters. Now if this redistribution Bill becomes law they have taken considerably more voters from Moose Jaw North and they will be added to the south constituency making it even larger. I understand that this same criterion applies to our larger centres in the province.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you can say, "I see no rhyme or season for a change such as this." But this time I can only say, "I see

no rhyme,” because I do see a reason, a political reason in which, by redrawing some boundaries of one constituency, you strengthen a certain political party’s strength in a neighbouring constituency and weaken that of another. And since this Bill is introduced by the Liberal Government sitting opposite, Mr. Speaker, and has been carefully planned and arranged by them, there is no question in my mind as to whom they hope and whom they intend to benefit from it.

In the southern portion of the province all but two of the constituencies are now held by Liberal Members. Therefore, why make any changes in these, because by making changes they might weaken the hold they now have in this area. This is what the Members opposite have in mind. So they say, “Just leave it alone, but let’s go after those northern seats where many of them are held by the New Democrats.” That’s where they want to do some carving and some slicing. and, Mr. Speaker, carving and slicing is what they have done, feeling with a certain certainty that this will result in more seats for them based strictly on the results of the voting in the last election.

but might I warn you. It takes more than a redrafting of constituency boundaries win elections. Our people in Saskatchewan based the manner in which they vote on the performance of the government in between elections. And this redistribution will only add coal to the fire of an already disenchanted and dissatisfied electorate in the performance of our Liberal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we know after the Provincial Treasurer, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) told us this morning that he and four other Members of his party, I believe the Members for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), Hanley (Mr. Heggie), Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), were responsible for the changes in these boundaries. I say that it proves to us that the change has been made strictly because of political reasons and hopeful political gains, and that an equal representation of voters by our Members was given very little consideration if any.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I like to look ahead. We, as Members of this Legislature, were elected to this office by our people to perform our duties and to look after their interests in a democratic and honourable manner,...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — ...a manner in which any of us should be prepared to go to any of our constituencies and be able to say that I am sure that I am worthy of the confidence that you have placed in me. the time is fast approaching, Mr. Speaker, when the elected Members of this Legislature will be representing a younger generation. this younger generation is watching us each day. Let’s improve our democratic process of Government and give them the leadership and guidance that they have the right to expect.

Had an independent committee been set up to look into the reallocation and redistribution of the constituency boundaries, I feel that this would certainly have been amore proper way of handling this whole situation. And certainly it would have given us a lot less room for criticism.

**April 15, 1970**

In closing, I warn the Members opposite that they have in introducing this redistribution Bill, displayed a last desperate and glaring attempt in this Session to hoodwink the voters and citizens of our province. the Members opposite now realize that since 1964 their legislation and their Government performance and the promises that they have made, have failed our people of Saskatchewan. the only hope left is to attempt to change, to carve and to slice the constituencies in a manner that might assure them of victory in the next election.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the electors are awaiting an opportunity to give their answer. I find, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F.K. Radloff** (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks regarding the Bill. It amuses me to see the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) smiling. He seems to be enjoying the whole process today. I think he can recall how the old guard juggled and switched the boundaries around in trying to maintain power. I think he knows all about the NDP plotting and it amuses him to see a little justice being done today.

Mr. Speaker, equalization of population areas is indeed a difficult task. It appears that the committee has been very successful in accomplishing a most difficult work. They have used tremendous wisdom in planning the redistribution of the constituencies throughout Saskatchewan. I expect some errors to be made but they are indeed of a very minor nature. It is certainly difficult to understand why the Members opposite are weeping and wailing.

We all realize the population increases in the two large cities. I certainly feel that Regina and Saskatoon are entitled to one extra seat. And, of course, the committee has provided representative justice for these two growing communities. It is unfortunate that rural areas are going to lose one Member. I think we all understand, however, that population numbers are changing and that this trend is going to continue. We must all recognize this change. Fair-minded and reasonable Legislative Members must congratulate the committee for its work and wisdom in this regard.

I am somewhat dismayed at the large area I will have to represent with the Cumberland district now being added to the Nipawin constituency. However, the committee has recognized the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) is a man who has always advocated a change. The Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) talks about correcting mistakes of the past and of course there were many. We all recall the shifting of the boundaries during the Socialists' rule and now the NDP want justice and they are very happy, I expect, that this is now being provided.

The revised boundaries in the new Nipawin constituency add new responsibility in order that I might properly represent this constituency. The boundary changes outlined are reasonable and well planned. Conversation with the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and of course Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) and Melfort (Mr. Willis) and the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) indicate they are generally well pleased with the

boundary changes. I do not expect these Members to stand up in the House as they have already stated their position but in talking to them they are certainly pleased that they are going to be in the House for some time.

It is somewhat regrettable that some of my west area has been traded for Cumberland but I intend to represent those people from Choiceland and Snowden. Changing population has forced the constituency arrangement to the south of Nipawin and I am somewhat surprised to have those areas of Arborfield, Zenon Park, Ridgedale and Gronlid added to my seat. I want to assure the Members opposite that I will try and maintain my large majority.

Again I say the people opposite are sort of crying in the woods but they certainly must have some regrets for their past actions. Now they talk about fair play and all that sort of thing. Surely they must remember that they have created some of the actions which give the Liberal party concern.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I am going to support this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to congratulate the Members on this side of the House who have made a number of very worthwhile comments this afternoon in regard to the discriminatory nature of this Bill.

I only want to say one thing in regard to some of the comments made on the other side of the House and that is to a remark made by the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), when as he said he claims to have one of the biggest seats in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I don't quarrel with that statement at all. He has a mouth to go along with it if I may say.

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald** (Cannington): — On a point of order. Certainly we can put up with a certain degree of comment back and forth, Mr. Speaker, but a big mouth to go with it, that's unparliamentary. I don't think that we have to put up with that kind of nonsense.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well so far this debate has proceeded with a reasonable degree of freedom from personalities and I would hope...Oh, let me go back to the beginning and I will say this:

I have always thought that personalities of any kind of any nature whatsoever have absolutely no part in any debate in this Legislature. But that rule of Parliamentary Procedure has been observed more in the breach than in the practice in this Legislature. The honour, the dignity, the decorum of this Legislature are a collective honour, a collective dignity and a collective decorum. If it is breached by one it is breached by all, if one look bad, then all look bad. A few years ago when I was first elected to this position I used to try and bring Members to order time and time again. The result of that was that I was in the position of perpetually nagging the House. I gave up and I decided that the honour and the dignity and the decorum of this Chamber was a matter solely for the Members to uphold and that it was in the final analysis between the Members and the people who elected them.

I would sincerely hope that all the Members of this Legislature would consider these words seriously and would refrain from personalities of any kind and nature whatsoever and one of the best and first places to do this is by refraining from calling each other by their names, but rather by referring to each other by constituencies. I would sincerely ask that all Members do this and that they refrain from the use of any personalities during debate. Very regrettably this Legislature has one of the worst reputations in Canada in this regard and I sincerely hope that this unfortunate practice will cease now.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly stay within the boundaries that you have laid out. I was shocked to hear today our Leader bring out the true facts of this Bill and I say that they are disgraceful facts of redistribution, the disgraceful population variations in Regina and Moose Jaw and a number of other centres. In Regina one seat or a constituency, a sure New Democratic seat loaded with some 18,000 voters. A Liberal seat in the south of Regina with less than some 4,000 voters is I say a disgraceful performance. The Member for Regina South West said that there should be even more seats in Regina and I think that there should be. You, Sir, from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) were on that committee and I think it would have been proper that you and your committee have another seat or create another seat in Regina Centre. We all know why this was done, because it was mainly New Democratic votes that were being done, because it was mainly New Democratic votes that were being lumped together. That is why, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation.

In Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, it is very similar. As has been mentioned before, in Moose Jaw North there were 6,200 voters and in Moose Jaw South some 13,000 voters. Do you call that equal representation, Sir? What a farce has become the democratic principle of people's choice of government, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) stated that if an election were called today they would sweep the province. I challenge them to that, Sir. I challenge the Premier on that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — You would be swept clear out under the rug, if I may say so. You wouldn't have enough Members to fill the front benches of this side of the chair, Mr. Speaker. It's this denial of real freedom of free speech by ballot, Mr. Speaker. It's an abuse of democracy. It's typical of Liberal perversion of truth. It makes a mockery of democracy, a mockery of democratic principles of justice. It's the kind of the far right present-day Liberal denial of true democratic participation that is daily leading to people's disenchantment with elected government representatives. The Liberals have that philosophy so clearly expressed to me by a Liberal businessman of this city with whom I had an enlightening conversation, who admitted that he was a strong supporter of the Saskatchewan Liberals. He also indicated that if he had the power to make it legally possible that not one person who wasn't a property owner would get a vote in either provincial, federal or municipal governments. That's the principle that many Liberals of Saskatchewan are following as much as they dare, to deny as many people as possible the rightful choice of a free vote in the area they have a right to vote. This Government is going back 500 years in creating pocket boroughs or rotten boroughs as they were called in that

day. I would simply prefer to call them rotten boroughs, Mr. Speaker.

Now that redistribution has taken place the picture of the constituency boundary manoeuvring for the Liberals point out one thing and one thing only, Mr. Speaker, that is panic in the Government ranks. Desperate measures are being blindly taken, purely political in nature to shore up a crumbling dynasty under Mr. Thatcher.

You know Mr. Speaker, I knew that the changes in the Melville constituency were coming. There were just too many Liberal leaks all over the place and we knew that these changes would be doctored in every possible way to improve a desperate but failing Liberal effort to sneak into power by any means possible. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has been in Melville laying down the law to the local Liberals there on a number of occasions. Whom he was dressing up for the next running of the election, I don't know, but probably our Deputy Minister of Compulsory-ops once again. He finds that there is opposition to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Thatcher disagrees with him. So do other people in Melville. In speaking from a public platform in Melville the Premier said: "We will win Melville back but we must run a Ukrainian." I say, Mr. Premier, we'll take you up on that one and we'll win once again in Melville no matter who you run. May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of what all the Liberals do, the New Democratic party shall win in Melville and in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government has lowered itself, I consider, to a new low in the way they have plotted the boundary changes in Saskatchewan and particularly in the Melville constituency. They seek to regain the Melville seat by driving a wedge or drawing the boundary line on ethnic bases. They lopped off the north part of the constituency consisting of some 12 townships where there is a predominantly Slavic and German people, hoping that in that portion of the Melville constituency remaining a New Democratic candidate of Ukrainian origin would be voted against because of the ethnic factor. How baseless and foolish and repulsive such a move is on the part of this Government. They hope to win Touchwood with a Ukrainian candidate. They won't win that one and they won't win Melville.

May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, the support for my party and my candidacy in the last election was not an effort by one ethnic group or another. If people of Ukrainian origin voted for me, and many did, I was very proud of it. But, Mr. Speaker, may I say and add that those of my people who did not vote for me I respect for exercising their prerogative of having a freedom of a democratic choice. This was their fundamental reason and privilege of choosing Canada as their homeland. Mr. Speaker, my reason for being very happy and very satisfied with the way the people of Melville voted in the election of 1967 was not only because many of my people voted for me. My greatest satisfaction was the extent to which people of other national origins gave their support to me and the New Democratic party, Anglo-Saxon, German, Poles, Scandinavians, Hungarians, Czechs, Chinese and yes, even the first original inhabitants of Canada, the native people, all these people voted for me. They didn't question my ethnic origin, nor my religion, nor my colour but they came out flatly and said, "Here is a man who believes in the things we do, things the way we do, who stands for the things we stand for, a man who speaks, thinks and stands for the policies of the New Democratic party. We will support him."



That is why I am proud of these people. I am very proud of the people of Saskatchewan of that calibre. I am very proud and humble as well that they asked me to represent them in this Legislature and I was chosen to serve them. If the people of the Melville constituency represented-elect me as their candidate again in the next election and in spite of all the political shenanigans by this Liberal Government, including spiteful boundary changes, Melville will be won in the next election by the New Democratic party. And I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because the people of Saskatchewan don't trust this Liberal Government. Very little has been done in the last number of years to warrant their trust. Promises broken by the dozen, taxes on every single item imaginable. They don't believe you, they don't trust you, they don't believe the Premier or his cohorts. The very fact that you people are showering the goodies in the Melville constituency makes people sceptical of your gifts. Remember the quotation, "Beware of strangers bearing gifts." The very fact that you people are responsible for the bizarre, the unreal, dishonest and purely political boundary change will in fact only serve notice to the people that this Liberal Government is not to be trusted. The people of the Melville constituency of Saskatchewan see the discrepancy between reality and the phoney, deceitful practice of this Government. They will not be misled.

Mr. Speaker, there is one fact that I am very much surprised the Liberals haven't learned, and that is that our people in Saskatchewan place a great deal of stock in integrity and honesty and sincerity, great human factors so irrelevant to the Saskatchewan Liberals. The old Liberal philosophy that money will buy anything, that every vote is on the block for sale, is evident in all their approaches and dealings with the public. It may have been a strong factor not too many years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but not any more. The people will not be bought any more by Liberal trinkets and Liberal promises, whether these people are of peasant European stock or Canadian native Indians. They will not be insulted the way the old-line parties have insulted them for generations.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, the young people, all the young people will laugh in your face, Mr. Premier, if you think you have garnered their loyalty and their votes by letting them drink a little liquor, or hand out a few jobs through the Youth Agency. The people of today demand that we recognize their intelligence, their acute awareness of what goes on in the world today, their keen insight, into matters such as what goes on in the province today as well. the people of Saskatchewan will not be bought, coerced or bullied any more, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Your last desperate effort by changing boundaries is going to fail, Mr. Premier and Mr. Treasurer. You are going to get clobbered in the next election and call it any time you like. In the Melville constituency the victory will go to the New Democratic party. the people have already decided. It's odd, Mr. Premier and Mr. Deputy Premier, that you really haven't heard them. You just couldn't be tuned in, Sir. But as I read it and many others do too, the message is coming through loud and clear. If these boundary changes are going to do anything they all but clinch a New Democratic victory in Saskatchewan and in Melville. I will not support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst** (Wadena): — The Bill we have before us today is one which I don't see how any fair-minded Member sitting on the other side of the House can support. You know a lot of us had a high regard for certain Members sitting across there, such as the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), some of their Members from Saskatoon, the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith), the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes), and others. How can they support this kind of gerrymandering?

We know we heard the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) talking about history and where certain words came from but this House I think has all heard of Long John Silver. Well, this Bill that's been presented looks like Short Dave Silver. It's a type of a Bill which holds a gun at the head of the people. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) told us that a committee of four was appointed to draw up this Bill. He doesn't tell us how they were appointed or when they were appointed or what material they had to work with. but we do know that yesterday after we had this Bill presented to the House, when Members from this side or someone on our behalf went to the Chief Electoral Officer's office to ask for working papers for some information on the proposed constituency maps or maps on a small scale, we were told we couldn't get them. We were told that four large maps had been supplied to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and that had to be enough.

Now on the blue paper today we see Bill No. 1 still standing there, introduced at the beginning of this Session. But it is still in second reading, Bill No. 1. Bill No. 86 is brought in one day, we have no time for study, no time to get the information we need and then we are asked to give it second reading right away.

We have heard a lot of talk about the population of our cities. One of the Members opposite mentioned that Saskatoon had a population of 130,000 so this would give them with six members an average of about 21,500 per member. No one on this side has disagreed that the cities should have increased representation. It is not the increase that we are bringing to the attention of this House but the manner in which the increase is being given. It is the conditions under which they are given increased representation. Now while they are quoting the necessity for an extra member for Saskatoon or Regina, they are using total population. The total population of Saskatoon being 130,000 averaging about 21,500 per member, maybe slightly better if it was figured right out to the last point. But when you take the rural constituencies such as my own I'll have in the neighbourhood now of 11,000 to 12,000 voters. When you take those who will not be voters such as the younger people and so forth, it will be equal to the average city seat almost and it will be far larger than some of these pocket borough city seats which are being created. If they have all this information surely the Chief Electoral Officer could have made some of it available to us yesterday when we were asking for information.

The last time we saw redistribution in this House we saw 22 changes. There were 22 constituencies affected, that's just three or four years ago. In every case area went from the smaller constituency to the larger constituency. It is no wonder after looking at this Bill that the Premier told me the day the House

**April 15, 1970**

adjourned last year, he said: "I want to assure you that if I can do anything to cut up your constituency to get rid of you I would do it." You know, Mr. Speaker, that hurt my ego because in the last redistribution I didn't need Raymore and that district around there but they gave it to me. I didn't need Semans and the district around Semans, but they gave it to me. I thought they like me, I thought they wanted to make sure I came back here. But then he told me when the House adjourned last year that if he could do anything to cut up my constituency and get rid of me he would. Well now, what did they do this year? Gave me some considerable changes in my constituency and I will have a little more to say about that in a moment or two.

We saw the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) get up here and make quite a passionate speech. At least I think he felt he was doing an effective job. He said the criterion was representation by population as far as practical. Well, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, the practicability didn't go very far. The practicability stopped with them as soon as they got the pencil on the paper and looked at the returns of the last election.

He says that the city member can serve more than the rural member. That is maybe true and I want to say that in the 1951 redistribution the general criterion was to have the rural constituencies of 8,000 to 9,000 of a voting population and the urban 12,000 to 13,000 of a population. Population was considered. While it was true that if we are going to have equal representation by numbers of people, there should be no difference in urban or rural. But I think all Members throughout the years in this province have recognized that it is easier for an urban Member to serve an extra 1,000 or 1,500 voting population than it is for a rural Member. It is also further recognized that the constituencies in the far North cannot have as large a population on account of the area as can the constituencies in the more populated parts of our rural part of the province. It is a peculiar thing to me that he said there was stability of population in the South but yet the North has a higher population. But the Member for Hanley said there was stability of population in the south. It wasn't a matter of stability of population, it was a matter that they couldn't twist the boundaries around and create more seats for themselves.

The Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) said that outside of the cities he had the largest constituency to represent. I believe he said some 14,000 to 16,000. In that neighbourhood. Well according to the 1967 statistics in Souris-Estevan there were 12,116 names on the voters' list. There are a number of constituency on the list that had a higher number of people on the voters' list than did Souris-Estevan. Yorkton, for one, had more. In both of those cases, both in Yorkton and in Souris-Estevan it is part urban and part rural. Weyburn had a larger number, Swift Current had a larger number. so you get the constituencies, both urban and rural, and there were a number of them that were larger in proportion as far as population was concerned than was Souris-Estevan. So I don't see where he gets his argument from. I assure him that he had more population than there was in Watrous or Last Mountain or Hanley, some of those constituencies. I'll agree with him that he had more population.

The Member for city Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) just was trying to create a mountain out of a molehill again. But this time it was a paper mountain he was trying to build. These papers that he had produced I think if he shovelled a little snow

on them we can all start a little ski practice and be ready for next year when he gets the other mountain finished, because he knows more along that line. So it is just a matter of trying to bury the facts under the snowdrifts is all that Member was doing. when you look at the way this Bill was distributed, the way the constituencies have been set out, one wonders if this was the result of some pot party or if he was sniffing too much glue when they were sticking the papers together because there is no sense, rhyme or rhythm to it. I notice it in a number of constituencies, Nipawin is a good example. They have taken a lot of area that wasn't in Nipawin. Well I think if I was the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer, after the heavy weight that the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) has pulled, I would put more area into that area too where they didn't know him. and when you look at Last mountain now, a long, narrow, thin constituency with a little curl on the bottom, I think we could dub that as the hot dog seat. It looks the shape of a hot dog, it's so long, thin and narrow. So when you stat to look at the way that they divided the votes it's amusing to see what were the results.

Now in the Wadena constituency they took off 15 townships, gave some to Tisdale-Kelsey, some to Kinistino-Melfort and 10 townships to Kelvington. Then they took about 22 townships from Kelvington and brought them back into Wadena. They took some seven or eight townships from Humboldt and brought them into Wadena. Now if Wadena was too large then some should have been taken off. If it was too small then some should have been added. But to take off one place and start adding in another proves that this was just a first-class gerrymander job to try and get rid of the Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers). but I can assure them it's not going to work. The present Member for Kelvington with all the pressure they could put on. In 1967 the Member who came to this Legislature then got here by eight votes, which were disputed. When the courts decided on the case they declared the election null and void. Our colleague now, Neil Byers, came here with over 500 of a majority. I am sure that the 10 townships they gave him our of Wadena when that area realizes what is trying to be pulled off, they in turn will change and give Neil Byers a majority in Kelvington from that area.

I have represented that area for a good many years, the area they have taken from me. There was the entire municipality of Ponass Lake, including the town of Rose Valley and the hamlet of Fosston and the little hamlet of Nora. These have been taken from me and put into Kelvington. The northwest corner of Kelvington now comes within eight or nine miles of Naicam which is only some 25 or 30 miles from Melfort. Those people in that area, their main town other than Naicam is either Melfort or Prince Albert. Yet when you get to the southeast corner of the Kelvington constituency you are on the doorstep of Yorkton. The people in the northwest part of the Kelvington constituency now do not have anything in common with the people along the east and southeast side of Kelvington. on the other hand they have left my constituency still to the northwest corner of Kelvington that goes over to Foam Lake. Straight north of Foam Lake there are two or three townships in there. Then it makes a jog six miles west, goes right up to the town limits of Foam Lake, goes to the south end of that township, then goes six miles east again and then back south. Now, no one not even a drunken person would draw a map like that if they were trying to get proportionate representation, trying to take into consideration what the Member

**April 15, 1970**

for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) said they were doing. If they were trying to use the geographic location, natural travel and other general community interest, no such constituency boundary would exist as now exists between Wadena and Kelvington.

I know that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) is very shaky about his seat in Prince Albert West, but you know, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have had trouble for some time getting a candidate in Wadena constituency. I invite him to come to Wadena and run in Wadena on the Liberal ticket. If he has done such a fair just job for the people of that part of the province I would be glad for him to come there and give them the change to say whether they approve of him or they don't. Or if the Premier wishes to come himself, I invite the Premier to come, or anyone of his colleagues who sit across there. They can come to Wadena if they wish to and I am prepared to debate these issues with them up there.

I felt that I could not let this Bill go through without protesting the injustice. Why, Mr. Speaker, if a Bill like this was introduced in Northern Ireland there would be a fight of the entire works, not just part of it. This is the type of bill which creates dissension, divides people and is not the type of bill we should see in a democracy. In a democracy we should be striving for constituencies whereby people make a true democratic choice to select a government and government responsibility should be to govern for the majority of the people, not like this Bill where they are taking in areas to try and sneak some of their Members in through the back door. I am going to watch when this vote comes on this Bill to see how many of the Members opposite are as fair-minded as a lot of us over here have assumed them to be, and see how many of them are going to vote for the greatest gerrymander Bill Canadian history has ever seen. I cannot support this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure, I suppose, using the word rather loosely or about as loosely as the Liberals have taken liberties with The Legislative Assembly Act, to listen to this debate now since 10 o'clock this morning until 4:20 this afternoon. I have been trying to filter throughout the entire debate some reasoning or some logic or some explanation which would be rational and reasonable for the people of Saskatchewan that is behind this Legislative Assembly Act.

All we have been really told is that there has been a Liberal commission within the Liberal party and the Members opposite who sat down and sort of concocted a witches' brew which is akin to The Legislative Assembly Act and then presented it to the people and to the MLAs for their consideration. Well, I can say that we didn't find any rationale or any explanation behind this Bill and I was reminded of Shakespeare when I was listening to the explanation by the various Members of the so-called commission about the introduction of the Bill. I want to just tell Members that the commission members or the so-called commissioners remind me very much of the three or four witches that Shakespeare talked about in one of his very famous plays, Macbeth. I can just imagine the Treasure sitting around and the Chairman of the Board, the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) wondering, you know, who would be good candidates for the witches to concoct the witches' brew

that will be the MLAs' redistribution Bill. I think there are no better words than the following to describe how this redistribution Bill really makes sense. The first witch said this:

Round about the cauldron go  
In the poison'd entrails throw.  
Toad that under cold stone  
Nights and days has thirty-one  
Swelter'd venom sleeping got,  
Boil thou first i' charmed pot.

And here is your golden rule, Mr. Member from Athabasca:

Double, double toil and trouble,  
Fire burn and cauldron bubble.

And that was the simple technique and the principle that was applied.

So I can see the Chairman of the Board, the Member from Athabasca saying, "Now who would make good candidates to concoct this witches' brew? It takes a very specially talented man to be able to throw all of these ingredients into the hodge-podge that is Saskatchewan, stir them up real good and proper and come out with a variety of hot-dog constituencies; in one area a square constituency, in another area a round constituency, and he had lots of candidates, I must say, to choose from when he was looking for the candidates. He finally picked on the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). I think he's got a little bit of the necessary characteristics and ingredients to make a good witch to concoct the MLAs' brew. The Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) — well, we really didn't expect it of him. The Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) of course would be the leader of the crowd and the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) rounded out that crowd very, very, very perfectly indeed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Double, double toil and trouble, fire burn and cauldron bubble. That's what they have given to the people of Saskatchewan when they came up with this MLAs' Redistribution Bill.

Then to hear the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the Minister of Welfare — and I am sorry he is not in his seat — and the Hon. Treasurer justify this Bill was almost as humorous or as ironical as the quotations that I have on occasion had to look to from Macbeth, particularly this one quotation, because you know really what this redistribution Bill signifies and what it signifies for those members of the commission and for most of the Members on the opposite side, is the end of the Liberal party come the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — This redistribution Bill, as my colleagues have said, indicates that no one knows better than the Premier and the Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan that they are on their way out as far as the people are concerned, than the boys opposite...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — . . . because there is just one quotation I think to absolutely put the icing on the cake, to describe better than anyone on this side, to describe the actions of the Member from Athabasca, the Minister of Welfare and the Treasurer, when they introduced this Bill. It also comes from Macbeth and I am indebted to the Provincial Librarian for helping me find it about a half an hour ago. And you will recall it was one of the soliloquies by one of the characters, Macbeth, I think in fact who said:

Out, out, brief candle, the Liberals are but a walking shadow.

The Member from Athabasca and the Minister of Welfare are but poor players that strut and fret their hour upon the stage and then are heard no more. It is a tale, referring to this Member's Legislative Assembly Bill, it's a tale full of sound and fury signifying nothing when it comes to the next election and that's exactly what's going to happen.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — And that's exactly what's going to happen to the Member from Athabasca and all the Liberals — a tale. Yes, that's right, a tale of sound and fury signifying absolutely nothing. Oh, no, the Member from Athabasca says that's not true. Well, we're going to challenge and we challenge again the Liberal Government to call that election to see if the people of Saskatchewan are going to be bought off by this redistribution Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, we've had some very, very strange arguments indeed advanced by the Members opposite. Again, I have been in this Legislature now for three years and I've gotten beyond the point of being surprised by some of the logic and reason — and believe me that's an attribute that I don't fully believe in — when I say that of the arguments of the Liberals on the opposite side, some of the logic and the reason in trying to justify this Bill.

First of all, the Member from Hanley he said, "Well, you know this Bill embraces the best principles of representation by population." the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) got off his mountain for a change and said, "You know Saskatoon's growth is phenomenal and this new seat that we've got for Saskatoon reflects this phenomenal growth." Well, that may very well be so but I just want to remind the Members of the House and those two Members and the people of Saskatchewan what we are talking about when we are talking about even and fair redistribution. the Member from Saskatoon City Park — whoever that's going to be — will have a riding of 5,000 people to represent. The Member from University will have 11,000. The Member from Centre will have 15,000. The Member from South will have 11,000 and my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair will have over 17,000. I'll have over 17,000. Now, if you try to apply the figures on the basis of the 1967 elections, what you really have is that there will be one Liberal Member for every 10,000 persons in the city of Saskatoon approximately.

On the basis of redistribution there will be a Liberal member but there will be one NDP member for over 17,000 persons. That's the effect of this Bill that is being introduced now.

In other words every New Democratic member who is representing Mayfair or Riversdale will have to carry and represent about 8,000 more persons per riding than the members on the opposite side. Well, this phenomenal growth that the mountain-builder, my learned friend from City Park-University talks about — I hope he doesn't calculate the mountain the way he has calculated this redistribution Bill because it will come down around his shoulders.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, he said this is phenomenal growth and he said you know this phenomenal growth is justified. There is something very interesting about this justification. He said, "It's to be justified because the city of Saskatoon is growing and the City Park and the University and the southeast area." Like the Member from Hanley, he also said, "You know, I've got a little bit of Saskatoon and Hanley and that's good because you know the city is growing out that way, it's the proper balance of urban and rural and the like." If the city is growing so fast in City Park and University, why then only 5,000 persons to be represented by the Member from City Park. If the city is growing so fast in University, why only 11,000 members and in South 11,000 members and yet the overburdening, staggering figures on my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair and the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale. There is absolutely no logic or reason to the argument. Of course what it is is just a phoney excuse and a sham and an attempt that the press hopefully will pick it up and say that Saskatoon has one seat more and somehow that equalizes the distribution. This is the most iniquitous and unjust and unfair Bill the citizens of Saskatoon have ever had to put up with.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, then I was very interested by the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) talking about the history of gerrymandering. He said to my colleague from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), "You know you are wrong about gerrymandering." He said it wasn't Gerry in Ireland or wherever my colleague of Touchwood was talking about. He said it was another Gerry in Massachusetts. Then he went on for about five or ten minutes and he told us all about the history of gerrymandering and for that we are indebted to the Member for Hanley because it is true that there is no one who knows more about gerrymandering than the Member from Hanley.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — But, however, there is one truth that's for sure, the eternal truth that the Member from Hanley said and we all on this side agree with you Hon. Member and he said this, "That no amount of gerrymandering will hold the people back" and the next election will show that when the New Democratic party wins it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, you know the Member from Athabasca is always a very colourful debate when he gets into the Legislature. the very forward-thinking Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who goes back to 1951 for his logic and his argument and I am complimenting you, Member from Athabasca, when I am talking about 1951 because many of us expected you to go back to 1931 or 1921 with respect to most of the philosophy. He said, “You know what they did 20 years ago we are now putting into effect in the Province of Saskatchewan.” Ah, he! — no one can say we are not a progressive or forward-looking Government, the Member from Athabasca intimated. He said, “I want to read you a few quotations back from 1951” and I don’t know if he was trying to tell the younger Members on this side of the history of the whole operation — or the older Members on their side. I don’t know but I think that this argument that is advanced by the Member from Athabasca, indeed the very Bill itself typifies the very existence and reason for being of the Liberal party and the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan; namely, that in all matters, even this final piece of legislation of this Session — the redistribution Bill — that they are 25 or 30 years behind the times and regressing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — There could be nothing that more typifies or characterizes the confusion, the indecision, the lack of logic, the style politicians who are over there on the opposite side than this redistribution Bill that has been brought forward in this Legislature at this time. The Gardiner machine someone mentions, my colleague from back here, that is the guideline. That’s the golden rule for politicians of the Liberal party. The only thing that the Member from Rosthern, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), can allude to is the Jimmy Gardiner machine. When it comes to implementing a new redistribution Bill, the Member from Athabasca goes back to 1951. They implement deterrent fees. They go back 10 years. They try and put impositions on hospitalisation, on medicare. They are now putting the squeeze on the school boards, putting the squeeze on hospital boards, putting back and cutting back on every positive and progressive step that the people of Saskatchewan have put on in the last 20 years. That’s the guideline of the Liberal party when it comes to the introduction of this Bill.

The Member from Milestone the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said, “Why to listen to the New Democrats talk you’d think that they had invented the words ‘justice’ and ‘equality’.” Well, I can see this, that to listen to the Member from Milestone and the Member from Athabasca talk, I am sure the people of Saskatchewan think we did invent the words of “justice” and “equality”, compared to what they have talked about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — He has very faulty and funny mathematics, you know. We are trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan and the Liberals about the question of why it is that in every constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, every constituency that I have gone through — well, I shouldn’t say every, I think there may be two and I am going to give just a very brief rundown — the population and

the area of representation have been drastically cut down when a Liberal is going to be representing that seat, absolutely drastically cut down while in every case where a New Democrat, on the basis of 1967,...I'll come to your seat in just a minute. I've got all the seats here, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, no, no, the Minister of Municipal Affairs I don't think was a part of the mess in the sense that he drew up the boundaries, but if he votes for this Bill he and every other Member will be a part of this mess and they will stand to be judged by the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — But I have confidence in the Minister, I am sure that he will see justice and will stand when the right time comes. But why is it, why is it, Mr. Deputy speaker, that we are trying to show and inconclusively prove — the Leader of the Opposition did it this morning — that in every New Democratic seat there is an increase in the representation and population and in every Liberal seat there is a drastic cutting back in the number of people they have to represent? You know why? You know? Because there are fewer and fewer Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan and there are fewer and fewer chances to get into the constituencies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — We tried to tell that to the Minister of Welfare. His mathematics were all cock-eyed. My colleague from Moose Jaw South said that and that doesn't surprise me because the way the Minister of Welfare doles out the welfare cheques we know his mathematics are cock-eyed because they don't get to the welfare recipients. The way the Treasurer comes forward with his budgets, with hidden deficits and a variety of other accidents of mathematical errors, we know this Liberal Government can't calculate and use mathematics.

I just want to give you a very brief rundown of what I am talking bout. Here is Pelly constituency, on the old boundaries, 7.5 thousand voters, now under 6.5 Moose Jaw North under the old 8.2, now 6.2 — down 2. Kelvington old 7.4 — down 6.2. Redberry old 6.8 — down 6, a reduction of 800. Melville old 9.9 — nearly 10,000, down 8.6 — down 2. Last Mountain — this is a good one — 6,700 down to 5,500. If you could put that in the corner of Riversdale constituency I could have five Last Mountains and if they could say that was fair representation.

Regina Whitmore — here's a good one. The old one was 11,400. You know what the new one is? Take a guess — 5,800. Not a reduction of 1,000 or 2,000 but a reduction of nearly 6,000 in representation.

Yorkton constituency down from nearly 13,000 to 11,000. Nutana South down 12,000 to 11,000. Hanley — well, that's about equal — 5,000, that's one of the fair ones, the Member from Hanley.

**April 15, 1970**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I can't touch that one, no. That was the strong argument for equalizing the urban and rural mix. The Member from Hanley is about as mixed up as the urban and the rural mix is itself represented.

Regina Lakeview — here's another good one — 13,600 down 10.9. Regina South East 16,000 in the old, down to 10,000. City Park is 5,500. I wonder if that's where the present Member from City Park-University will sit. City Park-University down to 11,000. Mayfair the same, in fact increased.

Nipawin constituency is up. Turtleford constituency is up. Humboldt is up and the Minister of Municipal Affairs is about holding his own.

You have three or four ridings, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and all of the others show a significant decrease in the population that the Member has to represent. and there is a clever design behind this as I have said already. Liberals, you know, have run their Gallup polls. They know the people of Saskatchewan are going to catch up with them sooner or later on deterrent fees. They know that the farmers are going to catch up with them sooner or later on two-cent tax. They know that. They know that the people of Saskatchewan resent the one per cent personal income tax increase. They know that the school boards don't like their autonomy being taken away from them by the Minister of Education.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — They know that the teachers are on the warpath and are angry about their rights being taken away systematically, and the workingman is upset about high unemployment and the consistent attacks on trade unions that the Liberals are propagating on them. That's what they see in these redistribution bills. so they look around and they say, "Well, where are the Liberals," and the Gallup polls say, well, there's a little bit here, there's 5,500 in City Park so we'll make it a Liberal seat there. There are the 7,000 in University, we'll make it a Liberal seat there. the Member from Regina South West...

**An Hon. Member:** — 3,500 in Whitmore Park.

**Mr. Romanow:** — 3,500, yes, in Whitmore Park. The Member from Regina South West, he's the vice-chairman of the board that the Member from Athabasca... They incorporated one capitalist principle anyway when they came to Saskatoon City Park-University. Like in every share there's a split of two for one. However, unlike most capitalist ventures this one isn't going to mean an increased profit for the Liberal party but for the New Democratic party, come the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — And the same thing is going to happen as well to the Member from Regina South West when it goes.

Well, I am not going to take up more of the time of the Members of the House, but I can tell you that in every riding that the New Democrats are representing, the all increased population, you can just see it in every case. It continues more and more representation, more and more burden that is carried on by the New Democratic party.

I am citing those figures because I want to reiterate again the theory behind this Bill, not a theory of justice or fairness or equity. The theory behind it is to try and isolate the New Democratic strength in large, large ridings and break down the very limited Liberal strength in a variety of small, little constituencies. And that's what the mathematics show in this area and everybody knows that and nobody knows it better than the Member from City Park-University.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, I'm going to tell the Member that I took the liberty...I'm going to tell the Member from City Park-University that he had better be careful where he picks his seat to run because you know, Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), I took the liberty of doing some calculations over the noon hour and even on this daveymander, if you run in Saskatoon City Park, you will have a majority of about 120 votes and that's a little slim because the candidates that are going to stand...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — ...You're gone, oh, well you're not going to run there? Well, let's take a look at Saskatoon University. If you are not going to run in Saskatoon University, I am going to tell you in Saskatoon University you had better be careful because there your majority is only about 450 votes and if the mood in the country is about like I think it is about, there are two new New Democratic seats in Saskatoon for sure.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — We're going to give you all the time in the world to build that mountain, come the next election this fall. This mountain is going to need a lot of maintenance and a lot of taking care of, Member from City Park-University, and you'll have all the time in the world to attend to those duties, make no mistake about that. Well, the vice-chairman of the board, he'll be there also for a little bit of assistance. I can see them, the pick and shovel boys as they are dealing with the mountain.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Did the Member for City Park-University say he would run in Riversdale? Well, I welcome him to run in Saskatoon-Riversdale constituency.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Charlebois:** — Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I was born on Avenue "I" right opposite the Richardson Road Machinery.

**April 15, 1970**

**Deputy Speaker:** — I think the Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale has the floor.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I was beginning to wonder where or if the Member was in fact born. I am very pleased to find out that he was, on Avenue “I”, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Charlebois:** — I have more tricks up my sleeve than you’ll ever have!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Members opposite know what I am saying. They know that the gig is up for the Liberal party. This is really an attempt to save the next election for the Liberals opposite and you know you can always tell when someone’s on a griddle because the Member from Athabasca...the Member from City Park-University, he’s always on a griddle so I am not going to use him as a good example, but the Member from Athabasca typified it today. They came in with this Bill, you see, and the Member from Athabasca he’s got a nice safe seat in Athabasca, so he thinks — chairman of the board, he’s got it all set up for himself — but when he said that the present Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) was thinking and is being asked by many people in Athabasca to run against him, boy...did we see...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Oh, look at how the chairman reacts. You see how the chairman of the board reacts. He is trying to portray the cool, calm approach that is typical of any chairman of the board. you know when the chairman of a board is faced with an economic or political crisis, he tries to play cool and calm. Well, I can say to the chairman of the board, the Member from Athabasca, we’ll see in the next election if the daveymander is going to help him. Liberals opposite think that my colleague from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) isn’t going to be with us, that my colleague from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk), that my colleague from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) isn’t going to be with us. You know in 1944 when this...well, just listen to this. In 1944 there were what — five New Democrats or CCFs, prior to that there wasn’t one New Democrat and in 1944 we swept in and ran you off the rails on the Liberal redistribution bills and that’s going to happen...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Oh, Mr. Speaker, the member of the board is losing his cool and we’ll have to replace him with the vice-chairman from Regina South West, so I think the type of speech that the vice-chairman made — you know I wouldn’t be too safe about the chairmanship of the board that the Member from Athabasca has got. There are some very eager eyes looking from behind the chairman of the board.

But they know what the story is because they think that this type of a gerrymander is going to save them against all of the sins that I am going to describe to them that the Liberals have perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan since 1964. This Government and this party have continually made promises after

promise after promise and right after they have made the promise they have broken it. Promise after promise. You know what has happened as a result of that, Mr. Speaker? There has been a credibility gap that is as wide as the Grand Canyon, as far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned with the Liberal party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — There isn't anything, anything that the people of Saskatchewan will believe about this Liberal party and its dying death wishes and throes. This Bill proves that. They will accept this as an act of a Government that is old and dying and losing touch with the people of Saskatchewan and is going to be wiped out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I see in this Bill a long shadow of Otto Land and Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I see in this Bill the Treasurer and the Premier and the Member from Athabasca whistling as they walk past the graveyard and they see the two shadows moving long over the horizon of Saskatchewan. I see some shadows of unsold wheat, tons and tons and tons of wheat that are haunting the people of Saskatchewan, this Liberal party. I see in this Bill — Oh, it's written in between the lines, Member from Regina South West — I see tons and tons of potash that remain unsold. We can read in between the lines and we can hear the feet of the people, 22,000 last year leaving the Province of Saskatchewan — that's what is behind this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — We can see behind this Bill some form of concern that the Minister of Highways, (Mr. Boldt) said he was against the Canadian Wheat Board. We note that the Liberals are concerned that the Premier accepted and embraced Operation LIFT, and we see concern on deterrent fees and the emasculation of the hospital boards and the school boards. Oh, yes, there are long shadows that are lurking in behind the scenes of all the members of the board. we can only expose those shadows and remove them to the light of day come the next election, which we hope will come as soon as possible.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it has been said already more eloquently by Members on this side than I could ever hope to say with respect to the question of this Bill being a disgrace to the people of Saskatchewan and to the Legislature. I am going to be accused of being holier than thous and I don't care, coming from those fellows, that wouldn't be so hard to be. This Bill makes a mockery and a sham of democracy in the Province of Saskatchewan. We can play politics all we want and debate it and hit hard in debate as I would expect all Members to do. We can compete hard when we are out on the hustings. We can advance our views in a very difficult way and as hard and as strenuously as we can, but we ought not to expect that type of politics to be injected when it comes to representation of the people on the floor of this Assembly. I don't pretend to be speaking for

**April 15, 1970**

anybody but myself but I think my colleague from Regina talked about young people just very briefly. We talk about extra-parliamentary activity and we say we are concerned about extra-parliamentary activity. I share that concern but I can tell the Hon. Members that one of the reasons for that concern is because the young people are looking to the legislatures and to the legislators and they are seeing sham political operations like Bill N. 86 being advanced here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — We hear very often the word of relevancy. How meaningful is this Parliament and this Legislature and these legislators to the people that we represent in the Province of Saskatchewan? Do we have any dialogue with them? Are their wishes being expressed and are we sensitive to them? I don't think the answer to that is Yes. I don't think that they are going to buy us as a credible alternative or solution to the problems of the society. They are going to look and they are going to be disappointed and I say disappointed rightfully and ashamed of the acts of the Liberal Government when it introduces Bill No. 86.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — We have said time and time again that there is a need to take out of politics the question of representation. To the victor do not go the spoils of office. To the victor go very serious and heavy responsibilities of government with philosophy and programs. Far too often the old line parties, those parties that are 100 years ago, have viewed politics as a philosophy of to the victor go the spoils. They have viewed it as a spoil system, as a control of all of the boards and all of the important functions of our society because that's the way they played politics. That no longer is any good in the world today. We've got too many problems of technology, too many other problems in our society, too many other concerns and fast-thinking and fast-moving young people when it comes to the question of determining our political system on the basis of to the victors go the spoils. They have in fact shown again, as I have said, the fact that they are really not with it when it comes to this Bill, because this Bill reflects the old style politics and the old style politicians, each and every one of them that inhabits the benches opposite, because it is the politics of the spoils system, it is not the politics of philosophy or the politics of programs. It is the politics that is barren and devoid of principles and ideas.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I will show you how fast the politicians' promises are made in this Government and are broken, how the words and the actions of this Government are valueless. They are worthless currency. I have here in my hand Debates and Proceedings, Part 2, 1963, Fifth Session of the Legislature. I am going to quote just very briefly the words of the now Premier, the Hon. Member from Morse constituency. May I say this before I quote it that I am going to be presenting an amendment to this Legislature, giving an opportunity to the Members opposite to tell us where they stand when it comes to this question of spoils politics, and the question of politics on philosophy, whether or not they

are going to introduce fairness and justice in the entire operation of redistribution and representation.

We have said that an independent boundaries commission is the answer. My colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) has time and time again introduced a Resolution and has eloquently spoken in favour of it, to be rejected up until now by the Liberals opposite. We say that the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta who have an independent commission have proven that it can work. I say to the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) that there may be some wrong doings and acts of indiscretion with respect to the Federal Redistribution Boundaries Commission, but I would much rather have that type of system than the Liberal commission within the Liberal party in the back rooms deciding the fate of the people of Saskatchewan.

We have to take it out of the area of politics. We have to put it in the hands of an independent commission. So I am going to give my friend from Hanley, I am going to give my friend the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), - he is a fair-minded man I know. He says so many times — I am almost getting ready to believe him, almost. I am going to give the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), the chairman of the board; I am going to give that very hot-in-pursuit vice-chairman of the board from Regina; I am going to give all the little shareholders opposite a chance to give their say as to where they stand.

I am going to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd):

That all the words after “that” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Bill No. 86 be not now read a second time because it completely and totally fails to adhere to the democratic principles of representation by population and further that this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that the entire subject matter of Bill No. 86 be referred to an independent commission on electoral boundaries composed in similar principle to the Commission in the Province of Manitoba.

#### **RULING BY MR. SPEAKER**

I would draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the principles involved in the movement of amendments to Bills. Again I quote from Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, page 526. Represented amendments:

It is also competent for a Member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill to move what is known as a “reasoned amendment”...A reasoned amendment is placed on the paper in the form of a motion and may fall into one of several categories.

1. It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

In my opinion this Resolution falls into that category.

The amendment may seek further information in regulation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.



**April 15, 1970**

And again in my opinion this amendment falls into that particular category.

The amendment being an alternative to the main motion the debate continues on the amendment and the motion concurrently.

**Mr. M. Kwasnica** (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate. I think this has been one of the most exciting debates so far and I want to commend Members on this side of the House for really showing up the Liberal Government for what it is.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — First of all I want to take exception to this redistribution Bill because it is nothing but a gerrymander. I will be losing four polls in my constituency to Turtleford, four polls, which, when you look at the vital statistics of those polls, are obviously in favour of the Liberals. I regret losing this area because in spite of the majority perhaps being slightly in favour of Liberals, many of my friends live there. Fine people, fine farmers. Many people in this area are parents of children that I have taught for the past 11 years.

Losing these polls to another constituency means a reduction of about some 500 voters in Cutknife. In 1967 there were 8,640 voters, now that number will be reduce to about 8,100. I gather, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal gerrymanderers must have reasoned that I am unable to look after some 8,640 voters and they saw fit to reduce some 500 of them. I take this as an insult to my ability to look after people in my constituency. I have never turned anyone away from my door in the three years that I have been their Member. I have always replied to their problems and questions and I have answered hundreds of letters in the last few years. In very few cases have I been unable to get action on the problems that the people had.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was really expecting to get some of Wilkie constituency to the south. I knew that they were going to take some of the north and I thought that maybe they would ease the burden of the present Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), but I see that they didn't see fit to do this.

But ready, Mr. Speaker, I am positive that the reason that these four polls were taken away from Cutknife had nothing to do with Cutknife constituency whatsoever. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the real reason for this gerrymander is to attempt to throw a few more Liberal votes into Turtleford constituency in the hope of winning that constituency held by Mr. Wooff, with the majority of 27.

Now what are the facts in the case, Mr. Speaker? Well in the one poll Tangleflags there are 36 Liberal votes, 32 New Democrats, so if voting patterns remain the same the Liberals may pick up four votes in that poll. Then there is the Green Street poll, 32 Liberal votes in the last election, 18 for the New Democrats, and if this pattern remains the same they will pick up 14 there. Then there is North Bend which is a poll snug up against the river where they had 69 Liberal votes and 19 for New Democrats. If voting patterns remain the same the Liberals could pick up 48 votes there. Then there is poll No. 32 Northminster that I lot to Turtleford. This poll comes within seven

miles of Lloydminster, my hometown, and people naturally come to Lloydminster to do their shopping. Now what is the vote like in this poll, Mr. Speaker? 56 for the Liberals, 44 for New Democrats, 12 majority for the Liberals. So, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious in this case that the boundary changes in Cutknife are 100 per cent political, plain and simple. No intention of justice whatsoever.

If the Government wanted to be at least a little bit fair why didn't it take in all of poll No. 28, Dry Gully, instead of just a little pocket of that poll? I'll tell you why they didn't take that poll in. The results are the reason. How many Conservative votes in that poll? There are 12. How many New Democratic in that poll? 65. How many Liberal votes in that poll? One! Mr. Speaker, this what it has done. I expect that since this poll was such slim pickings for the Liberals that they must have ferreted out that one Liberal vote and made sure that he was taken in, to make sure that they could win Turtleford.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sorry for the Liberal candidate in Cutknife constituency. I would like to see the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier go to Cutknife and tell the Liberal candidate what they have done. They have taken out some 78 Liberal votes which they are going to need to win. I don't know what the next candidate is going to do.

The second major objection that I have to this Bill is that it breaks the general practice of using natural boundaries. The North Saskatchewan River has been the natural boundary between Cutknife and Turtleford from the very beginning of those constituencies. What is the logic in changing the boundaries now?

Mr. Speaker, looking at all the inequalities in this Bill and looking at the lack of any of the major normal principles being incorporated into it, natural trading patterns seem to have been disregarded. The Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) talked at very great length this morning about the natural trading pattern. I find that they have really fouled this one up. The principle of natural boundaries which would be the North Saskatchewan River in this case, the true principle of true representation by population, all of these are not incorporated in this Bill.

I find this Bill highly objectionable. As a matter of fact it makes me angry. Mr. Speaker, come the next election I am going to work three times as hard to make sure that we win those polls that they have taken from Cutknife and I am sure that we are going to win the election the next time around too, because the people of Saskatchewan will be angry as well.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am 100 per cent in favour of the amendment as proposed by the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and I just want to remind the House what the Premier said regarding this same situation some years ago. I have the Debates and Proceedings, Part 2, 1963 Session, when a similar problem arose and the present Premier said and I quote:

I think this whole debate indicates one thing very clearly. Redistributions in this House or any other House should be done by an impartial committee, and not by a political body which makes political decisions as this Government has done.

**April 15, 1970**

Mr. Speaker, I therefore support the amendment and not the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.R. Guy** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one word on this amendment. I am not going to hold the House up very long.

I want to remind all Hon. Members that this suggestion was made in 1951 by Members of the Liberal opposition when we had the redistribution Bill in that year. However, statements that were made by Mr. Fines and others in the Government convinced us at that time that this was the right approach, so we have followed the CCF principle ever since.

I think the key statement was made by the Member for Kelsey, Mr. Brockelbank, when he said in 1961 that a small committee was not satisfactory because every Member, since he is affected, should have the right to make his concerns known regarding boundaries. So he said that the Legislature and the Committee of the Whole particularly was the place for determining electoral boundaries. This CCF policy of 1961 was followed then and we see no reason to change it and we accept the same philosophy today.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 22**

Lloyd	Smishek	Pepper
Bowerman	Thibault	Matsalla
Messer	Whelan	Wooff
Wood	Snyder	Willis
Davies	Michayluk	Kwasnica
Romanow	Brockelbank	Kowalchuk
Dewhurst	Baker	Byers
Meakes		

**NAYS — 31**

Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Larochelle	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Gardner
Steuart	Estey	Coupland
Heald	Hooker	McPherson
McIsaac	Gallagher	Charlebois
Guy	Heggie	Forsyth
Barrie	Breker	McIvor
Loken	Leith	Schmeiser
MacDougall		

The debate continues on the motion.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the Members on both sides of the House for their almost unanimous support of this Bill.

I think this is one of the most encouraging things that I have ever seen happen in public life. I have to believe that you will all support it, led by the Member, the Hon. Mayor. He led the way by saying it was a good redistribution because the NDP would win five out of seven seats in Regina. Then every Member opposite whose seat had been in any way changed to make things more equitable and fair got up and said, "However, we will win our seats, this is a gerrymander, this is a terrible thing, you have done it for political purposes." I don't know if the Hon. Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) said that. I am not sure. We have given him a fair challenge, I admit. But all other Members stood up and stated, "We will win the seats." Even Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) reading the usual bitter diatribe he makes. He listed all the people that voted for him, and he gets all mixed up on this ethnic bit and how his parents came over here to escape I don't know what. He says the Poles voted for him and the Ukrainians voted for him, the Swedes voted for him, he didn't mention the Irish. there is one ethnic group that he should get. I don't know how he missed them, I will check into it though. I'll speak to some of the members of the IRA and see if they can be lined up for him in the next elections. Although if I were him I wouldn't be holding my breath about coming back here, but he might be but I doubt it. Miracles maybe aren't at an end. But it is a remarkable thing how they all stood up and said that it was very unfair, very political and then announced that they would be back and they would win. You can't have it both ways. Either it is unfair and we did it for political purposes, and you won't win, or it is very fair and we didn't do it for political purposes, which is the truth, and you will win, which I doubt.

I think the truth is that it was very fair and we didn't do it for political purposes and most of you won't win anyway. And as for the people not trusting us, if you look back, it was the Socialists that the public did not trust. They didn't trust you in 1964 when they elected us and they didn't trust you again in 1967. I suggest that when we go to the people this fall, or whenever we do — I am sorry I shouldn't have let that out — could you have that taken off the record? That was very indiscreet of me. I can assure you we won't go until you get Henry in the leadership or whoever you are going to get and we won't make a move until then. Then we are liable to move like greased lightning, before you change your mind.

But, again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when they mentioned the figures they always went back to the 1967 figures, which as I pointed out are two and a half years old. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said that if I had better figures I should give them to him. Well the calculations that we made were made by going and looking. If you go and look in Moose Jaw, if the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) goes and takes a look at what is happening in his own city in the northwest particularly, he will see with his own eyes that it is growing. If you go out into Albert Park you will see the high-rise apartments there and you will see the people in them. And so you don't need figures. You just have to get out in your constituencies and look around.

The same in Saskatoon. When you fellows get back to Saskatoon go over to those other parts of town. They will let you in I am sure. I will get a pass from some of the boys there. I'll see that you get safe passage through some of the better parts of town. Go and take a look at what is happening. I am

**April 15, 1970**

sure that you will that there is great growth taking place, and you will come back and apologize for those things that you said.

But, Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to say again that I wasn't impressed by anything that the Hon. Members brought forward. I was rather amazed that as usual that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) always has two answers to everything when he gets up in the House. First he makes a plea, "Don't look back. look ahead. we never want you to look back." And with the record of that outfit over there I don't blame them for not wanting to look back. I wouldn't want to look back either.

Another think that he always does is recommend that everything be referred to a committee. Well, I would like to tell the Members opposite that is why they are not in the Government and that is why most of them won't even be in the Opposition. When the people elect you, you are sent here to govern. That is the representative that give you and not to a committee or a study or a royal commission, but to the Members to govern. That's what we have, the courage, the foresight, to do it and that is what we are doing here. This is our Bill. We are presenting it here, a redistribution not for the last election, but for the next election. I am sure that when Hon. Members on that side think it over, the fair ones over there will vote for that side think it over, the fair ones over there will vote for it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 31**

Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Larochelle	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Gardner
Steuart	Estey	Coupland
Heald	Hooker	McPherson
McIsaac	Gallagher	Charlebois
Guy	Heggie	Forsyth
Barrie	Breker	McIvor
Loken	Leith	Schmeiser
MacDougall		

**NAYS — 22**

Lloyd	Smishek	Pepper
Bowerman	Thibault	Matsalla
Messer	Whelan	Wooff
Wood	Snyder	Willis
Davies	Michayluk	Kwasnica
Romanow	Brockelbank	Kowalchuk
Dewhurst	Baker	Byers
Meakes		

**Hon. A.C. Cameron** (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved second reading of **Bill No. 85 — An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Assembly, I am going to be very non-controversial in what I am going to say. I am hopeful that we may get the unanimous support of the Legislature in the proposed legislation, of which I propose second reading now.

I propose to be brief, but I propose to be direct. I don't think that we in this Chamber or the Government have to make any apologies for the legislation which we are introducing this afternoon. I think in essence it is an attempt to alleviate to some degree the injustices suffered by Saskatchewan people at the hands of the two national railways.

It is not necessary in this Chamber to catalogue the sins of commission and omission perpetrated upon the people of Saskatchewan by the two national railways. The injustices that we have suffered at their hands are burned in the memory of Saskatchewan people. The people of Saskatchewan are entitled to an explanation why a penalty is imposed on all goods brought into Saskatchewan by rail and are entitled to an explanation why all of our resource products shipped out of Saskatchewan by rail are subject to a special penalty as well, a penalty which is not applicable to either of our sister provinces.

We are entitled to an explanation why Saskatchewan products pay a freight rate penalty while the same operation in Manitoba and in Alberta has been granted freight concessions. Surely we are entitled to an explanation why our two national railways so readily agreed to haul Alberta coal to the Pacific Coast by unit train operation, bringing tremendous saving to the coal producers of that province. They have recently readily agreed and put into operation a unit train operation to haul Alberta's sulphur to the West Coast, bringing a saving to the sulphur producers. Yet they have consistently refused to even consider the possibility of moving Saskatchewan potash by unit train.

I think we are entitled to ask for an explanation why they persist year after year in raising our freight rates to the West Coast at the very time that they are granting major reductions in rates to our competitors. This discriminatory freight rate levied against Saskatchewan has made it of course increasingly difficult to secure markets both in Asia and in Europe for our natural products. These railways have imposed rates on Eastern shipments to the point where our products have been effectively eliminated from the markets in Ontario and Quebec and Eastern Canada.

All attempts with reasoned discussions with the railways to date have been an exercise in futility. The voice it seems to us that these corporations understand is the voice which affects the pocket book. This Bill, we think, is that kind of voice. Until now we have negotiated with the companies from a position of weakness. Henceforth we are determined to speak from a position of strength.

It is most interesting to note that the major consumer of Saskatchewan potash is the American Mid West. And the American Mid West it is interesting to note is also the market to which we ship our exports of oil to the United States. We know that research is well enough advanced today that it shows that it is

economically feasible to move potash by pipeline with oil as its carrier.

We have the oil. We have the potash. These two products share the same market area in the Chicago area in the Mid West. Should it not perhaps be the time for us to interest ourselves in the movement of these two products by a common carrier, by a pipeline into the common markets, and thus avoid the excessive freight rates which are levied on this product when it is moved by rail. These are only a few of the injustices that we recite to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I am not going to take the time because we are all familiar with them.

I want now to turn to the Bill itself. One clause of the Bill states that any provision in any agreement whereby the liability for payment of mineral taxes is made the liability of any person other than the owner, such a clause shall be null and void. That means that the mineral tax which we assess against these two railway companies and the third major landholder, the Hudson Bay, will not in turn be passed on to the lessee or the renter. This Bill will prevent that practice and stop the loading of their rightful taxes onto the backs of the potash industry, the oil industry, and on others.

Section 3 of the present Act provides for a tax of 10 cents per acre on all minerals owned by other than individuals. Farmers of course are exempt. This Section remains in the Bill. A new Section introduced imposes an additional tax on all mineral owners having in excess of 500,000 acres. The tax is a graduated one. the greater the amount owned the greater the degree of the tax. The tax will be applied in this manner. Those owning mineral titles up to 500,000 acres in total will be levied 10 cents per acre; those owning over 500,000 and less than 1,000,000 will pay on that parcel of 500,000 acres at the rate of 20 cents per acre; those owning 1,000,000 in excess up to 1,500,000 will pay on that over 1,000,000 up to the 1,500,000 30 cents per acre; those owning from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 acres on that 1,500,000 the tax and all acres above the 2,000,000 will be 50 cents per acre. This tax is universal in its application. all owners of minerals in excess of 500,000 acres will be taxed at the new rates. Presently, however, we have only three corporations owning minerals in Saskatchewan in excess of 500,000 acres; namely, the CPR, the CNR and the Hudson Bay. The CPR owns approximately 2,750,000 acres. The CNR owns approximately 3,000,000 acres and the Hudson Bay owns approximately 2,300,000 acres. If you are applying to these owners in excess of 500,000 the present rates, the tax at the present rate applied to these three major landowners nets the Province about \$800,000. The application of the new schedule of rates will bring to the Province \$2.6 million in place of \$800,000. the tax increase is in the neighbourhood of \$1.8 million. Now I think any other details about the application of the Bill and the formula and how it may apply can be best answered in Committee.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I rise first of all to indicate support from those of us on this side of the Legislature for the Bill which is being considered in second reading. I do want, Mr. Speaker, to make just a very few remarks about it and perhaps

the Minister can in response supply some additional information. Perhaps we could call it 5:30 at this time.

## STATEMENT

### APOLLO 13

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Before we proceed to the business of the House may I draw your attention to the fact that Apollo 13 is still on its way back to the earth and I understand that there will be a crucial course correction sometime later this evening. Might I suggest that regardless of opinions in connection with the space program, regardless of the opinions program and constituency in connection with the exploration of the universe, which Members may have, here are three human beings, members of the human race who are returning to earth from an exploratory expedition probably comparable or analogous to that of the second voyage of Christopher Columbus to the North American continent when he was returning in his leaky caravels. I wonder if I would be presumptuous if I suggested to the House that each in his own way, each in his own manner, we should all rise and spend a half a minute in contemplative thought on behalf of these men.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I had suggested before we broke for the supper hour that I rose to indicate our support for the Bill and also to make a relatively few comments. The comments come, Mr. Speaker, because if one takes the Bill, which in itself is reasonably straightforward, together with the Minister's statement as to how it is proposed to use the Bill and why it is proposed to pass the Bill, we have a rather curious bundle in the way of legislation effects. I was interested, I must say, in hearing the Minister's comments about these hard-hearted, unreasonable corporations who listened only to power. As the Minister's rhetoric began to roll I fully expected him to say, "Up the Revolution," but he didn't quite come to that point.

There are some aspects of it that interest me and which I think should perhaps be commented on. First of all, we ought to recognize that the Bill in the form which it is printed does represent an increase in taxation or I think we should perhaps say another increase in taxation. I don't know whether this will make 1,100 or 1,010 increases in charges for services or new taxes or increases in taxes that the Government has imposed since 1964, but it is at least one more. that, however, isn't the point of my remarks.

If I take the Bill plus the Minister's statement, what it seems to say is "Taxation if necessary, but not necessarily taxation." The Minister seemed to be saying that he was asking us to pass the legislation, not to produce revenue but rather to be available to the Government with respect to negotiation for more favourable freight rates. in other words I assume, and I would like the Minister to comment when he closes the debate, that the Government is not necessarily intending to really make use of the legislation. I note that the final clause suggests that it doesn't come into effect except on proclamation. So I'm assuming that it is the threat of taxation rather than the revenue from the taxation which is in fact of interest to the Government when it proposes this Bill. I should like to know about the Government's intentions in that respect.



Secondly, the Minister noted that there were three companies which could be affected if the Bill goes into effect. These companies, the Canadian Pacific Railway company, or some of its subsidiaries I presume, the Canadian National Railway, and the Hudson Bay Company. They are affected because they all happen to be owners of very substantial amounts of mineral rights in the Province of Saskatchewan. I can understand that in writing the legislation it had to be made to apply to all on the basis of ownership. One couldn't exempt any one company because that would be discrimination and I believe there are legal acts against that. But I'm curious about the fact that, as the Minister seemed to be saying, the main purpose of the Bill was to give the Government some power, some authority with which to negotiate more preferable freight rates. What then is the position of the Hudson Bay Company? So far as I know the Hudson Bay Company doesn't own any railways; it is consequently not guilty of overcharging of freight rates. Consequently if that's the reason for the Government imposing this new taxation, the Hudson Bay Company should not be charged, and I wonder if it is the intention of the Government then to refund whatever taxation it may obtain from the Hudson Bay company because it owns property of this kind.

The third question I have to raise is: suppose the railways, the two of them who do own mineral rights as well happen to react in different ways, suppose for example the Canadian National Railway says it will meet the requests of the Government but the Canadian Pacific Railway doesn't, or suppose the CPR says we will meet your requests but the CNR doesn't, what then does the Government propose to do with respect to the one that does meet the Government requests? I would be interested in having the Minister's comment on that rather peculiar situation.

Fourthly, I suppose I have already asked this question. Suppose that both companies comply with the requests of the Government whatever they are, then do we assume that there will be no tax levied and consequently no tax paid?

The fifth thing that I would like the Minister to comment on is just what is it that the Government is wishing the railways to do or just what is the Government requesting the railways to do? Surely we ought to have some better information than merely that the railways are guilty of imposing rates which nobody can understand and which all of us, I agree, are convinced are too high and have been for some time. Well I think we need to know more from the Government about just what it is expecting the companies to do.

The sixth question I would like to raise has to do with the Minister's statement that the companies who may have to pay this tax are going to have to assume the cost of it themselves. He made quite a point, and I'm happy to hear him make it, that the companies would be restricted by law from passing this charge on to any of their customers. This they had to pay. They couldn't pass it on. I would be intensely interested in hearing the Minister explain just how they are going to bring that into effect. Just how are they going to say to the Canadian Pacific Railways that when one of your subsidiaries or one of your holding companies pays a tax on mineral rights then the railways can't pass this on? I would be extremely interested in having the Minister unravel or unveil to us just how it is anticipated that the Government is going to make this particular part of the bargain really stick.

I'll say, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, it is our intention to support the Bill. The Bill as it is represents an increase in taxation but I do hope the Minister can clear up some of the rather curious points about what happens if we take what is in the Bill together with his statement. I'd like to know whether it is the threat of the tax rather than the revenue from the tax in which the Government is really interested in wanting to use. Secondly, I would like to know what the intention is with respect to the Hudson Bay Company and its holdings. It doesn't have any railways; it is not involved in the argument or the discussion about freight rates. Does the Government intend to refund to the Hudson Bay company or just how does it expect to handle that little bit?

What does the Government intend to do, thirdly, if the CPR conforms with its wishes and the CNR doesn't? What does it intend to do if the CNR conforms with its wishes and the CPR doesn't? Suppose both of them comply, then what does the Government do? Does it apply the tax or not?

Fifthly, what is that the Government wants the railway companies to comply with? And finally just how does the Government propose to manage and to bring about is suggestion that the companies will have to assume this themselves but will not be able to pass it on to any of their customers to be paid in that way?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — The 20 questions — I think it is 20 that I counted — the Leader of the Opposition mentioned could best be discussed in Committee. Well he had 5, 5a, 5b, and...I'm rather surprised that he could say he gives support to a Bill with which he has such tremendous reservations, and upon which he knows so little. I would think that he is supporting the Bill for reasons far different to the purpose of introducing the Bill. He seemed to think if it is just a tax measure to raise more revenue, I'm all for it. If it is an attempt to assert some authority and to make known to these corporations that we propose to talk to them in terms in the language they understand but he is not so sure he wants to vote for it. These are the questions which can be answered. Now he asks another vital question. Does he propose to make it compulsory that they can't pass on this tax to someone else. The Bill says, Yes. Now he says, "I'm interested how this may be done." Well I should think he should have some conception of how it may be done because that was in your original legislation in 1945, precisely that same clause, only we dressed it up and made it more watertight than you had it. So I should think that should answer that particular question. Then he said, "If it is to get at the railway companies does he propose to refund it to the Hudson Bay?" I draw his attention to the fact that there is no provision in this Bill for refunding the tax and it's applicable in a universal manner to all mineral owners that have in excess of 500,000 acres and the Bill is specific in what it means. By ownership is defined under Section 3: a person who is registered in a land titles office is the owner of the minerals whether or not the title is severed from the title to the surface or not, not just on the surface, it's on the mineral rights which they own. If the Hudson Bay Company owns 2.3 million of acres they are going to pay tax on 2.3 million of acres. If any other company rises to the position where they have an excess of 500,000

**April 15, 1970**

acres under ownership they will come under this Bill as well. There is no exemption under the Bill. In fact, it has universal application.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher** (Premier) moved second reading of **Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend The Industrial Development Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill, I think, is obvious. In the past year SEDCO has made some very substantial loans, both for industrial purposes and also for agricultural purposes. For example there have been a great many loans for feedlots and hog operations, and we are facing even more substantial loans in the year ahead. We have loans to make to such industries as the distillery in Weyburn, possibly the pulp mill in Meadow Lake, and certainly the sawmill in Meadow Lake. We have two or three other fairly large industrial enterprises which may materialize in the next few months. Therefore the officials of SEDCO have suggested that it is absolutely imperative that we have authorization to increase the ceiling at SEDCO from \$40 million to \$55 million. I would be pleased to answer any questions, Mr. Speaker, at the Committee stage.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. D.V. Heald** (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 82 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of the amendments to this Act. Before I go into the details of the Bill before the House I would like to mention some of the highlights in our battle against the slaughter on our highways. Last year we succeeded again in reducing the number of fatal accidents by 34 or roughly 16 per cent and the number of non-fatal accidents by 185 or 4 per cent. Actual numbers speak much more clearly for themselves in statistics. The fact that 41 fewer people were killed on our highways is, I suggest, a very encouraging indication that our legislative actions have succeeded in putting a halt to the increases which were experienced for a successive number of years. I want to quote a statistic here, Mr. Speaker, which I think is a good statistic and it is a very interesting statistic: the death per million vehicle miles rate in 1969 was the lowest since 1960 — .065. Mr. Speaker, with the legislation which this House has passed during the past few years the groundwork has been laid to improve the ways and means by which we can through administrative and law enforcement action improve safety on our highways. Many changes have taken place and many more are forthcoming. Advanced technology has made it possible not only to build better highways and better cars but also to bring to our attention the bad accident-prone driver. With the increased necessary actions which is aimed, not only at the individual driver, but also at determining trends in the ever-increasing mobility of our society. We can detect weakness in our transportation system and draw conclusions from bad experiences of the past.

Mr. Speaker, the three “Es” of highway traffic and safety, engineering, education and enforcement are the basic foundations

on which all our efforts are built. Many attempts have been made in the past to say that one or the other of these three are more important but I think everybody realizes now surely that they are of equal importance. the most sophisticated highway system in the world could be a death trap for an uneducated and an unskilled driver. On the other hand, a well educated and skilful driver can well be a menace to others if he disregards the law and the rules of the road and basic attitudes towards his fellow drives. on the other hand, law enforcement can be overbearing and could become detrimental rather than complimentary or effective. Mr. Speaker, I should like to report that during the past year we have made much progress in our attempts to improve the situation. Highway traffic and safety is a Provincial responsibility but we cannot do it alone. All provincial governments are faced with the same problems and therefore we have concluded that, by pooling our efforts and exchanging ideas and information, we may find solutions faster. Through the Council of Ministers responsible for motor vehicle administration and the Canadian conference of motor vehicle administrators we have been able to get the best advice possible and compulsory-ordination of efforts on the Provincial level has resulted in a number of safety standards for automotive safety including tire standards, safety helmet standards, break fluid standards, automotive safety glass standards, vehicle lighting standards, school bus standards and recreational trailer standards. This effort has been crowned with the establishment of the Canadian Vehicle Equipment code which will be administered by the Canadian Standards Association Code Committee and an advisory council composed of senior administrators from all 10 Provinces, the Federal Department of Transport, the Automotive Industry and Consumer Representatives. The Federal Minister of Transport introduced Bill C-137 in the Federal Parliament which will establish automotive safety standards at the point of manufacture and import for all motor vehicles sold or offered for sale in Canada. Here again through compulsory-operation and compulsory-ordination of efforts between the Provinces and the Federal Government we have been able to make large strides forward to accomplish safety measures which could not have been achieved by the individual Provinces. It has been a very gratifying experience, Mr. Speaker, to see these progressive steps being taken and to witness the unanimity in concern and purpose towards solution of our highway traffic and safety problems.

The officials of the motor Vehicle Administration Branch of the highway Traffic Board have been in continuous and constant contact with the law enforcement agencies and voluntary safety organizations throughout the province in order to establish better lines of communication and to find better ways to deal with our safety problems. The results have been very encouraging. Here again we have utilized the possibilities of advanced computer techniques to supply law enforcement agencies with the latest up-to-date information on every driver in Saskatchewan.

Starting this month, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and City Police Forces will be supplied with microfilm listings which include name, address, personal data and licence status of 495,000 licensed drivers. They will also be supplied with motor vehicle registration listings on microfilm which show the licence number, owner's name and address, serial number of the vehicle for 407,000 registered private passenger cars, motor cycles and farm trucks. These lists, Mr. Speaker, will provide long overdue assistance to law enforcement agencies and will ease the burden which was

**April 15, 1970**

created by tens and thousands of enquiries that my officials have had to cope with every year. I should also like to mention again, if I might, that the 1970-71 licence plates are reflectorized. I think this is another step forward for safety on our highways. I have received many complimentary remarks about this and I am looking forward to a reduction in rear-end collisions during night driving in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing now with the details of the amendments to The Vehicles Act I should mention that the amendments will be incorporated into consolidation of The Vehicles Act which will be printed as soon as the legislative counsel has the 1970 Act prepared. There have been three Acts to amend The Vehicles Act passed in 1967, 1968 and 1969 and I think for the purpose of clarification and for people using this statute consolidation is highly desirable. We have delayed a revision of The Vehicles Act for another year because of pending changes in the organizational structure of the Highway Traffic board and because of the need for complementary legislation relating to pending Federal Acts and safety standards. Clauses (h) and (i) have been added to Section 10 which will give the Board the power to prescribe by regulation the procedures and the fees to be paid by applicants in respect of public hearings for operating vehicles for public service vehicles. The Board may also provide for the return of all or part of such fees. An amendment to Section 15a and the repeal of Section 20 are complementary amendments. For many years the Highway Traffic Board, Mr. Speaker, has prescribed the rates which may be charged by public service vehicle operators. These prescribed freight rates are not always just to the operator or to the shipper, and therefore many jurisdictions in our country and also in the United States have adopted the practice of allowing rates to be filed. Amendments to Section 25 make the provision that rates may be filed with the Board and once approved by the Board they would become the approved rates. I point, however, and I want to make it perfectly clear that this is simply a permissive amendment. No changes can be made without public hearings, without a full opportunity for all interested parties to make full representation.

Section 44 makes provision for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to declare by order that subject to terms and conditions set out in the order motor vehicles shall not be required to carry a number plate on the front thereof. This provision makes it possible to carry special plates which may be authorized from time to time to make special events, and of course the particular case in point is the Canada Winter Games in Saskatoon in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the number of drivers that operator motor vehicles without a valid driver's licence. Our courts have at times have rather lenient with these offenders and therefore we propose to amend Section 63 of the Act which would set the minimum fine of \$25 or more, or in default of payment, through imprisonment for a term not exceeding 30 days.

Recent amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada have made it necessary to make amendments to Section 87 of The Vehicles Act whereby the new offences under the Criminal Code, that is Section 223, subsection (2) which is the failure or refusal to provide sample of breath; and Section 224, which is the .08 section, driving with more than 80 milligrams of alcohol in the blood are being integrated by these amendments into the statutory suspension legislation which was passed by this House at the last session.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before, we have succeeded in reducing the number of fatal accidents to the lowest death per million vehicle-mile level since 1960. I am convinced that the statutory suspension policy of the Government has proven itself and that this policy more than any other single factor is a primary factor in the reduction of fatal accidents on our highways. The effectiveness of the enforcement of this policy is also borne out, I suggest, by the number of convictions for Criminal Code offences involving alcohol. When we compare the figures of the six-month period from September to February, 1968-69, with those of September to February, 1969-70, we find a marked increase in convictions from 835 to 1,451 convictions for Criminal Code offences involving alcohol. I would like all Hon. Members to note that we have not lost sight of the importance of stern enforcement of these provisions to deal with impaired drivers. However, I have been quite alarmed by the large number of repeat offenders who have two, three or more convictions — these drinking-driving convictions — within a five-year period. Many of them are repeatedly driving while suspended and therefore these amendments propose some stern measures in the Bill before you, Mr. Speaker.

To make my point I should like to quote you some figures the Motor Vehicles Branch has related to me for the month of September, 1969. In September of 1969, 297 drivers lost their licences during that month because of Criminal code offences and convictions. 183 of these or 61 per cent were convicted the second time and 22 of these or 8 per cent were convicted for the third time within a five-year period. Here is, I think, a rather significant statistic. Of these 22 who were convicted for the third time within a five-year period 11 of the 22 drivers were found, that is 50 per cent were found to be driving while under suspension or prohibition and were convicted for that offence.

Now Section 87 of The Vehicles Act has been amended to make provisions for a statutory suspension of five years for third convictions for an offence under Section 192 which is causing death by criminal negligence; Section 193 which is causing bodily harm by criminal negligence; Section 207 which is manslaughter by means of a motor vehicle; or subsection (1) of Section 221 which is criminal negligence in the operation of a motor vehicle. These are the most serious of the driving offences.

A further amendment makes provision for a statutory suspension of three years for a third conviction for an offence under subsection (4) of Section 221, which is dangerous driving; Section 222, which is impaired driving; subsection (2) of Section 223, which is failure or refusal to provide a breath sample, or Section 224, which is .08 driving — that's the .08 section.

A third conviction for an offence under subsection (2) of Section 221, which is failing to stop at the scene of an accident, will result in a two-year statutory suspension. a third conviction for driving while disqualified will result in a three-year statutory suspension. It should also be known that any combination of convictions for the third time or more for offences under 221, 222, 223, 224, 225 within five years will result in a three-year statutory suspension.

Mr. Speaker, subsection (11) and (12) of Section 87 of the Bill make provisions so that a person who is not a resident of

Saskatchewan and is convicted in Saskatchewan for an offence under the Criminal Code may be prohibited from driving in Saskatchewan for the same period as would apply to a Saskatchewan resident. This proposed amendment fills a void in the previous Section 87 of The Vehicles Act.

Subsection (13) clarifies the situation for Saskatchewan residents who are convicted for offences under the Criminal Code in another province. These convictions have always been treated as if they were handed down in Saskatchewan and the amendment makes specific statutory provisions for these cases.

A newly drafted subsection (14j) provides that the provincial magistrate or judge or court, as the case may be, convicting the person whose licence is revoked pursuant to the statutory provisions of this Bill, shall secure the licence from the person and forward it to the Highway Traffic Board.

Mr. Speaker, during the past few years we have had quite a number of appeals against convictions for these offences under the Criminal Code. Now as a rule of law of course every person has a right to appeal a conviction and upon notice of the appeal having been filed the prosecution of the conviction is stayed. However, we have experienced quite a number of frivolous appeals which were later abandoned and it seems were launched only to gain time. Therefore, we propose, in subsection (15) of Section 87 of the Bill, that upon the appeal the licence of the person remains revoked unless the judge or court hearing the appeal orders the suspension of the revocation pending the determination of the appeal. This approach has also been used by an amendment to Section 225 of the Criminal code. Subsection (16) is a complementary amendment to the appeal procedure, and so is subsection (17), which clarifies periods of suspension after an appeal has been dismissed. Subsection (18) states that, upon receipt of a certified copy of the order of the judge or court setting aside or quashing the conviction, the licence will of course be returned to the person.

Mr. Speaker, last year I was approached by a number of the Chiefs of Police in the province to raise the reportable accident level from \$100 to \$200. Their argument was that the cost of repairs to damaged vehicles has risen considerably and as a consequence the number of reportable accidents has risen out of proportion. They could not handle the ever-increasing workload. Investigations of serious accidents suffered in quality because of this problem they were spending too much time on the \$100 accidents. Therefore, following the example of other jurisdictions I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to recommend in this Bill to the House that the Act be amended to require that accidents in excess of \$200 only be reported to the police. It has been estimated that this measure will reduce the workload of our police departments on accident reports by about 40 per cent and I am confident that they will have no problem in utilizing the saved manpower in a wise fashion.

One of the problems that have caused us some concern is that of persons who apply for licence while they are suspended or under prohibition. They can go to a licence issuer, pay their fee, and obtain a receipt which they believe permits them to drive for 60 days. This has happened frequently because the penalty for the offence is very low. Therefore we propose in Section 236 that the minimum penalty be raised to \$25 for making an application while under suspension.

Section 241 is housekeeping amendments to ratify the delegation of certain powers by the Board to the Director and to make provisions so that certified copies of records signed by the Director shall be received as prime facie evidence.

With these comments, Mr. Speaker, I should like to close my remarks on the proposed Bill to amend The Vehicles Act. I think the amendments will have a profound effect on many of our drivers who may have been taking drinking offences a bit too lightly. The Government is determined to continue the reduction of slaughter on our highways and I want to issue fair warning to everybody that we do mean business. We are not only suggesting this legislation but we intend enforcing it once it is passed.

Mr. Speaker, the quarterly report of the motor Vehicle Administration Branch for July, August and September, 1969 shows the highest number of conviction reports received in three months during the 1969-70 licence-year. Of the 24,641 convictions in this period in 1969, 798 or 3.3 per cent were for Criminal Code offences. That was a year ago. The quarterly report of January February, March of 1970 shows 16,612 convictions in that period but the percentage of Criminal Code convictions has risen from 3.3 per cent last year to 6 per cent Criminal code convictions. Mr. Speaker, it has been our experience that fines do not tend to curb our problems in Criminal Code cases, but the loss of a driver's licence has a profound effect. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will support these proposed amendments.

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support of this Bill in second reading. We are pleased to hear that the highway deaths have in fact been reduced. I'm led to believe that this is also the situation in our sister provinces in Manitoba and Alberta. Much of this I think has to be attributed to the legislation federally with respect to .08 and the tougher legislation in the Criminal Code. I am a bit concerned that we ought to be doing more perhaps in the area of education, in the area of vehicle accident. It does seem to me that together with education there is a great area for rehabilitation of the repeater. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) talked of the second-and third-time offender who comes before the courts. I think what this highlights, apart from the fact that he is a danger and a menace on the highway, the fact the man has an alcoholic problem. We have here a social or a medical problem which is concurrent with the problem we are dealing with here in The Vehicles Act.

The Government, I think, ought to be looking at an integral systematic approach, if you will, of the entire business of drinking as it may relate to driving, as it may relate to occupation, as it may relate to home and the like. We have to be putting more emphasis on the Alcoholism Bureau, as I say rehabilitation, medical treatment and the like, and of course dealing in a very stern and positive manner in The Vehicles Act. I personally agree with the stiffer penalties that are being imposed here in The Vehicles Act.

I think an important aspect of educating the public is a question of the highway Traffic Committee that the Legislature set up. I know my colleague from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has from time to time raised this before and I think he makes the point well. I think the point is that, if there is a committee that again goes out to listen to the people of Saskatchewan with



respect to highways and tries to educate them as to the provisions of The Vehicles Act, there will be an improvement in the situation. I think too often that the education process is too remote. The education process only comes into play once a person is caught and is fined or suspended or placed in prison. He'll get educated, that's perhaps true unless he has the illness that I've talked about, and maybe his friends but it doesn't get out as widely as it ought to. I have many complaints of the Federal Government and in particular misuse of public funds when it comes to advertising by governments, but I do think the Federal program of advertising on .08 is generally commendable. The advertisements are factual in an entertaining way and they help to tell the public what the person is facing having consumed the alcohol and taking to the road. That type of an education program coupled with increased driver-training programs in our high school means more money to high school programs, not cutting back on high school funds, as I think this Government is tending to do, but more and expanded programs. Assistance perhaps in the private companies that are engaging in vehicle education is in fact desirable.

I also agree with the computerizing and more modern updating of the data available so that vehicle researches can be up-to-date. I do, however, attach some reservation to the observation by the Attorney General that the RCMP will be forwarded a whole variety of information, as I gathered and I made a note of the Attorney General's words, "personal data about the driver." I think this is necessary but I raise a note of caution about the nature and type of personal data that the RCMP will be getting. Well, the Attorney General says "driving data". If that is in fact the case it will alleviate my worry. I think it is most important that we be always careful of two objectives; the objective of making sure that we cut down slaughters on the highways but also preserving and maintaining the personal rights and freedoms and liberties that we all have, that right to be a private individual. We agree generally with computerization and the modernization of the law in that area.

There are several other points that I would like to raise but they can be handled in Committee. With those few words I will be supporting the Bill on second reading.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, dealing with The Vehicle Act, perhaps I will be a bit out of order suggesting — what I would like to do is make a few suggestions. I strongly feel that fines are not always the answer. I think many times instead of imposing a severe fine on a drunken driver, if we could talk him into joining the AAs and so on, that we could perhaps do more good for him than putting him in jail and more good for his family.

Another area that I would like the Attorney General to take note of is if we could keep a record of the students who take driver training and which teacher they took their training from.

**Mr. Heald:** — ...point.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Mr. Attorney General I would like you to pay attention to what I am saying. The point I want to make is you might keep track of the students who take driver training and with which

teacher they have taken it. I have listened to some of the students who have taken driver training with one teacher and some have taken it with the other teacher and the remarks that they make about the training they are getting. Some of it just shocks you. So over the years if you could see the record each teacher has, I am sure that we will be able to pick up the best teachers to instruct the other ones. It is an area that I would like you to study. I hope you get what I mean. Check-ups I think is another thing too. I have watched the courts operate. It is sort of sickening when the young fellow comes up, pleads guilt and pays a fine and is on his way as if it was just a great big holiday. I think if some of them were sent for a check-up, made to take driver training, or made to attend certain films on driving, perhaps it would have more of an impact. If they had to pay their fine plus taking a short course, perhaps we would get a little further with them. I say these things with all sincerity and I am glad that the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) as well as the Attorney General is listening. Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I too join with the Hon. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) in supporting the Bill before the House.

Should the Hon. Minister introduce some other aspects of The Vehicles Act prior to the actual discussion of the contents of the Bill, I would like to express an opinion as to the statements he made and make some suggestions as to a program that might be followed under The Vehicles Act by the Highway Traffic Board, the group that administers The Vehicles Act.

Recently we added reflectorized plates and I think this is an excellent idea, something that was recommended by the Highway Traffic and Safety Legislative Committee. But the increase in the cost of the plates is approximately 35 cents so we are told. It costs the drivers of Saskatchewan \$495,000, there has been an increase of \$325,000 in taxes or thereabouts. I would like to see this money used in a safety program. I believe that there is ample money now from some of the charges that are being made on drivers. For instance, \$285,000 is charged to drivers under 25 at \$2 per driver. The \$25 surcharge for those who are in accidents where there is damage in excess of \$50 brings the Provincial Government something like \$630,000. and \$1,200,000 is picked up by The Automobile Accident Insurance Act and extension policy tax levies. All these monies add up to a considerable sum of money.

I think we should look at a program which would put \$750,000 or so back into a compulsory, driver-training program for the Province of Saskatchewan. We should have a compulsory vehicle-checking program so that vehicles could be checked periodically, once every six months for instance as is the case in British Columbia. I think the drivers should be tested at regular intervals, as was recommended by the Committee. I think there should be a research bureau to check the cause of accidents, to find out whether we can cure the next accident with education, engineering or enforcement. All of these areas are areas that are recognized by those who are working on traffic safety, programs that need attention. They cost money. I suggest to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) who is in charge of the Highway Traffic Board that we have the money, the charge for the

**April 15, 1970**

reflectorized plates and the charge for those under 25 years of age, the surcharge for those in accidents where there is more than \$50 damage and \$1,200,000 is collected on taxes on the compulsory insurance and the extension policies. there is also the traffic court clinic that could be utilized and operated to prevent further accidents.

Certainly I am in favour of reducing accidents. But I think when we take money from the drivers of the Province of Saskatchewan we should set aside a fixed amount, say \$750,000 or a million dollars, and say this money we are going to use for specific programs that were set out when the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee met and set down its recommendations.

I will support the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two additional comments. First of all I am pleased that the hon. Members opposite are going to support this Bill.

Dealing first with the comments of the Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), I want to correct one of his comments. He made the statement that the other provinces, Manitoba and Alberta, also had a reduction in deaths last year. That is not in accordance with my understanding. I think the national average last year, 1969, was about the same as it was in 1968. I think some of the provinces were down a little bit and some of the provinces were up. As a matter of fact two or three of the provinces were up quite substantially in 1969 as compared to 1968. But I suggest compared to this rather sideways movement of most of the provinces in the national average of sort of holding their own, the Saskatchewan reduction of 16 per cent is a very dramatic reduction. I had the National Director of the Canadian Safety Council in my office two or three weeks ago, Mr. Farmer, and we were discussing this and he wanted my opinion as to what I thought were the reasons for this reduction. I don't think, with deference, that it was the Federal legislation because the Federal legislation didn't come into effect until December of 1969, just before Christmas, you will remember. Our accident rate was down long before that. I credit our reduction, Mr. Speaker, almost entirely to the combination of two programs, and the most important of those two programs was statutory suspension which this Legislature passed a year ago, the automatic statutory suspension for impaired drivers, first offence six months, second offence 12 months. That combined with the .08 24-hour suspension law is, in my opinion, the main reason why we have been reasonably successful, not completely successful of course because we still kill far too many people, but reasonably successful and why our record is considerably better than the other provinces. I think the .08 Federal law, providing it meets the test in the courts, will be effective in this province as well as the other provinces, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, with the utmost of conviction, that the most important thing that we can do, what we did last year and what we are doing in this amendment is placing the emphasis on driving suspension.

Now the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), I think said that fines were not always the answer and I couldn't agree with him more. I don't think fines are the answer. I think education

is part of the answer. I agree with him. I think suspension of driving privileges for the people who have shown by their actions that they have a pattern of a number of these convictions, I think the only thing we can do with them is take them off the road. The average citizen who doesn't drink and drive, who is out for a Sunday drive with his wife and family, has the right to assume that the other man coming down the road is not impaired, is not going to barrel into him and kill his whole family. That's the rationale behind licence-driving suspension.

Driver education, I couldn't agree with you more. the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is responsible for the administration of that program. It is the most comprehensive program of driver education anywhere in Canada. this has been recognized. It means that the Saskatchewan program forms the pattern for many other provinces who are moving into driver education. We have the most comprehensive driver-training program in our schools of any provinces, and I think if you want any of the details, when you get into Education Estimates the Minister will give it to you.

The Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) as always has made some good suggestions and I respect his suggestions and also the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) because they were both on this Committee. They have a very great interest in this highway safety.

**Mr. Romanow:** — How about me?

**Mr. Heald:** — You weren't here. You were Johnny Come Lately. I respect your suggestions, too, but the other people have a little more experience than you have in this field. They were on this Committee several years ago. We're old timers compared to you. Anyway I think these are good suggestions. We welcome them. I know the Minister of Education has made a note of them and I have made a note of them. We'll word together and hopefully we'll be able to continue to reduce the slaughter on the highways in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

**Mr. Heald** (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 80 — An Act to amend The Limitations of civil Rights Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to The Limitations of Civil Rights Act. In this Session much has been said about the economic situation in our province. The provisions of this Bill reflect the economic downturn and are designed to assist debtors. They also include some housekeeping provisions to improve the procedures existing at the present time. Technical changes are proposed to take into account changes in The Agricultural Implements Act. But really the important provisions in these amendments repeal Section 19 to 22 of the present Act and substitute new sections. The basic procedure for repossession of farm machinery remains the same except that provisions are being made to simplify and streamline the procedure for a debtor to get a hearing before a judge. The Act will not apply not only to conditional sale contracts but to chattel mortgage contracts as well. This corrects an oversight that has bewildered me for

**April 15, 1970**

years. I am unable to understand why the Act hasn't heretofore applied to chattel mortgages as well as to conditional sales agreements and lien notes.

Now then rather than use the words 'vendor' and 'purchaser' the words 'creditor' and 'debtor' are defined and substituted. They are clear and everybody knows what they mean. This brings the wording and terms of the provisions in line with the actual vendor-purchaser relationship which the provisions deal with. We are adding some articles to the Act, refrigerators, freezers, by a House amendment, skidoos because skidoos now are a pretty necessary piece of farm equipment in the winter months in this province where we have a six, seven or eight months' winter. The provisions before the House provide for a simplified procedure for a debtor to make an application for a hearing. Two copies of the notice of intention to repossess will be required. The debtor will be allowed to apply for a hearing before or within 30 days after receiving notice. This gives a much-extended period over the existing one which requires the debtor to apply within 20 days after receiving the notice. The penalties for recovery and possession in contravention of the present Section are extended to disposal of the goods in contravention of the provisions. Notice of possession must be given to the debtor when the creditor takes possession. Once possession is made by the creditor, he will be required to hold the article for 30 days. In this time the debtor will still be able to apply for hearings. If he does so, the creditor will either continue to hold the article or return it to the debtor unless the judge requires otherwise. I think this provision will be a great assistance to debtors and is of course a major extension of the debtor's ability to apply for a hearing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, appeal provisions have been set up. The present Act makes no provision for appeal, although the judges have allowed them to some extent over the years. I think these amendments will clarify the position and ensure that appeals under the Act are permissible. Mr. Speaker, the Government I think by this Act is taking constructive measures to ensure that this Bill, this Act, is current and relevant to the present situation in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Bill before the House I suggest and submit is a major step in ensuring currency and relevancy and is therefore deserving of the support of all Hon. Members.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 o'clock p.m.