

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
71st Day

May 3, 1973.

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

On the Orders of the Day

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

HOUSE PROCEDURE

He said: Before I call Orders of the Day, on May 2, 1973 on the Orders of the Day, two questions were directed to the Chair by the member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). Questions of the Chair should be in writing to the Speaker, however, at that time I agreed to answer his questions later.

Question number one: How can we get a Recorded Vote on last night's Bill No. 124? The only opportunity to have a recorded vote will be on Third Reading of this Bill.

Question number two: What steps should Members take if they wish to speak before the vote is taken?

In all cases the Chair advises the Members before the mover closes the debate. If the mover is not closing the debate, the Chair always asks, is the House ready for the question. If a Member wishes to speak he should follow Rule No. 22 which reads:

Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

This does not mean that he just rises and stands there. He must address himself to Mr. Speaker, in an audible voice so that the Speaker is able to see and to hear him. Members should not stand in the aisles visiting with other Members. If they do, the Speaker doesn't know if they are trying to get the Speaker's attention or not.

Members wishing to discuss with other should go to the chairs at the back or sit on the steps near the Member he is visiting. Members speaking should be very careful not to refer to other debates or debates which took place in a committee. If this is done, the Speaker is not aware of the statements and at a later time, when the reply is being made to those statements, it causes the House to become out of order and puts the Speaker in an impossible position if a Point of Order is raised.

If further explanation is wished, I shall be pleased to discuss it with Members in my office.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have just one comment. There is one little difficulty and I would hope that the Speaker would appreciate the point of view we are trying to put here.

When the Speaker stands on his feet, very often that can take five seconds for the vote to be finished. You have asked us, on many occasions, not to stand while you are standing. We

May 3, 1973

would ask that when you call the Vote, to stop and sit down and make sure you check both sides of the House, or some pause which would enable any other Member to get on his feet and make the request.

We certainly agree with the presentation that you made this morning about the fact it should be an audible presentation. I think, to the one particular important issue, The Forestry Act. I think there were three Members that did attempt to do that, but because you were on your feet and reading the Vote, they didn't wish to interrupt you, and bang, the Vote was over without the opportunity of them speaking.

So we will accept your ruling. We would hope that you would have that pause, so that we can ensure that every Member would have his opportunity to get on his feet when you are not on your feet, which is certainly the rule of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: — I do not wish the Speaker's statement to be debated but all that a Member has to do, when I am looking down, to just say, Mr. Speaker, then I know that someone is trying to get my attention.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENTS ON REFINERY IN KAMSACK

HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in response to a question by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), I made some statements with respect to the refinery at Kamsack, Saskatchewan.

I said, yesterday, that it was my understanding that the local Credit Union was prepared to lend up to \$100,000 to a local group. At that time I was under the impression that the Credit Union was, indeed, willing to do that.

Last night, on the telephone, I spoke to one of the people at Kamsack who had been trying to organize a local group with respect to possible purchase of the assets of the refinery and I now wish to correct an impression I left because I think that I was in error, when I believe that the local Credit Union was prepared to lend that much money.

I want to state clearly that according to the information I now have, the Credit Union has never committed itself to lending that amount of money and that discussions may well proceed with the local Credit Union and with Canadian Propane officials. But I think that it was in error and it was an error which was my fault, because I took the wrong impression from information that had been supplied to me with respect to the position of the Credit Union in Kamsack.

QUESTIONS

KAMSACK REFINERY

MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Before the Orders of the Day I should then like to direct a question to the Minister about the refinery in Kamsack. I ask if he would state whether or not the Government, either directly or through SEDCO, is prepared to back up the efforts

of any group to keep that refinery going by long-term loans, grants or by taking an equity position?

MR. THORSON: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, the Government had said that it was prepared to guarantee a loan of up to \$125,000 liability. When the Government made that decision and that offer to the Kamsack group, I was under the impression and the Government was under the impression, that that is all of the financial assistance that would be required. Since I spoke to one of the local people on the telephone last night, I am led to believe that more assistance may be required from some source other than local sources.

I have undertaken, in my telephone conversation, to say that if the Kamsack group will indicate the extent of any additional financial assistance that may be required, I am prepared to present that to the Government and support their position within any reasonable limits.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) that Bill No. 129 — **An Act to amend The Attorney General's Act** be now read a second time.

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the Hon. Attorney General to stand this item as I know Mr. Lane wishes to speak to it.

As I understand the rules, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lane not being here can nonetheless speak at a later time to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just have on or two remarks about the Bill and I should like to suggest that I have sympathy with the general aims of the Bill, but I have some opposition to the Bill also.

The Law Society and the practising Bar believes that the plan instituted by the Liberal Government should be continued and extended, that the time has come to put more money into legal aid into the Province of Saskatchewan and that the number of areas covered by the Legal Aid Plan should be expanded.

I observe in the Budget that there is more money planned for this current year. I hope that not only will criminal cases be covered, but an area of civil cases will also be covered by the expanding Plan started by the Liberals.

The problem that I have with this Bill is that it is too nebulous. It puts too much power in the hands of the Attorney General. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, with the Government doing the things that they have done, we now believe that every path is beset by lions. And we may be reading far more deviousness into the Bill than is appropriate. Nonetheless, we have grown cautious on this side of the House and are unwilling to have the Government give unto itself a blanket authority to make any kind of a deal, with any person it chooses.

May 3, 1973

I, therefore, suggest to the House, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot accept the broad powers which are set forth in the Bill, unless the Government is prepared to make amendments; and I have only one suggestion, (there are other possibilities), that is: That no contract entered by the Attorney General or the Government pursuant to Item 3 or 3(c) or 3(d) or pursuant to the regulations under 3(d), be acceptable without the concurrence of the Law Society of Saskatchewan. Unless the Law Society approves each and every plan, contract, arrangement or agreement I believe the Attorney General should not proceed.

The Law Society of Saskatchewan is a very responsible body. It has acted wisely and over the years has done an extremely good job in protecting the legal rights and the welfare, legally, of the people of Saskatchewan. I believe that kind of a suggestion would strengthen the Bill; would go far towards satisfying us on this side. At the moment, despite the feelings that I have, that we need a broader plan with more money, I do not support the particular amendments set forth in this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, that is mainly our concern as expressed by the Hon. Member from Albert Park.

We can see the powers given that the Government can make agreements with any organization he wants. There is a potential for abuse which we object to. We think that the Law Society should have the final okay. We note that the amendments or the Legal Aid Plan as brought in by the former Liberal Government, was a Law Society program and it was specifically set out. This is now, of course, in the Attorney General's program. I realize the need for more flexibility, but we cannot accept the fact that the Attorney General can now make agreements with any organization he wants, which is obviously set out in the Bill.

It is that very nebulous position, with the very broad, broad powers given to the Attorney General, that we object to without the requirement that the Law Society approve these.

For these reasons we object to the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in rebuttal, but I do think that some important points have been raised by the Members opposite.

First of all, we have a peculiar problem with respect to the Province of Saskatchewan. And the problem is really two-fold. Firstly, our plan in the present setup does not allow federal compensations or federal reimbursements on a per capita basis. Members will know that the Federal Government has offered a formula of 50 cents per capita for compensation back to the Provincial Government.

During the course of our rather extensive negotiations with the Justice Department — I'll just check to see whether the letter was personal or confidential, and it isn't — Mr. Lang, the Minister of Justice, writes as follows on March 20th with

respect to our plan. He says, quote:

Regarding your final question concerning the eligibility of the current Saskatchewan Legal Aid Plan to qualify for Federal contribution, under the terms of the proposed Federal-Provincial agreement, retroactive to January 1, 1973, I have examined a copy of the plan which you sent with your letter and it is my impression that it would exclude or restrict a number of matters which are required to be covered under the proposed agreement. For example, it is limited to only some of the Federal statutes and regulations where offences or proceedings contemplated by the agreement arise.

Appeals by the Crown are made discretionary and the plan would appear to deny legal aid to person who are subject frequently to criminal charges.

In these circumstances I feel that your existing plan is not sufficiently in accord with the proposed agreement to permit a Federal contribution during the period January, 1973 to the date to which are able to implement the terms of the agreement. However, given flexibility, the proposed agreement in terms of the type of legal aid plan which the province may choose to adopt shortly, I would hope that you will be able to give effect to the terms of the agreement.

Signed: Otto Lang.

So what he is saying to us, in short, is that our present plan is inadequate and doesn't meet the Federal standards in terms of getting compensation. So we have to amend our plan if we are going to get the 50 cents from the Federal authorities. So that is point number one.

Point number two. We feel that we have to try and organize ourselves to move now in the area of legal aid, particularly as has been pointed out to us by Dean Carter for northern Saskatchewan.

In northern Saskatchewan, the legal aid services are really paltry. They are next to being non-existent, apart from the fact that lawyers are volunteering out of Saskatoon to travel on a regular basis.

So the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) says that they don't oppose it but they are worried about the generality of the Bill. Well, we have two choices. We either make the Bill specific, in which case, there can be no Bill this Session, because the letter is dated March 20, 1973, of the rejection and we are just unable to implement it. We are unable to make any specific decisions as to what we are going to do with the Carter Report. We don't know whether we are going to accept or reject it or take it under amended circumstances. So we have the choice of either waiting until we have something specific in law, in which case we miss this Session, and nothing is done. Either, (a) to get Federal contribution, in order to allow us legislation which will allow us to amend our agreement, or (b) to allow us to implement in those areas where it is absolutely necessary and where we can without any major disruption of the Legal Aid Plan, implement any of the recommendations of the Carter Report.

May 3, 1973

So that is the one choice. The other choice is the choice that we have adopted. To amend the Act to give us some flexibility. As I said in Second Reading, and I can repeat again in winding up, the intention of my Government, of our Government, is as follows:

We want to amend this law to do two things. (1) To allow us to amend our present plan in order to allow us to receive the Federal contribution. Because we don't think it should go without Saskatchewan benefiting. (2), To start gearing up for the implementation of a new Legal Aid scheme. I want to assure the Members before we go ahead and implement any final legal aid scheme, we will be in consultation with the Law Society of Saskatchewan. There is no doubt about that.

I must, however, say quite frankly to the Member for Albert Park, that I for one would not approve of the suggestion that no Legal Aid Plan be implemented without the concurrence of the Law Society. I think that it is highly desirable that we have extensive negotiations and get their approval if possible, but I am sure that all Members would agree that we are the Government, and I do not say that in any arrogant way, and we must have the ultimate decision-making power as to what we think is in the best interest of the citizens, not in the best interest of the Law Society of Saskatchewan

Although we are going to get ourselves involved in negotiations, and we intend to do so, we can't. I don't think, agree to an amendment which says that nothing can be done until we get the Law Society's approval. That, in effect, would give the Law Society absolute power of veto and I don't think that is right.

So what do we intend? Basically we intend no change in the plan the way it is presently working. We will continue for the summer months working it the way it is. We will start tooling up for an implementation of a law plan that we can get some concurrence from the Law Society and hopefully, if not, a law plan that we think is right and start tooling up for it. Where possible we will try to implement a northern plan. Where possible we will amend our present system without changing it very significantly in order to allow us to get the Federal contributions.

So basically it is the same plan that we have been operating on. As I told the Member for Albert Park in private correspondence, or private communication, hopefully we will have by the fall session, if there is a fall session, a brand new Saskatchewan Legal Aid Plan, which will encompass the entire range of proposals for legal aid that this Government will have to make to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

So I reiterate in closing, this is not to be thought of as the rationale or the legal basis upon which we are moving to set up a broad new Legal Aid scheme. We think that that should be debated in this House, at least I do. And I intend to present it. But we do think that in the interim period we should be amending our Act in order to try to do those two things: (a) get Federal contributions, and (b) try and expand the provisions of legal aid where possible to the people of northern Saskatchewan and elsewhere. Now that's the rationale of it and I explained that in second reading, Mr. Speaker. And that, as far as I'm concerned is the extent of the Bill. I agree, if you read it

strictly in strict law terms, it does give us wide degree of latitude and it's simple because we just don't know what power we may need or what we may not need in order to accomplish those goals.

By the way, I noticed in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix a third-age story that this was the Legal Aid Plan and all the power was to resolve itself into the Cabinet and the like. I don't want to be critical of the report, but I do think in the light of the explanation in Second reading that it was somewhat inaccurate in this regard and Members ought not to be misled in that regard.

MR. LANE: — Would the Attorney General permit a question before he takes his seat?

Would you then be prepared to give the Opposition the commitment that prior to the implementation of a new Legal Aide Plan for the Province of Saskatchewan, we have an opportunity to debate this in the Legislature?

MR. ROMANOW: — At present I can give you this if this is a commitment. I can only say this to you — my personal hope would be (and I'm convinced this is what will come about) that there will be a Bill which will encompass what we propose by way of a Legal Aid Plan. Now I want to just hedge by bets here a bit because, we I've said, I don't know what we are going to do with the Carter recommendations. We may throw Carter out. He recommends setting up a Legal Aid foundation and we may say 'no'. Quite conceivably we would. We are going to designate the Law Society to do that job for us, under certain terms and conditions. That's very conceivable — in which case I don't think we need to bring in a Bill, because the Law Society is technically still administering our present Act. So that if there is an radical departure from this I can tell the Hon. Member that I will have a Bill before this House, if I can get Cabinet concurrence in order to have the matter debated.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislature a group of students from Meadow Lake. I think this is only about half of the group. I understand there is another portion coming later this morning. The staff of Jubilee School in Meadow Lake have done a lot of work and put in a lot of effort in brining 170 students to Regina to visit the Chambers and other points of interest and I should like to congratulate the staff and those responsible for organizing that trip. I understand they are going home through Outlook, viewing the dam.

They are down with three busloads. The teachers who are accompanying the and the bus drivers — the teachers are Mrs. Elliott, Mrs. English, Mrs. Wilfing, Mr. Taylor, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Coughland, Mrs. Heibert, Mr. Pike and, of course, Emil Arraf, and their bus drivers are Mr. Korebo, Mr. Pliska, and Mr. Agray.

I am sure the House joins me in wishing them a very

May 3, 1973

successful and informative trip and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Wood that Bill No. 104 — **An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970** be now read a second time.

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have just one more comment to make with respect to this Bill.

I have sympathy with the position taken by the Hon. Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who spoke with respect to a companion Bill. I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that people have the right not to vote. They have the right to elect not to participate in civic politics or in any other politics. There are those people who, for religious reasons, never participate in the political arena, Federal, Provincial or Civic. As I say, I sympathize with the general aims of the Member for Regina North West to encourage greater participation in politics, but it is by no means necessary that people should participate to a greater extent than they do so now. It is by no means necessary that they should be forced one way or another to participate in any form of government, including the casting of ballots. There are those parts of the world, such as Russia, where it is inadvisable to avoid casting a ballot and there are other places, such as Australia where you may be fined if you do not cast a ballot at an election.

I oppose both of those systems. The rights of the citizen are to participate or to decline to participate. I believe that the municipal government should be so structured that every person has an adequate right to participate if he so desires, but he should not be required to participate. To the extent that any Bill makes it easier for people to participate in government, within reasonable bounds, I suggest those aims. I do not think the argument that has been raised, that the lack of participation is evidence of a failure of our municipal electoral structure, is sound. I do not agree that people fail to participate because of the way the civic government is structured at election time. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the arguments. I don't think that the arguments presented support the contention that the motion should be passed or that the ward system should be imposed; I believe those who want to participate in civic government and cast a ballot should do so. Those who choose not to do so should not be singled out either as supporting a proposition, or opposing a proposition, nor should we say that they have been denied their rights.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. B.M. DYCK (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to enter debate on this Bill I want first to congratulate the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Wood, on his fine presentation of the Bill to the Legislature and I understand that his remarks were added to rather effectively by a number of Members on this side of the House yesterday. He included in his presentation a number of solid arguments in

support of the division system — some of my remarks will cover some of those arguments, same terrain, but I want, however, to discuss some of these from a different point of view, and I want to add some others.

I might point out at this juncture that I have given the concept of a division system a considerable amount of thought and study and as my review of this system progressed there emerged more and more convincing arguments in favour of a division system. Before I start on this part of my address, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment very briefly on some of the observations made by the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac).

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Wilkie quoted in the newspaper a number of headlines and these headlines were supposed to be opposed to the division system. I believe the Member from Wilkie would be surprised where the support for the division system came from.

Some years ago even the Leader-Post had a positive editorial viewpoint on this system. It stated in an editorial on the proposed ward system, and I quote:

The Leader-Post is of the opinion, as expressed on previous occasions, that if there is to be a change a system of large wards might work satisfactorily.

A report from the Regina Junior Board of Trade, about the same time, argues seven advantages to the division system, and let me list some of these advantages that they listed, or that they quoted:

A division system would afford a better opportunity to secure direct representation to the voters to the city council. This arises from the point that the representative is particularly familiar with his own locality.

Remember that these recommendations or suggestions are coming from the Regina Board of Trade some years ago.

Uniformity of representation.

This argument is very closely related to the preceding one. There is however a shade of difference in meaning in that the division system would provide the greatest degree of uniformity of representation. This is to say, since all of the citizens included in one division or another, each has an equal number of representatives.

Since voting in a ward system concerns a relatively small area compared to the city in general, knowledge of those seeking office is naturally more intimate. Consequently the voter is in a much better position to select the man of merit than he would be if those running for his office were unknown.

Another advantage:

A less complicated ballot will result in fewer spoiled ballots. A vacancy in council would not necessitate a city-wide election and under a ward system a candidate would be able to canvass personally the entire area and thereby make it easier for the voter to make a wise

decision.

Several disadvantages were also pointed out this time, but when the report was published in the *Leader-Post*, through another editorial, five days before the vote took place in the city of Regina, it leaned against the ward system. However, on November 26, 1934, electors of the city of Regina approved the ward system of voting by 3 to 2 in favour, 6,204 for and 4,191 against. So I think the Member from Wilkie would be a little surprised to learn exactly where the support for the division system came from. Even the late Ross Thatcher saw some merit in a division system through comments made during debate on expanding the number of provincial constituencies. His single statement can be used to argue in favour of a municipal division system — i.e., the representation argument. He said:

There is a fact that when the member is elected, how can any member no matter how effective he may be look after a constituency of 100,000 or more. We say he can't do it effectively.

Another quote from the same debate, by the late Mr. Thatcher:

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

Mr. Speaker, in carrying on with the main part of my address I want to say at the outset that polarization is inevitable in a discussion of any issue which affects the individual's belief and I know that the division system, as a valid form of urban government, is one such issue. Few people who have given any degree of consideration to the system can admit to having no strong opinion on the matter.

In 1965, Clyde Cocking argued in the February 20th edition of the *Vancouver Sun*, and I quote:

Who is your representative on Vancouver's city council? You know who your representative is in the Legislature in Victoria, and you know who your representative is in the House of Commons in Ottawa. You can sit down at any time and drop a line to your MLA or your MP and draw some comfort from the knowledge he will be aware you are one of his constituents. You know, or at least are entitled to expect, your man in Victoria and your man in Ottawa will know your problems and their environment better than anyone else, but you don't have a man at City Hall.

Cocking's thesis is — what is good for us at a provincial level is good for us at a local level. He believes strongly in area representation. He points out that if the election-at-large system were to be carried out at a Federal level obviously the interests of Prince Edward Island would soon fade from sight. And I might add that even under the present system Prince Edward Island often takes a back seat.

In the same article Cocking points out that Vancouver is not a homogeneous community. How else but through district representation can special groups, such as the Chinese, get any

representation at all. The fact is, of course, Mr. Speaker, very few larger cities are homogeneous groups. Cities invariable have income divisions and ethnic divisions. For example, let me draw to the attention of the Members of this Legislature the situation in the north west section of Regina, which houses a large percentage of people of Indian ancestry and which in general invites low-income inhabitants. No alderman lives in this area of the city and there is here a singular absence of amenities common in other areas of Regina. The glaring absence is an educational one. There is no high school there. Why in a society which lauds education as a fundamental or success it is interesting that in this area of the city where the children would clearly need extra encouragement to attend school, the deterrent of long distance travelling should be allowed to remain. However, it does remain and has been allowed to remain, by alderman who have been elected at large and who apparently feel no urge to rectify the situation.

The opponents of the division system argue heatedly that aldermen under such a system are guilty of attending to the affairs of their respective divisions at the expense of the interests of their whole city. Obviously such an offence would have been highly advantageous in the area like north east Regina. However, the irony is that even if a representative in this area took his seat on the council, there is still a chance that his voice would not be heard by unwilling listeners. Yet, the importance of his being there is incontrovertible.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the right of every citizen to have an area representative on city council, is fundamental to the democratic way of life.

Now in conflict with the views of a free-lance writer like Clyde Cocking, are the views of Alan Jessop, Editor of the editorial page for the Province of British Columbia. He looked back into history at the division system as it operated in Vancouver and wrote in January 7th issue of 1964 the following:

Each ward has a tiny political empire presided over by the reigning alderman. Ward politics prevailed throughout the year. There were all sorts of deals between aldermen to vote public money for improvements in their bailiwick. Under such conditions it was difficult to coax men of stature to run for council and when they did they were seldom able to win elections being defeated by ward political machines dedicated to retaining their grip on city hall.

Mr. Speaker, my first question would be, what constitutes a man of stature? If the qualities are easily recognizable by the majority of the voters and considered desirable by the majority of the voters, then there is no reason why a man of stature should not be elected under any division system, or under any system. If being a man of stature, however means being a professional man, with an income in excess of \$40,000 yearly, then the division system would probably not elect very many men of stature, and that might not be so bad after all.

With the cost of election campaigns skyrocketing to run for city council in an at-large system requires substantial financial backing and since money usually begets money, councillors tend to represent a certain sector of the population which is not the majority. For example, the 1973 city council of Saskatoon is

May 3, 1973

comprised of two lawyers, two teachers, (one is a university professor), two businessmen, one realtor, one CPR official and two retired individuals. In Regina the 1973 city council is comprised of two lawyers, two Realtors, one chartered accountant, one industrial consultant and four retired individuals. I think, Mr. Speaker, no one here could deny that in both cases the representation is limited and in both cases it is similar. I want to make myself abundantly clear at this point. I am not criticizing the members of the city council at Saskatoon since I have the highest regard for the time and effort they put into their jobs and I have been on council myself and I know what's involved. In addition, of the 11 members of the Saskatoon city council, eight live in the eastern section of the city and three live on the western side of the city. In Regina not one council members lives north of College Avenue. This would seem to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one half of each city has no representation at City Hall.

However, there is more to be said on the subject of representation when the alderman represents the city at large. One is forced to wonder whether in fact the aldermen believe they are representing people or representing some abstract thing called the city. A questionnaire I sent recently to aldermen in western Canadian cities produced some rather interesting replies. The questionnaire asked such questions as: What is the general attitude of the public to the division system? In your opinion is the system working well? Let me say, immediately, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of aldermen in each city where a division system is in operation said that public opinion favoured the system and that they, as aldermen, favoured the system. Those who opposed the system did so primarily on grounds of division politics and deterioration in quality of aldermen which they felt, Mr. Speaker, were detrimental to the development of the city as a whole. However, none of them explained in what way the division system hampered development of the city as a whole. It would seem to be, Mr. Speaker, that the division system simply means a division of responsibility. It means that each alderman knows exactly which area and which people he is responsible for and conversely it means that city inhabitants know which alderman is responsible for their area. As it is we have two bodies of individuals in our major cities who as far as people are concerned are not responsible to a given electorate. They are not responsible as individuals to a given division or district like an MLA or an MP or a rural councillor. They are responsible for a city, city in the abstract, Mr. Speaker. However, city in the concrete means people. When a farmer in rural Saskatchewan needs a culvert installed or an approach built to his farm, he calls his councillor. He knows this man. He knows his representative on council and his councillor knows him. The farmer will expect and should expect that some action will be taken with respect to his request with respect to a given situation. The responsibility is clearly defined. There can be no buck passing.

Similarly in provincial politics if there is difficulty with a highway approach or if there is a lack of understanding with respect to certain government program, then the person involved can see his MLA. He can reasonably expect that action will be taken to deal with his problem and similarly with respect to federal matters.

But what is the situation with respect to a city resident? If he needs a street or a sidewalk repaired, if he is not

satisfied with certain civic programs, whom does he see? Whom does he contact? Who is responsible? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is the problem because in point of fact no one individual alderman is responsible. Because, as Members of this Assembly know and can appreciate everyone's responsibility is no one's responsibility. In the northern half of Regina and in the western half of Saskatoon there are hundreds of people who do not have representation from their area. This fact alone, Mr. Speaker, is sufficient evidence that we need a division system in these two major cities.

Most of the alderman who completed my questionnaire, Mr. Speaker, emphasized the advantage of getting to know the electorate. I have often wondered how aldermen in Regina and Saskatoon feel, knowing, as they must know, that the majority of people in the city have no idea who they are. Surely, they must be concerned when they realize that a small percentage of the people that they are supposed to be representing they know themselves. Of all the cities in Canada, Winnipeg appears to have given this whole area of urban government greatest consideration. The concept of area representation has always been of the core of Winnipeg thought. In the booklet which describes their new organization some of the background of thought is included. It says as follows:

In seeking a solution in structural problems of the area it was felt that any new structure had to provide easier access to government by the citizens.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this should be the aim of all governments. At all levels we should be constantly looking for ways to get closer to the people we represent. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that at the local level one way is through the institution of the division system. Give people the opportunity to get to know candidates and find out which candidates know most about them and about their area, then perhaps more people will come out to the polls on election day.

Mr. Speaker, they will know that it is worthwhile. In cases where there are five, six or seven aldermanic seats to be filled at one election there may be 25 or 30 candidates. This places the electorate in a very difficult position. In all likelihood many don't even know six of the candidates, so how can they vote for six people. In the division system on the other hand, only the people of the division would vote for one alderman. During the campaign they would have every opportunity of getting to know the candidates. This would undoubtedly encourage more interest. As it is voters are not inclined to go off to the polls to place an X beside a name to which they can pin no face, no personality, no policy. There is little doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that we would increase the number of voters markedly if we introduced a division system. I could add here that with this system a vacancy on city council does not involve a costly city-wide election but a relatively inexpensive election on a division basis. Although countless individuals over the years have opposed area representation and yet the question is raised again and again.

In Saskatoon, for example, the city was divided into five divisions from 1911 to 1920. During that time a bylaw to erase the system was defeated. However, in 1920 such a bylaw was passed and the division system was abolished. In 1966 the Saskatoon city council considered the division system once more

May 3, 1973

but the stage of holding a plebiscite was never reached. The matter was dismissed at the council level. In Regina a division system was used for one year, the year 1935. Two plebiscites on the subject have been held since then, one in 1959 and in 1970 but the system has never been reinstituted.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in time Brandon, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Halifax, Ottawa and Toronto are using a division system and it is working. Winnipeg, Halifax, Ottawa and Toronto have used the system for over 100 years but here we are in Saskatchewan still using an at-large system in our two key cities. Saskatoon is not a homogeneous group, Mr. Speaker, and Regina is not a homogeneous group. For too long now we have had similar people from similar income brackets, with similar occupational categories and from similar resident areas of the city on city council. It is time the city council was comprised of a group of people who are more representative of the city, that is the people of the city. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Members of this House and the people of Regina and Saskatoon to take this matter very seriously and to give it careful thought and to realize that in a democratic society area representation is an absolute necessity and the division system is nothing more, nothing less than area representation. And I wish that the Members of this Legislature would place their support behind this concept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to the proposed division system and in doing so I should like the Hon. Members for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and others to stay in the House for a few minutes because I want to remind them of their own policy.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate in 1965 when we had the change in boundaries, and I should like them to sit and listen because I think that Liberals forget their own statements and their own policies they enunciate in the House and outside the House. Their former political leader, former Minister of the Crown in the Liberal House, the Hon. Hammy MacDonald, now the senator, in second reading of the debate on the changing of boundaries for Regina and Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, had this to say, and let me quote:

I think this House is well aware that the Liberal Party for many, many years has contended that the citizens of Saskatchewan ought to have one vote. This has not been the case. We have found in the city of Moose Jaw every citizen had two votes. In the last election the citizens of Regina East and Regina West had two votes. The voters of the city of Saskatoon had five votes. Mr. Speaker, it is a well known principle and especially well known by my friends opposite that one person ought to be entitled to one vote, Mr. Speaker, Why should a voter in the city of Saskatoon have the opportunity of voting for five people and a voter in a rural constituency have the privilege and the opportunity for one person and one person only.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Party's position is that in the provincial elections and in municipal elections in rural

Saskatchewan every voter should have one vote, why should their policy be different when it comes to civic elections in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. Surely this is the same principle that applies. In fact, Senator MacDonald carries on, and let me quote again:

I think my friends opposite have promoted the co-operative movement and have promoted some of the principles for which the co-operative movement stands and one of the main principles that has stood for generations has been the principle of one person, one vote, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a good principle (said Senator MacDonald) not only in the co-operative movement but also as far as the elected Members of this Legislature or to any other Legislature might be concerned.

This is Senator MacDonald, a Liberal. He said, "One vote for one person." He didn't say ten votes for every person. Then, Mr. Speaker, it appears that Senator MacDonald has apparently changed his mind shortly after because he didn't call for a vote to that other Legislature that he had the privilege of being appointed to. I would have hoped that he would have carried on and said, "Let's carry on with the principle of electing everybody to any legislative body", as he stated in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, he went on:

It has been the desire of this Government (meaning the Liberal Government) to endeavour to divide the cities of Saskatoon, Regina and Moose Jaw as fairly as possible to as close to an equal number of voters in each constituency as possible.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this was Senator MacDonald's commitment and pledge but Senator MacDonald went to that other place without a plebiscite, without a vote, and apparently with it disappeared the Liberal principles of one member, one vote. Apparently at that time the principle of equal representation disappeared because in 1970 we saw what happened to the equal division of our constituencies in the Province of Saskatchewan.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Liberals are saying that they are really not opposed to divisions but that there should be a plebiscite. Well, let me deal a little bit with plebiscites. It seems to me that the Liberals' defence for every issue is to advocate plebiscites. Well, Mr. Speaker, remember when we had the fight in 1962 for Medicare, the Liberals said let's have a plebiscite. When the hog marketing issue came up, they said let's have a plebiscite. The division system they say, let's have a plebiscite. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, when the people of Saskatchewan were outraged in 1968 over the deterrent fees and some suggested that there be a plebiscite on this question, the Liberals said, No. All of a sudden their principle changes. When they introduced Bill 2 some of the workers suggested, let there be a plebiscite among the workers to see how they feel about it and they said, No. But they did say, Mr. Speaker, that they would have a plebiscite in 1967, they said that they would have a provincial plebiscite. The Liberals promised the people of Saskatchewan that if they were elected in 1967 they would conduct a plebiscite of whether or not the people wanted a drug program. Well, Mr. Speaker, we waited. In 1967 we waited. We waited in 1968 and 1969 and 1970 and in 1971 the people had a plebiscite. We had a plebiscite and people said, look, we've

May 3, 1973

had enough of your Liberal administration and their failure to keep their commitments and their failures to hold plebiscites on issue where they promised to hold plebiscites.

Mr. Speaker, the scoundrel's defence is always to pledge hi loyalty to this country. And it seems to me that the Liberal position is always when there is an issue that there might be some difference, they say a plebiscite. But when it comes down to performance they forget about those plebiscites very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, the division system is important to stop this buck passing in our cities as to who is responsible. In the city of Regina and I want particularly to talk about the area that I have had the privilege of representing in Regina North East. We are the less fortunate part of the city when it comes down to services being provided to our people. You know when a new area is developed where the more affluent settle, there doesn't seem to be any problem for our city fathers immediately to provide the necessary services. But in the lower income areas, particularly Regina North East, because I submit because of lack of representation in our city council we do not have adequate recreation facilities. Despite the fact that the people of Regina North East have helped to pay for every high school in the city of Regina, we still don't have a high school in Regina North East. On the school board, again we don't have representation from that area. We don't have a spokesman from that area. There isn't an area in the Province of Saskatchewan that is as large as Regina North East with as large a population that hasn't got a high school. I know that the Minister of Education has been trying to persuade both school boards to take action in this area and I have made representations to take action in this area. I have made representation but for some reason or another, they are adamant against the idea.

Conditions of our streets and sidewalks are inferior to other parts of the city. One of the responsibilities of the city council is to ensure that people have reasonably pure air to breathe and to prevent pollution. The responsibility for this area still rests with the municipal governments.

I know in my area people are disturbed about the noise pollution that emanates from Imperial Oil. And even though it is the responsibility of the city council to initiate action, they keep passing the buck and ask somebody else to assume the responsibility.

In recent months there was the issue over the trailer courts in my constituency. Again, a responsibility for the civic government to provide facilities for locating of trailer courts for those people who wish to live in trailer courts. Even though the people made representation to city council, again they kept passing the buck. They said, in our area where we reside as council members that problem does not exist and the dickens with the people of Regina North East.

Mr. Speaker, the buck passing has gone on much too long. It is time that we elected people form the areas where people will know who their representative is and that that representative has some dedication to the particular area, so that he can speak on behalf of the people for the services that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into any lengthy documentation of the need for a division system. It is the responsibility of the province to establish and the municipal governments

have to accept the authority of the province to set the guidelines and the rules of how elections are to be conducted at the municipal level. Who should vote and should not vote. How the whole electoral system is to work. And to say that this is going beyond the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. Is just not stating the fact.

Over the municipalities under our terms and conditions and under our constitution the responsibility lies with the Provincial Government. To set the rules of who are the eligible voters; of how the system is to be worked and surely the matter of division also is the responsibility of the province as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) yesterday made reference to the last election. There were 30 candidates who ran for 10 positions. And that in itself, to the average voter, is something that is confusing. To vote for 10 people form a group of 30, to be able to decide who is the best person to represent him is not the easiest thing to do. Particularly when many of he candidates run on the popularity that they have developed in a community, not necessarily of their ability to be a good representative at the electoral level. But because of their activities and in many cases because of the money that they have to conduct an effective campaign, do get elected.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the system will be by far more democratic when the people in a division will have a choice from three or four candidates to elect a person to represent them in their area.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I do support the Bill. I want to again remind the Liberals that their policy and their principle enunciated by their former political leader, is one member, one vote, one person one vote. If that is the principle and that is their policy, then, Mr. Speaker, I submit they are compelled to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, long after those in Opposition have been forgotten, and their names no longer appear anywhere, the name of Everett Wood will be remembered in the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon as the Minister who stood his ground, in spite of the most unfair and unethical attack ever directed at any Minister in an effort to dissuade him from bringing democracy to the larger cities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Everett Wood, as Speaker of this House and as a member of the Executive Council from 1962 to 1964 and from 1971 until now, has established himself as a man of integrity, a man of courage and a man of principle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — And those people who aim their vicious, unjustified remarks at him do themselves no good. They cannot hurt him. His integrity is established, his courage has been tried. His

May 3, 1973

fairness when he was the Speaker and as a Minister has never been successfully challenged.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to this debate and the pathetic futile efforts of Members opposite to make a case for opposition to this Bill, one begins to realize that their whole motivation, their whole performance is not because of high principles but for self-preservation.

Have they told us whether or not they are in favour of the division system? No, they have not. Have they told us whether or not they are in favour of polls with 3,000 people in them? No, they have not. Have they told us whether or not they are in favour of 38 per cent of the people, or 33 per cent of the people voting at civic elections? No, they have not. Have they told us whether they are in favour of representation from every part of the city? No, they have not, Mr. Speaker. Have they told us whether they want representations on boards and committees from every part of the city? No, they have not, Mr. Speaker.

But what have they done? They have made a pathetic, inept attempt, Mr. Speaker, to argue for a plebiscite. Something that they took out of the legislation when they were the Government. A procedure that has always been used by them as a stalling technique. Why, Mr. Speaker?

If you look at the map you will find that all the people on city council except two — one of them who was a former New Democrat Cabinet Minister and one who lives outside the area — are supporters of theirs in the ridings of Lakeview, Regina South and Wascana. I am talking about the new ridings.

The Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane), unless he can get Glencairn cut out of his riding, since there is no chance that Lumsden will be gerrymandered again as it was to get him elected, will be fighting for one of those three ridings. So will the Hon. Member for Albert Park. It all adds up to this. The political machine, the Liberal political machine that elected most of the alderman and the mayor, is the only hope that any of them have of getting elected in these three ridings.

It is a case of self-preservation. It is very simple. If you take the hood off the political motor and take a good look at it, this is what it amounts to. They need the people that are sitting there representing these areas on City Council in their desperate attempt to gain the three ridings in the one-third area of the south part of the city, and that, Mr. Speaker, is what this argument is all about.

They are going to bat for these people because they expect them to go to bat later on, on their behalf.

Their pathetic performance included challenging the right of the people to come to this Legislature to meet a Cabinet Minister. They say this group were the New Democrats. The Leader-Post said that there were 50 people.

Mr. Speaker, I say that there may have been New Democratic chairman, but they weren't all New Democrats. And if you come to the two-thirds of the city north of College Avenue you will find Conservatives and Liberals who agree with this legislation. And I am waiting for the time when a provincial election comes to see what the Liberal candidates say in that part of the city.

You will find that there are Liberals and Conservatives who agree with this legislation and are quite prepared and anxious to ask the Minister questions about it because they feel aggrieved and they wish to make representation.

They suggest that secret meetings are being held about the division system. Well, Mr. Speaker, since 1956 it has been my good fortune to hold many meetings regarding the division system in this city.

I want to say this to the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, no speeches by them, no castigation by their friends, will prevent any elected Member from this side of the House from holding meetings with any group at any time, at any place in this city, to answer questions regarding the division system or anything else, or to organize support for it or to explain the reasons for it. Members opposite have criticized me before, their criticism at no time has prevented me from holding meetings. It hasn't before. It won't now and it won't in the future, Mr. Speaker.

Voters in my riding, in answer to a questionnaire, by a huge majority have instructed me to support this Bill. They influenced me. They are the people who elected me, not the Members opposite; they did everything they could to stop me from getting elected.

They ask us whether we have consulted SUMA. Well, it should be pointed out that the members of SUMA got elected on the other system. I think it is natural that they should make a certain position. Let me tell you about the position that SUMA took on Medicare.

You know they have a history of taking positions. I dug out some old clippings. "Mayor Favours Medicare Satisfactory to Both". Let me quote, June 22, 1962:

Mayor R.C. Dahl of Swift Current said Friday (Who was he? Wasn't he a candidate one time for the Liberal Party?) 90 per cent of mayors and overseers of towns, cities and villages polled by him on Medicare would like to see the plan go into operation with satisfactory arrangements to both sides.

And on further:

The response to the questionnaire was that 10 per cent were in favour of the plan as is.

Ten per cent.

The rest want to see the plan go into operation but with satisfactory arrangements made with the College of Physician and Surgeons.

It indicates the position that these people take.

The Chamber of Commerce speaks for those opposed. Do you think we would have had Medicare if this position had been followed through?

MR. MacDONALD: — Certainly . . .

MR. WHELAN: — You're kidding, Cy. You're

May 3, 1973

kidding and you know it. The Chamber of Commerce speaks for those opposed. The Labour Council speaks for those in favour. The public knows this, and what is new about it?

That was the situation in Medicare, when the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park was President of the Chamber of Commerce. What is wrong with it? The Chamber of Commerce is their ally. The Labour Council is ours. They have always said the labour people tell us what to do. What a brand-new approach, they now say we are telling them what to do. That is a brand-new song. I have not heard that one before.

The truth is that they don't really know. And I don't think the labour movement will pay much attention to them anyway. There has been a lot of racket, a lot of noise about the need for a plebiscite. Hon. Members opposite have had lots of help from the media. I just want to tell them this. In spite of all of their noise, in spite of all the racket, only two people have indicated to me by telephone that they were opposed to this Bill. At least 50 have indicated that they are in favour. One of those who is opposed lives outside my riding and the one who lives in my riding is a stronger Liberal than the Prime Minister himself.

We hear a great deal about blackmail and about rigging open line radio shows. Do Hon. Members think for one moment that most New Democrats are not aware of where the calls come from that clog up open lines on given subjects. Do they think that Regina citizens don't recognize the voice of the wife of one of the Hon. Members opposite when she harangued the Hon. Everett Wood for 12 minutes on a radio program. Let's quit kidding ourselves. When the Medicare dispute was on, an ad appeared in the paper suggesting that people phone their Members.

Let me enlighten the House. This isn't anything new. It said:

In protesting Medicare doctors are not only fighting for their freedom they are fighting for the liberty of every working man in Saskatchewan. Support your doctor in your fight for your liberty. Demand the repeal of the Medicare Act. Write your MLA, phone your MLA. In Regina call Mrs. Marjorie Cooper, (the telephone number is there). Hon. Allan Blakeney (and the telephone number is there). Hon. C.C. Williams (and the telephone number is there — my name and phone number were also listed).

This advertisement sponsored by the Saskatchewan "Keep our Doctors Committee". Send your donations to "Keep Our Doctors Committee", Box 1781, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't even put their names on the thing. They gave a box number. The telephone numbers appeared in the ad. And they were told what to say. And this harangue went on for days. I used to get a call at 3:00 o'clock in the morning over and over again. That is part of the game. If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen, they say. Each telephone all indicated that if Medicare wasn't withdrawn the caller wouldn't vote for the sitting Member. Blackmail: I don't think so. I don't see how it is blackmail. I expected that. This is what they said to me, Well, that is not blackmail. Oh, no, if the Liberals do it, it isn't blackmail. When they talk about

facts you can imagine our surprise, Mr. Speaker, when we discovered that the callers in the Medicare crisis were giving phony addresses, phony names and making phony sounds on the telephone like a dying baby. Mr. Speaker, we discovered by having the calls traced, because they were being made at all hours of the day and night, and they were coming from one location.

This wasn't blackmail, Mr. Speaker. This wasn't planned, I am sure. Nobody was planning this sort of thing, it just happened, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — There were banks of telephones all in one room. Just a complete accident. And it just happened that there wasn't a New Democrat in the room.

Before the accusation is made that the New Democrats are going into civic politics, let's get the record straight. No decision has been made in Regina city in this regard. I think it is well known that I am not in favour of them going into civic politics. As a matter of fact, the first requirement that the people in this city have is representation from every area.

If the alderman does not represent us in the division we will find it out a lot quicker than we do at the present time, because there will be no one to pass the buck to, as the Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) has said.

The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) said it was a plan to get our people elected. That is quite a remark coming from someone who used a contemptible gerrymander to get elected to this House.

The Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) made quite a speech this Session when he talked about a resident members for the riding of Rosemont. Mr. Speaker, he very well knows that Rosemont won't exist until the next election is called. There is a resident member for Rosemont now because it is part of a huge riding called Regina North West. I am honoured to be the representative from that constituency.

He asks why the people from the north side don't run for public office. Mr. Speaker, the present system is so costly that they cannot afford to. And no group of ordinary people can afford to put on a campaign to explain the division system. If the Hon. Member knew anything about the finances of two-thirds of the people in this city, he would know why they don't run for public office. Some of those who tried are still paying for their one fling in civic politics. The Hon. Member for Whitmore Park says we will be stuck with the division system for nine years. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's correct, but we were stuck with the Liberals for seven long years . . .

MR. STEUART: — . . .long, lean, good years!

MR. WHELAN: — . . .All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that anyone who can survive that can survive any hardship.

They say we are dictators. Well, you know that's not new

May 3, 1973

either. I was going through a raft of old clippings and this is something that the Liberals have been saying over, over and over again. I am glad the Hon. Member for Athabasca is in his seat. Away back on May 3, 1973, he made a speech. The headline said, "Ituna: Policies blasted by Liberal MLA."

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. He said May 3, 1973. I haven't made a speech on that particular date yet.

MR. WHELAN: — All right, May 3, 1962. It went way back to there. You had the record player on that day. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. He was using the record player and he turned on that dictator line and he was running it out at Ituna. This is what he said:

The policies of the two 'D' boys, Diefenbaker and Douglas, have ruined Saskatchewan's economy. Under these two dictators, results have been similar.

The Hon. Member for Athabasca on May 3, 1962. I think their strategy committee went through the old clippings and dug out all the old files and said, this is the one for us. They decided on the dictator line.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill will guarantee democracy in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. Evidence for its need exist in every aspect of civic government in these two larger cities.

Why does the legislation only apply to cities over 100,000 in population while the need for division in other cities may exist, in places like Lloydminster where, according to my seatmate, the entire council lives in Alberta and the mayor lives in Saskatchewan. I think there is a definite need for a division system there, and it is entirely evident in the larger cities when one examines where aldermen have resided down through the years.

There are criteria for aldermen being elected on a division basis in smaller cities or by mandatory legislation, cities like Brandon in Manitoba where the population is under 50,000, and rural councils being elected on a mandatory basis across this province.

The need to introduce this legislation can be easily documented in the city of Regina. Over a period of many years, only two members of city council, only two aldermen have been elected from the north half of the city and yet the people on that side of the city pay taxes too. If you look at the map at the present time, the location of aldermen — this has been the case for many years, as long as you care to remember — there are 50,000 — and you can take the latest constituency map — there are 50,000 people living in the area where the 10 aldermen and the mayor reside. There they are, just take a look at them. They are in your three constituencies, Regina South, Wascana, and Lakeview. If you keep on harping, there will be only one of these constituencies you'll have a chance to get elected in at the rate you are going, even these two are close enough, if you keep on at the present trend, you will lose them. When these people see the advantages of the division system you will lose the three where you might have a chance. Here's the picture, just take a look at them, all crowded in one little

area of the city. This has been going on . . . take a good look at it, you can recognize the dots, you know where they all live. There is one of them north of College Avenue and he lives way north of College Avenue! He's in the 23 block, he's a hundred yards north of College Avenue! That just shows you what the situation is in this city at the present time. That's the way the system works. That's the way it has worked for years. There's the evidence! It is just an unbelievable thing. You have got to be from that end of the city before they will let you be an alderman.

Mr. Speaker, what does this legislation do and why will it benefit cities over 100,000. Well it guarantees local autonomy for every portion of the city of Regina and on a representation by population basis. And it gives the citizen an opportunity to participate in civic government by knowing on a first name basis the person designated to represent him. It removes the discrimination which presently exists against the law and middle income people. I want you people to listen to this carefully. I think this is really important. This is where the discrimination of this whole system comes in, a monetary discrimination which prevents them from seeking election on a city-wide basis. It would be possible, in my estimation, under the new system for an alderman to be elected at a cost of \$500.

Let's examine each of these points. On the basis of representation by population the present system is highly unrepresentative, unfair, and undemocratic. It provides a vehicle for a handful of people with a low voter turnout and high powered publicity to get elected. A contradiction in this and although he deals with many facets of Government that are close to people, an alderman has within his jurisdiction probably twice as many facets, including everything from cleaning sidewalks to police protection. Yet under the present arrangement there are 100,000 people in the city of Regina without an alderman living in their midst or anyone designated to look after their particular needs.

MR. LANE: — . . . little . . .

MR. WHELAN: — Well, try phoning one sometime. Try asking someone north of College Avenue who the aldermen are. They name almost anybody else, Les Benjamin, Henry Baker or Ed Whelan, but they don't know who the aldermen are. This legislation would bring about a close association of voters with a person living in the division or designated for the division. They would know the alderman's name, his telephone number, where he lives and could contact him at any time to make representations regarding zoning, street cleaning, pollution, traffic, fire protection, what have you. In return, the aldermen would be fully conversant with and fully aware of the needs of that particular area of the city. At the beginning of each year, as is done in rural municipal councils, a program could be worked out to develop the city as a unit without the fictitious conflict that is suggested as an obstacle to this type of system.

The next point I want to expand on his cost. One alderman in the city of Regina is criticizing the system. He said, why don't the people from the north side of the city run for office? Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to this alderman who probably spent \$4,000 on his campaign for election, they don't run from the

north side of the city — and I mean north of College Avenue, that takes in the west end, the west end and a great portion of the city as well as the north side — because it costs too much money, they cannot afford to run. The cost of running in the city at large discrimination against those, against the low and middle income people. It says to them loud and clear, you cannot be a candidate. That, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, is what this legislation is all about.

The argument is made that this legislation should not be introduced without a plebiscite. What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? The plebiscite was voted on on the 2nd of December, when the temperature hovered around zero. As I said earlier, there was a 38 per cent turnout of voters, the Members opposite, and I don't care who their advisers were — they have to take the responsibility for this, set the date in December, by amending the legislation. Actually, only 36 per cent voted when you allow for spoiled ballots on the division system; 17,000 or 20 per cent voted against the division system, the other 80 per cent didn't exercise their franchise or vote for it; 80 per cent of them did not participate, 80 per cent were not even considered with the voting system and with the weather and with the date. Compare this turnout, if you like, with the average turnout in a provincial election. In the 1971 provincial election, there was an 81.5 per cent turnout of voters in the city of Regina as a whole. In a plebiscite of this kind it is obvious from conversations I have had with many people that these people have had no experience with the division system, they have no knowledge of the fact that it has been introduced in most parts of Canada. As a matter of fact, the position those people are taking suggests they are in step with St. John's, Newfoundland. When we introduce it, Saint John's will be the only city of any size without this sort of system. But because of high powered publicity opposing the division system, some of these people voted, "No" at the time, having heard only one side of the story. I ask, is this democratic? I may estimation this legislation when it is tried will give the residents of Regina a chance to assess the division system accurately and when a plebiscite is held, we shall get an accurate picture of both methods of government. The division system applies in the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan and was introduced on a mandatory basis in Manitoba and cities varying in size from Winnipeg to Brandon. The division system was introduced on a mandatory basis without a plebiscite and without a vote. Although some cities have had a plebiscite, and then brought in the division system by legislation, by and large, and this applies to Manitoba and Ontario, the system was introduced by mandatory legislation.

In Saskatchewan when the larger school units were introduced the opposition screamed for a plebiscite. The answer was, a plebiscite shall be made available after the system is tried. Some plebiscites were held. Results of those plebiscites, I suggest, are the real reason why there is such an uproar emanating from City Council and Members opposite. You can tell fairy stories, and you can frighten people when they don't know how a system operates. But fairy stories, exaggerations and screams of dictatorship will not work when the people have experienced the system. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this Bill know that very well. At the present time, every province in Canada, as I said, except Saint John's, Newfoundland have a division system. Are all these people wrong? Are they dictators? Are they undemocratic? Let's quit being silly.

Let's look at another example. At one time the cities of Saskatoon and Regina elected MLAs at large. The Opposition objected and led the move to have single member constituencies. I don't think you will find anywhere that I object to this, because I agreed with the principle. What I want to say now to Members opposite, is there one of us who would go back to the city-wide system to represent our people? After we have answered that, don't we agree that the principle applies even more directly to the aldermanic situation where the alderman deal with so many facets of administration that are close to the individual citizen. Mr. Speaker, I say that it does. I say that it is obvious to the people in the city, the larger cities.

The division system has even been recognized in the city of Regina as a means of representation for recreation programs. City Council has divided the city into regions for recreational activities with good results and acceptance. Is this bad? Was there a need for a plebiscite? They did not object.

In addition to having an alderman representing a designated area, it must be obvious that these people would know the leaders at the local level throughout the city. Check if you will the boards and commission in Regina and you will find that very few committee members are from certain areas in the city of Regina. Why? Because they have no representation to speak for them when the committees are put together. These areas are ignored on committees. What is the net result? They are without a voice, without representatives on committees. They get schools last or they don't get them at all. One recalls the fight for Dieppe School, Mount Royal School; the fights over re-zoning, paving, parking, telebus, traffic lights and you name it, on and on. If the present system is good can we justify it with the record of participation by our citizens? Mr. Speaker, I say that we can't. But if there is a condominium someone doesn't want in another part of the city, or if there is a trailer court, it goes where there is no alderman to speak against it. At the present time representations are made by them who are upset by this sort of action when they arrive in a group at City Hall to express their chagrin at a decision because they don't live close to them, whether it is traffic, zoning, paving, street cleaning, or schools.

The argument is made that it will cost more to run an election this way. It will. But what price do these people put on democracy. How much will they spend for it and, furthermore, how democratic do you think a city-wide by-election is when 6 or 8 per cent turn out, as they did recently for a school board by-election in Regina. No one wants to pay the tremendous costs for this method to choose a school board member. There is an argument over who is going to pay for this, as a matter of fact.

Criticism is voiced that the alderman will not have to live in the division. A rural councillor does not have to live in his division, an MLA does not have to, and an MP does not have to live in his riding. This provision gives present aldermen an opportunity to run in any division. Certain aldermen claim they have been looking after the city, doing a good job; they should be able to run anywhere and get elected. I think this is only fair.

The argument is made that parks will not be looked after on a division basis. If anyone is looking after Wilson Park

May 3, 1973

for instance, I wish he would let us know. If anyone is considering development of parks in some parts of the city, I wish he would give us some evidence.

A great to-do is made about the plebiscite and how we are ignoring the wishes of the people. A plebiscite, if one had been held on the Medicare dispute — the Hon. Members opposite were screaming for that one — it would have thwarted Medicare. This Bill provides for a plebiscite after the system has been tried. The Members opposite had seven years in Government during which they could have had a plebiscite on Medicare, or on the drug program if you like. My question to them is: Why didn't you? They talked loud and long about the need for one during the Medicare dispute just as they are talking now. They are asking us to respect the wishes of the voters. They are really afraid to oppose the division system. They are just really using this technique to stall. In the city of Regina, twice voters voted against paying for the construction of a bridge on Broad Street, built by a land developer during a dispute. Twice it was refused by the voters. As a council they recently decided to prepare a bill to ask this Legislature to ignore the wishes of the voters of the city of Regina to pay the land developers for that bridge. No, their concern and their sanctimonious respect for the voter is shot down in flames when one realizes that they have asked their officials to prepare a private Bill to pay back the land developer, after the citizens have turned it down twice in a bylaw. Twice they voted it down. But they bow with humility to a 20 per cent plebiscite. I think it is a bit hypocritical.

Mr. Speaker, from where I sit the principles of democratic local autonomy and representation by population are at stake. Members can try to confuse the issues in any way they like. But when the division system has been introduced and tried, and this democratic operation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — . . . Eugene is coming . . .

MR. WHELAN: — I am sorry. He'll have to wait. This is far more important than any Liberal.

. . . It's democratic operation has been proven and the people in every local area have an opportunity to express themselves when they discover . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. WHELAN: — Can I continue, Mr. Speaker? When they discover that they have as much to say to their representatives about the operation of the city, when the 100,000 have as much to say as the others who now dominate the city, then we will have proved the value of representation by population.

I ask all Members, is that bad? This Bill is necessary. It will give democracy back to civic governments. Those who call it a dictatorial Act can't explain satisfactorily the domination of this city by a handful and the complete isolation of the others.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the community will be stronger. There will be better leadership and there

will be more participation. There will be a feeling in every part of the city, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say, that they belong to the community, that it is theirs, and that they will have something to say about the taxes they pay and how they are spent.

Without representation designated by the present system many citizens feel that they are paying taxes to people over whom they have very little influence and even less control. It is typical and predictable that the people who drew the rotten boroughs of Albert Park and Moose Jaw North would defend the lopsided representation that is the result of the present governmental system we have in Saskatoon and Regina.

I approve of this Bill in principle and practice. It is the essence of democracy and it is guaranteed in this legislation.

The Hon. Members ask who requested this legislation. Let me answer. The people who requested this legislation were those who could not understand or follow a ballot that at one time or another had as high as five slates on it for aldermanic positions. It looked like a skipping rope, as I said yesterday.

Those who live in polls with 2,700 or 2,800 people and did not know a single alderman in the city because they were so isolated from them, they asked for this legislation.

The people who were disenfranchised because they live so far from a poll in the city that they could not walk to vote on the 2nd of December, or the husband took too long at a choked-up poll and when he returned with his wife the poll was closed. They asked for this legislation.

The people who watched parks built in other parts of the city, while their part of the city was ignored, and they didn't know the name of an alderman to approach, they asked for this legislation.

The people who wanted a telebus when it was introduced in the south part of the city, and their area was ignored, they wanted this legislation and they asked for it.

These people who have watched parks, road improvements and zoning and dozen of other city services administered by aldermen who can hardly name the streets where these people live, they asked for this legislation. And they represent 100,000 people, Mr. Speaker.

Compare that to the 20 per cent who rode to the polls in their warm cars, blocks from their homes on election day, the 17,000 that cast their ballots against the division system.

Those who argue against the division system and for their system, argue for polls with 2,700 people in them, election day in below zero weather, against the system of polls used in federal or provincial elections. And against the system that is used in every city in Canada except Saint John's, Newfoundland. And they argue in favour of one thing, a plebiscite where 20 per cent of the people voted against the ward system or the division system without any experience with the division system. They stopped us from having it. They received their instructions and publicity and knowledge from a biased, political group that has only one objective, to keep their hold and their iron grip.

May 3, 1973

on the administration of the city of Regina, in spite of the fact they are definitely a minority group in the city. Only their antiquated, political machinery has maintained them.

The Province of Saskatchewan is responsible for the administration of urban and rural municipalities. Rural municipalities have division system. The province by its legislation decides who should vote and when they should vote, on what circumstances they should vote, the hours they should vote. Mr. Speaker, the province has an obligation to see that the vote for elected city officers should represent all of the people, that there should be representation by population, participation by voters, and an opportunity to vote on it after a trial period.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill does all of those things and I am in favour of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will excuse me as I just about fell asleep trying to follow the last speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there are many advantages to the instant replay and there can also be some disadvantages. What we have just heard from the Member for Regina North West is one of the disadvantages of instant replay. Exactly the same speech that we heard yesterday. I wished that he had the courtesy though to interject some new paragraphs into that speech to make it more interesting. I don't believe that any further comment is required.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, we are waiting to hear some new ones from that side.

MR. WIEBE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, taking about new speeches and new ideas, the news reports that came out of the Legislature last night stated that the Opposition was repetitious in their debates on this Bill. And I don't mind news reports like that at all. It just points out the fact that the NDP Government Members have got such thick skulls that it takes a tremendous amount of repetition to fully make some dent in their line of thinking.

My remarks are going to be rather brief. I should like to comment on a statement made by the Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck), in which he stated that he believes in the right of every citizen to have a representative on city council. Of course, each and every one of us believe in that right. But here is the difference between Liberals and the difference between NDP.

We not only believe in that right but we also believe in the right of every citizen to be able to have the choice as to how he will choose that representative. And this is the major debate on this Bill before us right now. It is the fact that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is denying the people of Regina and the people of Saskatoon the right adequately to voice their opinion on whether we will have the ward system or whether we won't.

I must agree as well with the Member for Regina North West when he mentioned the integrity of the MLA from Swift Current. And I have no quarrel with this and I agree with it 100 per cent. I have known the Member for Swift Current for many years. He is a man who does believe and listens to the people. It is for this reason that I was amazed and shocked when a Bill such as this was brought by the Member for Swift Current, into this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read an editorial which appeared in the Swift Current Sun, the home town of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I imagine that the Minister has had an opportunity to read this editorial. I quote: this in regard to withdrawing legislation which would be an appreciative move.

In the behind the scenes drama which almost certainly is played when a Government faces such a major decision as withdrawing proposed legislation, which has already been justified by its supporters, it is certainly hoped that our Swift Current MLA, Everett Wood played a prominent part.

Much as we have disagreed with Mr. Wood, he is certainly one of the Government's more capable Cabinet Ministers. He is not a tub-thumping, run them capitalists out of this province socialist. But rather a calm, cool, collected man, fully capable of not only appearing to listen, but also of actually listening to another's viewpoint. Unfortunately, Premier Blakeney, doesn't have enough men of the calibre of E.I Wood . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: —

. . .and neither does the ever-growing army of governmental advisors. Time and again there has been outspoken opposition to what those who are being governed term ill-conceived legislation or legislative proposals. Time and again the Government has rammed through what it wants and what it considers best for those it governs. It is therefore refreshing and heartening to see a break in the chain of events with the withdrawal of the proposals which would have directly inflicted elected politicians' whims and wishes on the administration of the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs had this effect on the Cabinet and was able to talk the Cabinet into withdrawing that Bill. I wish that he would use that same influence on the Bill which we are discussing today.

It is for this reason that I feel it is not a Bill that was drawn up or designed or brought to this Legislature by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think that possibly the Minister is just a victim of circumstances. Of course, there is Cabinet solidarity. A Bill like we have before us today could only be drawn up and only scrutinized by Members like the Attorney General, Members like the Minister of Health, Members like the Premier of this province.

The Cabinet has decided that this is what their Party wants. Cabinet has decided that this is what this Government wants and,

May 3, 1973

therefore the poor Minister of Municipal Affairs who happens to handle that department, and who also believes in Cabinet solidarity, has agreed to forego some of his other principles and allow this Bill to be introduced and rammed through the House.

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will reconsider his statement. He voiced some reservations to this Bill when he introduced it for second reading. I hope that he has had an opportunity to fully assess what this Bill can do and that he will withdraw this Bill, that he will urge the Members of the Cabinet to withdraw this Bill. Allow the citizens of Regina, allow the citizens of Saskatoon to voice their opinion on it. If they in turn want a ward system then by all means reintroduce the legislation

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few comments on this Bill.

You know one of the things the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) said, you know every time the Liberals ask for a vote, it is nothing but a stall. Every time they ask for a vote, it is nothing but a stall. You know something, I want to tell you, that if that is a stall I hope that we can stall this Bill forever. Go and ask the farmers whether they want a voice on Bill 50 or not. Go and ask the people in Regina. This not an argument on the merit or on the demerit of the divisional system. This is an argument about the heavy hand of the NDP, trying to force their way into municipal government in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, they are very rapidly getting to have the opinion and the reputation among the people of Saskatchewan — and I suggest the Member for Regina North West and some of the others — walk down the street, or the rural Members go back to their constituencies. The people of Saskatchewan are saying, “What are they going to force down our throats next?” “Who are they going to take over next?”

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just Liberals.

MR. MacDONALD: — What do you mean Liberals. Just go and find out. The problem is that you have been in this room for so long that you have lost touch with the people of Saskatchewan.

I defy the Minister of Municipal Affairs to stand up and tell me that his department was in favour of this Bill, because they weren't. I have talked to some of his officials and they advised him against it.

MR. ROMANOW: — Who is against it?

MR. MacDONALD: — I am going to say everybody. Hammer your fist again. You know when they talk about you they don't call you Romanow any more; they call you Romanoff. That is what they all you around the Province of Saskatchewan. You are a dictator!

The Minister of Municipal Affairs brought this in in direct

opposition to the very people whom he is supposed to represent and to be in charge of. I am referring to the SARM, to SUMA and to city councils of Saskatoon and Regina. I want to tell you that I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan, for example, were against the Hog Marketing Commission. They were against the fact that a dictator like Jack Messer would ram it down their throat. The people of Regina and Saskatoon I don't think are against the divisional system. I think they are against the fact that you are going to ram it down their throats.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think that when a Member is speaking it should be a solo and not a quartet.

MR. MacDONALD: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank you. Mr. Speaker, that is what they are against. They are against the method of imposition of this Bill. The Member for North West Regina said that the Minister, Mr. Wood will be remembered and so will that Government. They will be remembered for trying to destroy the University independence, for taking away the authority of the school boards, for now forcing the ward system down their throats. Don't kid yourselves, you will be remembered and you will be remembered for a long time.

Now the Premier stood up and he said that he wanted some criticism of the ward system. Well, I want to say that I am one who is criticizing the ward system. I am criticizing it for the city of Regina. I think the ward system was designed for one thing.

It was designed for large areas of population in urban centres that were not homogeneous. For example, the city of Vancouver. When you go over the north shore, we have to come over the Lions Gate Bridge and you get into Richmond, when you get to Lulu Island, when you get out to all the various areas of the city of Vancouver which are so large and so different and so distinct, that it is very difficult for a group of people to represent the city as a whole. It was designed, for example, for cities like New York, London, Toronto, Montreal, huge areas of population, where there is a distinct ethnic and geographic division between those areas.

I don't think the divisional system was ever designed for a city the size of Regina. I think that the aldermen and the mayors including our Member here — old hammering Hank himself — the Member for Wascana (Mr. Baker). I think that the mayor of Regina and the aldermen on his council were very sincere and dedicated to the city of Regina as a whole.

The second criticism I have of the ward system, and believe me it is a criticism that is recognized — that ward politics is tougher and provincial politics. That ward politics is more difficult than federal politics and that ward politics in many areas of the country is the dirtiest form of politics.

I say that ward politics is bringing in a new element into a small urban area like the city of Regina, in contrast to the other urban centres in Canada, you are bringing in the ward politics and you are going to find that it is going to be vicious, and it is going to bring divisions. This is my second criticism.

The third criticism is the fact that I believe there will

May 3, 1973

be inter-ward rivalry. Don't suggest there isn't in the SARM, because the SARM officials will tell you themselves that one of the real weaknesses of this rural municipal system is the fact that divisions, the various councillors trade off the goodies. You build a road this year, I'll support you on that if you do the same here. The exact same thing happens in the larger school unit. If you put a gymnasium in this town today or this year, we will vote to put a gymnasium in the other town a year from now.

Very often it destroys the sense of responsibility for the unit itself and the whole rural municipality itself. If you talk to the larger school unit people, or the SARM, they will tell you that that is the one weakness in the divisional system, in the rural areas. And it is far more apparent in the city system or the urban system, because in the rural system there is one reason that does justify the divisional system and that is the fact that a rural councillor is not only a policy maker but an administrator. He has the responsibility of going and checking on the culverts that are being put in, the road contractor that he has in his division. In other words, it is an economic means to keep the costs down because they don't have a large administrative cost.

But in the city Government there is strictly policy makers. They are not administrators. They are not administrators of the various branches of the Government. Now they do have administrative duties on committees, of course, but they have hired personnel that look after many of the functions that rural municipal councillors do not have. Don't worry there is inter-ward or inter-divisional rivalry in the larger school unit and in the SARM and the Minister knows it. That is the one weakness in the rural system. And certainly in the city system I suggest that this is going to be worse. I really believe it very, very strongly.

They also talk about the costs and about the great plea for the poor people. Well I am not sure and I would suggest to you that perhaps provincial politics is much more expensive than is municipal politics. I really believe that and yet I can remember when I first got into this business, I don't see any great wealthy Members over here. You take a great deal of delight in pointing to the rich, rich people that live in the south of Regina.

I tell you that in Whitmore Park there are a lot of good working people. People who don't make a great deal of money. People who are just ordinary citizens in the city of Regina. I don't like to have the Member for Regina North West stand up and point to those terrible wealthy Liberals and so and sos who live in the south of Regina. There are lots of good NDPers there too. Ordinary people. I also believe that to run in a ward will be more costly to an individual than to run in the city-wide system. Now you turn around and put the ward system where you have to run your own campaign, where each one is an individual campaign with an individual person, you might have five, six, seven councillors running in that same division, all investing their own time and money. On the city-wide system very often the radios and television, the newspapers put on city-wide debates, competitions, education and so forth. I don't believe there is going to be any change. I don't think there will be any change.

The last criticism I have for the ward system, and I want to be perfectly frank is the one that is recognized right across the nation, that very often the quality of the people who run isn't necessarily as high because unfortunately or fortunately you might have the two most brilliant administrators or the best living side by side and door to door. And I don't think that just because they happen to live in Regina South or Regina North or Regina East or Regina West that there is any detriment to the city. The whole concept of city Government or municipal Government should be to get the best representatives elected that is possible regardless of where they live. I'm not suggesting, of course, that we should elect somebody in Saskatoon from the city of Regina. That is carrying it to the extreme.

I want to talk about some of the arguments that the Premier used. You know, he said, there has been a movement directly toward the divisional system in provincial politics, federal politics and of course the Member from Regina North East brought up the fact that the Liberals on this side of the House broke up the multi constituencies in Regina and Saskatoon, he brought up the concept of Halifax. He brought up his own constituency that he had run in, a single, a dual, and a multi, but there was a basic different. That we were legislating about our own Government, the Government that we had the right to legislate about. Now would the Premier like to stand up here and have the Federal Government pass legislation dictating to him where he's going to run. But what you are doing, Mr. Minister, and what the Government is doing is standing up contrary to the wishes of everybody in local government in the Province of Saskatchewan and forcing them to accept your will at another level of government. And I want to tell you. I don't object to the divisional system if the people of Regina want it.

I want to tell you, if it's as good as the Member from Regina North West says, with all the power of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, why doesn't he put on an education program? Why don't you go out and hold public meetings? Why don't you go out and put on advertising campaigns or public relations campaigns on the radio, the television and the newspapers? Why don't you have a good public discussion? Why don't you educate the people and sell this great concept that you've got? And then in the fall when the municipal elections come along, put in a plebiscite, give them an opportunity. If it's as good as you say it is, why in the devil are you frightened to have a vote? Why in heavens name are you frightened to have a vote? Why won't you give the people an opportunity to express themselves? And the interesting part of it is that it is the SARM and SUMA and the city councils of Regina and Saskatoon, I don't think they object to the division system. They object to the way you are forcing it down their throats, the same as the farmers object to Jack Messer and Bill 50. And don't ever think that won't come back to haunt you. Don't think that won't come back to haunt you.

The Premier made the statement, he said, you know, the system that doesn't get over 50 per cent of the electorate to turn out is a bad system. I agree with you but you had better go out and look at the divisional system in the school boards in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in the rural municipalities, go look at what happened in Winnipeg, 38 per cent. The divisional system is not going to bring a magic wand to expand the interest of the electorate and the Minister knows it. Ask the Minister to give us some picture of the votes in the rural municipalities

May 3, 1973

for councillors. Most of the time there is so much lack of interest in the divisional system in rural municipalities that sometimes the same councillor runs unopposed for 25 and 30 and 40 years. Is that not a fact, Mr. Minister? Unopposed! In fact the divisional system works in rural Saskatchewan against the interest of competition, because there isn't any competition in the vast majority of them. There isn't and the Minister will tell you that. There are hundreds of municipal councillors in the Province of Saskatchewan who got returned to office by acclamation year after year after year after year, and there isn't even a vote. So how is the divisional system the magic wand to expand the electoral interest?

I can see that NDP machine, the political machine grinding out those NDP vote to elect George Bothwell, Wally Coates and I grant you there will be the next time. Oh boy, can't you see it? The Member for Regina Whitmore (Mr. Grant) really tabbed this Bill. The Bill to accommodate Bothwell and Coates. And I'll tell you something. If there's any reason this Bill should be defeated, it's the very danger that George Bothwell will get elected again. So don't wave this as a magic wand to expand the electoral interest of the voters because it hasn't worked that way in the school system, it hasn't worked that way in the rural municipality, it hasn't worked that way in other cities in Canada and the Minister knows this.

Now there was another argument that the Premier used. There is just one thing I want to finish and that is what bothered me most about the Member from Regina North West and everybody that stands on their feet is they justified the attempt on intimidation, justified the intimidation of this secret subversive meeting. And I should like to hear more of you stand up and justify this. First of all, if the NDP had gone into a campaign, public advertising, if they had turned around and had public meetings, publicly advertise for people to come and support this Bill and turned around and had a real education program, I would say they would be carrying out their responsibility. But when you turn around and call a secret meeting and instruct party hacks to intimidate the mayor of the city of Regina and the aldermen, I think that's foul.

And the real motivation is a very simple one. The NDP have been struggling within their own party as to whether or not they should enter the municipal field, struggling very hard, and they recognize that if they ever did enter the municipal field, particularly under the existing electoral system that they'd get slaughtered, and they know that. It happened in other parts of Canada. And they know that there is a large number of people that object to national political parties entering the municipal political scene. A lot of free people in Canada object to this, in principle, regardless of what party they are talking about. But the NDP knows that if they can get that municipal political

machine to grind in the off years between provincial elections, keep that party machine really oiled up, that it's going to be to their advantage, provincially and nationally. And so there is the motivation in this Bill and it isn't the altruistic ideas of the Member from Regina North West or the Member from City Park. Their one motivation in this Bill is to lay the groundwork for their political machine so the NDP can enter municipal politics in the Province of Saskatchewan and that they will have some opportunity of success in selected areas in the divisional system, and that's all. And I want to tell you that I hope that the people of Regina and Saskatoon recognize that for what it is and I hope that they respond on election day in the next municipal election with a resounding vote against the idea and the concept of gerrymandering the existing system for personal advantage of the NDP. That's the motivation behind it and that's why I can't support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.M. McPHERSON (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words having been a former member of City Council for many years in the city of Regina. Listening to the remarks of the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Whelan), he's got a very short memory and he can't remember his old friend Albert Wilson who lived in the north part of Regina. He represented everybody in this city. His friend Ken Cooper who held one of his cards, he know Ken Cooper well, NDP, he lived in the north side, west end. He represented everybody in Regina. And no one can deny the Member from the east end of the city, Henry Baker, he represented everybody in this city; there's no question about that. And talking about everybody south of College Avenue that's an alderman or been mayor of the city of Regina. I lived in the east end of the city just like Henry Baker did. He lived in the nine block and I lived in the thirteen block College. And I was re-elected year after year at the top of the polls, year after year as you know, and I received more votes over in Scott Collegiate area and Luther College area than I got in any other area. So don't tell me that an alderman can't represent all of the people in Regina. He knows something about what goes on. Gordon worked just as much in the east and as he did in the west end of the city and he lived in the west end of the city. So don't tell us that we haven't got everybody.

All you're trying to do is get this Bill through and you're trying to get it through for those great friends of yours, Bothwell, Pout McDonald, Coates, and the other one . . . oh yes, Koskie. Now where do they all live? Your friend Bothwell he lives up on 14th Avenue and Rae Street, that's not very far from here. And the rest all live in the south end of the city. So don't tell me that the only thing you can do . . . they're all defeated NDP candidates. They are also defeated in City Council. So what do you want to do? Bring them back! So don't give me that, that a ward is a good thing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. McPHERSON — One or two things I wanted to say in this. Our friend from North West was worrying about what the ads cost. The ads cost the same for me as they did for Ken McLeod and I represent three times as many people. So you're a little out on your

estimate about what the average cost is.

MR. MacLEOD: — I never got any discount.

MR. McPHERSON: — No, he didn't get a discount. Nor, Mr. Speaker, it's a bad Bill and I, like the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), have a lot of respect for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'm a little surprised that he's bringing this in. The Councils have strongly opposed the ward system and yet we're bringing it forward. Saskatoon opposed it and yet we're bringing it forward. We're doing it only for that group of four and they'll hurt this Government. When you get men like Bothwell around you and Coates, you've got real problems. If you keep them around you because they're the people that will bring you right down.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mill stones around your neck.

MR. McPHERSON: — I want to repeat again, Mr. Speaker. This is the only reason they are proceeding in this direction, is the great welfare for those four members. If the Government wished representation on City Council from all the areas of the city then why did they not make provisions also that the councillors be elected from each ward should be residents of that ward? This, Mr. Speaker, would at least be consistent with any concern to ensure regional representation on City Council. The fact that such provisions are not contained in the Bill is additional proof, of course, that they are not worried about the cities, they are not worried about the regional representation. Their only concern is about organizing politically and abusing the structure of civic government. We've had good civic government in Saskatoon. We've had good civic government in Regina and you're going to run it. That's what you're going to do if you bring in those fellows that have done so well. Look at what they've done for the city of Regina — nothing, not one of them.

There are other provisions in the Bill related to the change over to the ward system. As well there are a few provisions that might be termed as housekeeping amendments. I have no real object to these. At the same time I do know that some of my colleagues in the Opposition do object to that provision.

We will oppose this Bill, Mr. Speaker, because it is one more denial of the rights to one quarter of the people of Saskatchewan, a denial of the right to choose the form of civic government they wish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in this debate because this is a debate about basic fundamental principles to which the New Democratic Party adheres. There has been a fair amount of publicity of this topic in the press and other media. I must say that I think some of it is much too colourful, overly dramatic, stemming, in fact, from the type of releases and speeches that have been made by some people describing this action, which is a democratic action, as being dictatorial, in contempt and causing a fever pitch in the community.

MR. LANE: — And arrogant.

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK: — And arrogant as well. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the concept which is embodied in this Bill deserves more light, more searching examination, than it does the heat that has been generated in the public mainly by the Members opposite who made inflammatory and overly dramatic statements about this basic fundamental principle.

The Opposition in leading off the debate on this Bill, the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) suggested that this Bill was in contempt. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we view this Bill as being an appreciation of the democratic principles to which our party adheres. Plan and simple, that is what this Bill means to the people of Saskatchewan.

A number of statements have been made by Members opposite in this debate saying, in fact, Regina and Saskatoon have rejected the ward system. I want to deal specifically with my city of Saskatoon. The Member from Lumsden, the Member from Prince Albert, the Member from Lakeview all said that Saskatoon has rejected the ward system. However, I might remind them that Saskatoon rejected the ward system, but that was 53 years ago. And that's a fact, 53 years ago. If a person had lived in Saskatoon all of his life, he could be 53 years of age and never have experienced the ward system of government or the division system of government. So consequently, Mr. Speaker, I say that it's time for a trial of that system for the simple reason that at that time the city population in Saskatoon was a fraction of what it is at this time.

Some suggestions have been made about polls and plebiscites. It is interesting to note that the Jaycees in Saskatoon have taken a survey. I obtained the results of that survey, Mr. Speaker. The survey said 69.8 per cent were opposed to the ward system. I thought, that's interesting that the Jaycees have released those figures. I thought maybe I'd better have a look behind the scenes and see what the Jaycees are not releasing at this time to the public. They released those figures in a telegram to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I did a check. I found out that 381 people voted in that plebiscite. There are more than 75,000 voters in the city of Saskatoon, so that represents about one-half of one per cent of the people responding. That means that the people of Saskatoon were not disturbed about the possibility of having the ward system or the division system and in fact were not alarmed about the possibility of having the division system.

Of that small percentage that indicated they were interested either pro or con, 115 were in favour of having the division system implemented in Saskatoon. I would suggest to the city of Saskatoon and as a matter of fact to the city of Regina, that in Saskatoon clearly indicated that a plebiscite or a referendum on the implementation of a division system in Saskatoon or Regina is unnecessary.

The people of Saskatoon and Regina, by their actions, have shown that they are not concerned about the implementation of this division system. They are quit willing to give it a try. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that they will find the trial period will work out and they will be satisfied with the system.

Remember that the city of Saskatoon has not had a division

May 3, 1973

system for 53 years, when the population of Saskatoon was about 25,000, whereas now Saskatoon has a population of approximately 131,000.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that some other statements have been made across the way about the effect of the ward system in other cities. The Members across the way suggest that there is a comparison to be found in Winnipeg. Well I took the trouble of getting in touch with Winnipeg and I found that in the city of Winnipeg proper, in civic elections from 1964 to 1970 the vote turnout ranged between 42 per cent and 22 per cent. When the city of Winnipeg went into the unified or unicity concept the voting increased to 60.7 per cent, so I say there was a better turnout generally speaking in Winnipeg. There has been some suggestion across the way this won't help the voting turnout in the city of Saskatoon. I checked the figures on voting turnout in the city of Saskatoon. We find over the last five years, the voting turnout in the city of Saskatoon civic elections has ranged from a high of 37.7 per cent to a low of 18.8 per cent. That is a combination of the electors and the burgesses. If you deal with the electors alone you will find that the high for the voting turnout was 20 per cent and the low was 7.1 per cent.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will cause an increased interest in the civic elections in the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina thereby we may see ourselves moving closer to the percentage vote turnout in the provincial elections, which in Saskatoon in the last provincial election was 82.5 A very good turnout. We should be encouraging all people to participate more in civic politics, in civic Government.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, there were some other comments made about politics at the civic level. I think that's a red herring. Mr. Speaker, just for the simple reason that there is just as much opportunity at this time for participation of a political nature at the civic level as there will be under a division system. I suggest to you that if the voters of Mayfair constituency, at the civic level, are not that interested in politics. They are very interested, as my friend across the way will know, at the provincial level. The people of Mayfair constituency could elect all of the aldermen to the city of Saskatoon. But they don't choose at this time to participate in that manner and there is no reason to say that they will choose, if there is a division system, to involve themselves in that way. They may — they may not. I don't think that anybody across the way is suggesting at this time that they should be prevented from involving themselves in municipal government and municipal politics.

The Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) in his comments suggested that there was a reason for the city of Vancouver probably being divided into wards or divisions. He said it is because there are distinct divisions there that can be better served by a division system. He says it is only because the city is large — a huge city. He says that's not necessary here. Well, what about the province of Ontario? I asked the Member from Milestone. What about the province of Ontario where it is mandatory that cities of 15,000 have the division system? That is mandatory in Ontario and the Members across the way don't draw any attention to it in this Chamber but they choose instead to draw attention to the city of Vancouver.

I suggest to you it applies to cities in Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, equally as well.

Mr. Speaker, it's well-known what the stands of the two parties in this Chamber are with regard to electoral reform and democratic procedure. I think their crowning example was in 1965. At that time they divided the cities of Regina and Saskatoon into single member constituencies. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was in favour of that move.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You didn't vote for it.

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK: — The Member is right — I didn't vote for it because there were two hookers in that legislation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Were they happy?

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK: — And the hookers were this — it's unbelievable when you find out the kind of amendments that the Liberal Party was going to put into that legislation. One of the amendments was this — that if a vacancy occurred in the city of Saskatoon when it was a single seat that they would suggest, by order-in-council, which one of the new seats under the redistribution was the one that was vacant. They would, therefore, of course, by order-in-council suggest that perhaps Nutana South, would be the seat that was vacant. In other words, the Liberal Party of that day was rigging it so that if a vacancy occurred in the city of Saskatoon they would almost assure the election of a Liberal to the Legislative Chamber from Saskatoon City.

MR. McLEOD: — What year was that?

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK: — That was 1965. That was the year that they created Albert Park, the most rotten borough in the Province of Saskatchewan and that's the other reason why I was against the legislation at that time because they created constituencies whose size bore no relationship whatsoever to representation by population, which I think is fundamental to the democratic system. An example of this in Saskatoon city was that they created the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair and along beside it they created the constituency of city Park. The Liberal Party did that because they had lost all hope of winning the constituency of Mayfair so they cut out chunks of the area that was the old University constituency of City Park which they would win. The people of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to comment on this particular practice of the Liberal Party. Their understanding of how the democratic system should operate and they commented on it loud and clear in 1971 when they threw the Liberal Party out. They threw the Liberal Party out because they paid no attention to democratic representation by population. This Bill pays attention to the principle of democratic representation by population.

The policies that were enunciated by the Liberal Cabinet Minister of that day, who has now gone to the happy rest home at Ottawa, the Canadian Senate — an institution which is

May 3, 1973

continuously imposed upon the people of Canada with no choice as to whether they accept it or reject it. Senator MacDonald when he stood in this House had this to say?

The workers of the city of Saskatoon had five votes. It is a well-known principle and especially well-known to my friends opposite that one person ought to be entitled to one vote.

That's what Senator MacDonald, a Minister of the Crown of the Government said at that time?

He goes on to say:

Why should a voter in the city of Saskatoon have the opportunity of voting for five people and a voter in any rural constituency has the privilege and opportunity of voting for only one person, and one person only?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Is he on welfare now?

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK: — Yes, I think he is on welfare now.

Senator MacDonald at that time representing the Liberal Party and the Government of Saskatchewan said that that was a good principle, and I agreed with the principle, but they didn't follow through with the legislation. They followed through with the gerrymander and they heard the results of that particularly nefarious bit of legislation that they brought to this House.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that since I entered this House along with other Members, we have consistently fought for electoral reform, especially in the area of representation by population, and independent constituency boundaries. This Bill provides for the representation by population principle; balanced representation as a result of boundaries drawn by an independent electoral boundaries commission; it provides for a plebiscite after the trial period is completed; and it takes no power away from the civic level of Government that they presently hold. It provides that a candidate does not have to live in the division in which he is running, so that all of these aldermen in Regina and Saskatoon that have done such a good job, will have no doubt in their minds that they will be able to get elected in any division that they choose to run in in Regina or Saskatoon. In this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the cities have the power to choose the number of divisions that they wish to have.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks that a trial of this system is certainly justified in this instance, especially with regard to the city of Saskatoon, and I heartily support the principle of this Bill and will work for its implementation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.R. GUY (Athabasca): — I should like to speak to this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think what we have to talk about here basically is the principle of the Bill and the principle of the Bill, of course, is that here is one Government trying to force its authority on another local government. I am sorry that the Attorney General isn't

in his seat, but I'm happy to see that the Premier is here for the first time today. I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to have heard the Premier's screams of protest if, when the Boundaries Commission had presented its map, the Federal Government had said you cannot accept that map, we are going to draw the boundaries for the Province of Saskatchewan. We are going to tell you how many members. You would have heard the screams of protest of Allan Blakeney all the way to Vancouver and all the way to Halifax and yet he's not above telling the cities of Saskatoon and Regina that he is going to draw the boundaries for them — he's going to tell them that they are going to have a ward system — he's going to tell them when they are going to vote and how they are going to vote and he's not going to give them any opportunity or say otherwise. And that's the principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. The one level of government taking the authority upon itself to force its own will upon another level of government (and in this case a lesser level of government). As I was saying before, the Attorney General came in, I am surprised that he hasn't stood up in his seat and condemn this principle, because I am sure that he does not believe in it.

The other point that I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this Bill is that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) should be ashamed of himself bringing in two pieces of legislation and then bringing in six and two pages of amendments respectively. If there has ever been sloppy drafting in any department it has to be the Minister of Municipal Affairs department and it is certainly not the officials in the department who could be blamed and I hope that he doesn't get on his feet and try to blame the officials for six pages of amendments in one Bill and two pages of amendments on another Bill. The Minister has to accept the responsibility for the sloppiest piece of legislation that's ever come into this House.

Those are the only two comments I wish to make on this piece of legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF MR. EUGENE WHELAN

MR. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I have already spoke in this debate, but if I may beg the indulgence of the House — we are very honoured to have with us a very distinguished gentleman. You now the Irish are very famous — if you get two Irishmen they say you have a fight, but I think if you get one Irishman you've got a fight. We've got a member of an Irish family, the Hon. Eugene Whelan, Federal Minister of Agriculture with us today, and we have had his brother, Ed Whelan, as a Member of this Legislative Assembly for many years and the Whelans are a very honoured name in Canadian politics. It is my pleasure to introduce to the House, Mr. Eugene Whelan, Minister of Agriculture. I wish him well in his deliberations with our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and I welcome him on behalf of the Members to Regina and to our Legislative Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I join with the Leader of the Opposition in

May 3, 1973

welcoming the Minister of Agriculture for the Government of Canada. We do hope that the discussions with the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan will be fruitful and we hope that he enjoys his sojourn in Western Canada, seeing what farming is all about. I know that at least one other Member of our caucus wishes to add a word.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier in extending a very warm welcome to my brother. I should like to extend a very warm welcome to my brother, the Minister of Agriculture. It is with some knowledge that I can say that his mother is very proud of him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — His constituents and his family and his party, I am sure, are very proud of him. And on my own behalf, if the Liberals are lucky enough to get elected and form the Government at Ottawa and if they have to choose an Agriculture Minister, I guess I might be biased enough and I might say that I don't think they could do any better than to appoint him as their Minister of Agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — As young me we played on a hockey team. We never won any championships but three of the players took up politics. First there was Dick Thrasher who sat in the House of Commons as a Progressive Conservative and was John Diefenbaker's Parliamentary Assistant. Of course he played right wing. Then yours truly was elected to the Saskatchewan Legislature and he played left wing. Then Eugene Whelan was elected to the House of Commons and he is here today. I think it is appropriate and he played his position very well. He played left defence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, it is apparent I am sure to the Minister when he looks at the makeup of the Legislature that the New Democrats speak for agriculture in Canada's most agricultural province. The Minister will find us Members here, I'm sure, co-operative and progressive and prepared to work with him. To be sure that he is getting all the facts on Canada's Farm Tenure Bill I am going to send across to him a copy of the Saskatchewan Land Bank legislation. I wonder if the page would take it across to him to make sure he gets it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — You know, many don't believe that I have a brother who is a Liberal. If the Minister can spare the time I should like to introduce him to Members on this side of the House. Again, I say to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, a very warm welcome, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill 104 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words on Bill 104 much to the approval of the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) and others because I know I have their full support anytime I enter a debate. I want to enter into this simply to add a few comments and thoughts as it particularly relates to the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, I notice by the local press in Saskatoon that one of the aldermen has placed a notice of motion before the council on the matter of a plebiscite with respect to the introduction of the division system. My remarks would be to urge the people of Saskatoon to very carefully consider this motion by the alderman and the City Council in question. I think we are entitled all to ask ourselves about the full merit of plebiscites in a situation such as this when we know that the proposed legislation will become law very shortly. In Saskatoon we've had a number of major projects over the last several years which concerned the citizens. There was, for example, the establishment of an auditorium which was, as I thought, a good decision, but at the same time being opposed by a number of our people and the plebiscite was asked of our city fathers. To my knowledge, no plebiscite was, in fact, granted. I could think of the project to build the Idylwyld Freeway which was a joint city of Saskatoon-Government of Saskatchewan approach to which some people had questions and felt they ought to be consulted by way of a plebiscite. None was granted. I can think of the Midtown Shopping Centre which in my judgment is a good development, a positive growth for the city of Saskatoon and for the Province of Saskatchewan, to which many of our citizens asked for a plebiscite and a vote. Our city fathers saw fit not to grant or to have an opinion passed by them in this area. There is a place for plebiscites and there is a time for positive action to be taken by various levels of government. Before the plebiscite move in Saskatoon is considered by our city fathers and by the citizens, I ask them to consider why it was that no plebiscite was, in fact, granted on these and other important issues. Why it was that, in fact, plebiscites when the people all for them on other major issues have been, on occasion, turned down. And I don't quarrel with the decision to turn them down. That is the right of the City Council, the right of the Government of Saskatchewan, the right of the Dominion of Canada, given the individual and the particular circumstances.

I want to reiterate on this matter of a plebiscite the remarks made by the Premier. There was no plebiscite when the Liberal Government removed the provisions relating to the ward option in the present Bill back in 1970 or thereabouts, I believe. And I support the Premier when he says that if the removal of the ward system did not result in a demand for a plebiscite from a city council or demand for a plebiscite from my learned friends opposite, why then in the converse situation the plebiscite should be asked when we now see fit to re-introduce the ward provision?

The question of a plebiscite in Saskatoon or in any other community, in my judgment, will be, by the time it is set, academic. The matter will become law. Plebiscites are costly and expensive procedures. Plebiscites are matters which have

been established as a matter of fact, can, I think be open to some serious criticism, some serious criticism of the judgment in terms of the expenditures by city fathers in terms of all the other priorities for money spending that they have. This will not be an opinion poll of any merit. A plebiscite will, in fact, be an expensive and a costly opinion poll which will hurt the ratepayers of Saskatoon or the ratepayers of Regina. And so I urge those who call for a plebiscite to look at the realities of the situation, the realities of the situation being that there is very little opposition to the ward system, very little opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) smiles or laugh, chuckles, whatever he wants to do. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that the only communication that I have received on the ward system to date is a telegram from the Saskatoon Board of Trade. I haven't even been given a telegram by the Saskatoon Junior Chamber of Commerce or by the Regina Board of Trade or Chamber of Commerce. I haven't received one letter opposing the ward system. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have received very little correspondence on it but what I have received has been in favour of the ward system. I don't think that anybody can generate an issue in opposition to a system which is basically the improvement in the establishment in the democratic institutions in the Province of Saskatchewan. And that's why the Opposition is having, I think some difficulty in generating any support for their point in this area.

And I want to challenge the comments made by some of the Members opposite. For example, it was stated by my colleague, the Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) this morning, that the cities oppose the ward system. That is not so. The cities have not passed a resolution in opposition to the ward system or division system.

MR. McPHERSON: — What do you think they voted on?

MR. ROMANOW: — They have not passed any resolution that I have seen. Well, the Member from Lakeview says that they oppose it and I invite the Member from Lakeview to forward to me a copy of any resolution in the last two years, the last three years, for that matter by any city council, either Regina or Saskatoon, which says they are opposed to the ward system and I stand corrected if he can forward it to me. I can't speak with authority in Regina but I do know that so far as Saskatoon is concerned there is no opposition by resolution by the members of City Council to the ward system. In fact, in any conversations that I have had, formal and informal, with the aldermen, many will tell you that they are prepared to give the system a try, that they don't oppose the concept of the system. It's true that some feel that there should be a plebiscite before its implementation. That I don't argue with. But the business of saying that the people oppose the division system, that is to say the elected aldermen and councillors, is simply not consistent with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, even the mayor in Saskatoon is, in fact, 100 per cent in favour of the division system and the ward system. Mayor Bert Sears has stated time and again in the newspapers that he is for the division system. What he has opposed is the fact that there hasn't been plebiscite. This is a point taken.

But to say that he is opposed to the division system is totally misrepresenting the facts.

And this is the point. The Member from Milestone does misrepresent the two, He says this because there is no plebiscite that means opposition and I say, Mr. Speaker, that spells in his mind exactly why he is advancing the argument of the vote. He's advancing the argument of the vote because that's just another way of saying that the Liberal Party opposite is opposed to what is I consider to be a major democratic piece of innovation in Saskatchewan, the division system.

MR. MacDONALD: — No question, I'm opposed to it.

MR. ROMANOW: — And the Member from Milestone, at least he's honest about it. He's opposed to it, fine. We obviously differ but at least you are honest about it. As the Premier says when you're asked too vote on this Bill, the Bill is going to be a question of whether you stand for or against the division system and at least we know that one on that side is opposed to the division system.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief by simply saying that I dispute the arguments made the Member from Milestone that somehow this is going to be more costly, the ward system. This I can't understand. I don't understand how it is an alderman who wants to convince 125,000 people at large, how he can argue that somehow is cheaper than trying to convince approximately 15,000 or 16,000 people at large from a ward. That just doesn't make sense to me. At the least the alderman has got an area over which he can go door to door campaigning, which he can pamphleteer in relatively inexpensive ways. But how in the world does he get to 125,000 to 150,000 residents in order to get them to know him, in order for him to get to know them and understand their problems? How in the world can that be done except with massive expenditure on the radio and television and the like I strongly disagree with the argument advanced by the Member from Milestone that somehow this is going to be more costly. Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be less costly for those who run in a special or distinctive division system.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to record my opposition to the point of view advanced opposite that somehow the quality of those seeking office in the wards will not be as high. I suppose that one could say that the same argument applies to provincial politics; that the best quality of candidates rises only when you have five MLAs running at large, elected five from Saskatoon and five from Regina. The Member opposite doesn't believe that because he was part of the Constituency Boundaries Commission that drew the individual boundaries in the cities. He doesn't believe in that. And I object to his view because I think that it is peculiarly an elitist point of view, that somehow there are people in certain areas of the city who just don't have the quality or the ability to represent their own people on city council. That somehow the people in Riversdale, somehow the people in Mayfair, or somehow the people in North Regina don't have the quality in order to have them representing on city council, that the quality is going to go down because of this system. And I find that is a particularly objectionable concept, Mr. Speaker, that I, for one, cannot endorse. I say the converse. I am not one to judge quality.

May 3, 1973

The persons who are going to judge quality are those who will be passing judgment on those running, namely the people living in the divisions and in the wards and that's what the purpose is behind this.

Mr. Speaker, I also just want to make a comment about municipal party politics, and the objection to municipal party politics. I want to record my personal view in opposition to party politics. I am opposed to the development of New Democratic Party politics at the civic level and I say so now publicly as I have said so in times gone by and I will be saying so in Saskatoon. I oppose it because I don't think that at this particular time any advantage can be gained and I think there is an element of party divisiveness that can enter into it. But just take a look at Regina. We've had CVA and RCA now for how many years? Is that not party politics? It may not be NDP or Liberal carrying label party politics but it's politics sure as I stand here and as I'm a New Democrat and the Member for Milestone is a Liberal. It's party politics. And even if it was party politics, Mr. Speaker, what in the world are we so afraid about when we talk about people who come to hold public office whether it's on a civic level or on a provincial level because they have to hold strong convictions, political or otherwise. I mean we know as a matter of fact that one of the very able mayors of the city of Saskatoon, Sid Buckwold is, was and always will be a Liberal. We know that as a fact. He's now a Senator. I wouldn't knock Mayor Buckwold. I think he was one of the better mayors that the city of Saskatoon ever had. But does anyone here seriously suggest that Mayor Buckwold somehow was able to divorce his Liberal political convictions when he took the mayoralty chair. Of course, he couldn't. He's after all a human being. He brings to his decision making powers the same biases and prejudices and conviction as I bring to mine. Yet he was a good mayor. And so to suggest that party politics will creep into this system is totally wrong. Or Mayor Baker was the same way. As I said I don't intend to speak about Regina because I don't know about Regina but I'm prepared to stand 100 per cent behind Mayor Baker. He's a New Democrat and I say he was one of the better mayors the city of Regina has ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And so when the Member for Milestone argues about party politics being injected in this, I say that's simply not so.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that, and I must reiterate the point made by the Premier and by others on this side of the House on this matter of arrogance. Frankly, no doubt the news media will play it up. They have to date. Any allegations of arrogance made by the Liberal Party opposite on this issue with the media in Saskatoon and in Regina has certainly obtained headlines. And I suppose there's nothing that can be done to convince the Members opposite or convince the media about the arrogance of those who cry arrogance — the arrogance of the Liberals opposite, the arrogance of those opposite when they were in power. I know everybody shudders every time we mention Bill 2 but it happens to be a fact because I think that is a Bill that will be remembered long after I'm gone from party politics. There was no plebiscite and I don't know how many cries there were of arrogance. For those opposite to get up and to cry arrogance, for those opposite who drew the gerrymander Bill in 1971, and Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you this

was a gerrymander bill of four or five politicians. The Member from Lakeview was one, the Leader of the Opposition was one, I don't know whether Milestone was in on the inner Cabinet or not, all right the Member for Milestone, a political group. Mr. Speaker, they were the most partisan of the Liberal Cabinet, and the Member from Athabasca. They were the most partisan of all the Cabinet Ministers on the Liberal side at that stage of the game, and they played with the very basics of democracy when they drew those gerrymander lines.

The Member from Lakeview got up and he said, I represent three times as many voters as the Member from Albert Park." And he's right. He represents three times as many on the boundaries that he himself drew. I felt like asking him how in the world could it be, Member from Lakeview, that you represent three times as many people as your colleague and deskmate the Member from Albert Park? How in the world could it be in a democratic system? And these are people who sit down and now get up and cry arrogance, and they're the same ones that get the coverage from the news media on that cry of arrogance. It's simply because the news media adopt the approach that if it's said, it will be reported. If it's said, no matter who says it, or how it's said, it will be reported. We're not going to go behind what is said to interpret what is said, we're going to print it, especially on the ward system. Well, I consider in Saskatoon the opposition to the ward system comes from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and the Board of Trade, Mr. Speaker. Period. I'm not worried about the editorial comments. I've long ago given up on the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and their editorial comments as I think most of the people in this province have. But everywhere that one considers this issue, the emotional coverage contained in the media about the ward system simply is not consistent when we consider from where those cries of arrogance come and they come from the most arrogant group that ever occupied the front benches in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. GRANT: — You're ruining a good speech.

MR. ROMANOW: — I know that they say I'm ruining a good speech, but I get a bit sensitive especially this late in the Session now, no kidding, I get a bit sensitive when I hear these types of unfounded allegations and comments and I want to make my point of view clear, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think that they can brainwash too many people, maybe themselves and maybe a few journalists on the Star-Phoenix and maybe a few on the Leader-Post who have already been brainwashed to this point of view. But they're not going to be brainwashing the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. And if there is any integrity in the freedom of the press and in the independence of the journalism and in the artistry of reporting they will tell the people the facts, that this Bill is a positive step to increase democracy in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I must confess at this time that I had not intended to enter this debate, but I do wish to make just three or four minutes worth of comments after listening to the Attorney General.

The one thing that came through in the Attorney General's comments is that just about everybody in Saskatchewan is wrong except him. Everybody in Saskatchewan is wrong except him. The Leader-Post, Mr. Speaker, is wrong; the Star-Phoenix is wrong; the people who voted in Regina two to one against the ward system, they are all wrong, the City Council in Regina is wrong; the City Council in Saskatoon is wrong; everybody is wrong except the Attorney General and he says it's all our fault. Then the Attorney General wonders why the people of Saskatchewan think he's arrogant. Well, his speech today just about proves he is. He proclaimed to everybody here that except himself and a few more of the front benches and the back benches, I won't blame it on them because I don't think they are ever consulted in any event, but himself and a few more along the front bench have taken it on their own determination that they have decided what is right and hell or high tides are not going to prevent putting it into operation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the one fact that comes out loud and clear is that the people of Regina here determined not too long ago how they wanted to run local government. They determined how they wanted to run local government. And no amount of rationalizing, arguing or displaying of oratory will ever change the fact that they themselves determined not long ago that the ward system was not in their own best interests, the present system was in their interest, and they said it loud and clear, that the municipal type of government they wanted was not the ward system. Now I think that for most people that would be a fairly good verdict that they rendered but apparently it's not good enough for the Government opposite.

Now I don't want to go into all of the pros and cons of the ward system, but I can assure the Attorney General that he can accuse us of all sorts of arrogance and everything else but we would have rendered that verdict as being sufficient and not imposed the ward system upon them. We would have rendered that sufficient. So I only want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition and we're delighted the Opposition gets that much attention because there's not too many of us over here and we're delighted that he considered we warrant that kind of attention. So I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the Attorney General's display this afternoon has proven just about all of the things we have been saying about the Government not listening to anybody in Saskatchewan have been proven correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, would the Member answer a question? I'd just like to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: — He signifies he doesn't wish to answer it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn this debate, I couldn't resist rising because it's one of those occasions where I can wholeheartedly stand behind the House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — And once again prove my non-partisanship that I don't always oppose what the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Riversdale is for. I'm afraid I won't be able to parallel the Member from Riversdale in his flowery eloquence in the degree of his moral fervour but I shall make the best that I can as I stand behind and I support the principle very much of imposing and bringing about the ward system in municipal government.

Mr. Speaker, the key problem which I have seen is the ability of the Members opposite, the Boards of Trade, the people who run municipal governments in both Regina and Saskatoon to concentrate the fury of their attack on a secondary issue. And from their point of view it's a good point. Concentrate all the fury on a secondary issue, how this measure is introduced, whether we should have a plebiscite, what was the significance of previous votes against it and ignore the fundamental point. And the fundamental point is that we do not have democratic civic government. The problems that we have faced again and again are 50 per cent of the people, as the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) referred to who do not vote. Is it really democracy when only 20 per cent of the electorate is sufficiently important to their interest to be involved to the extent of voting in municipal elections? We've got the repeated problems which Members have referred to, of the business community running civic government, of the classes who control civic government, of the non-representation of working people on civic councils. These are the real problems of civic government and these are the problems that in some small way the ward system is trying to address itself to. And to try and becloud the issue and refuse to address oneself to those problems is the kind of politics which the Members opposite are seriously guilty of.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to re-emphasize another point made by my colleague from Saskatoon Nutana Centre and that is if the division system is good for the RMs, if the ward division system is appropriate to the cities over 100,000 what about everything in between. If the arguments are valid about Saskatoon and Regina, the business community controlling the civic governments in both of these communities, the arguments are equally valid about Moose Jaw, Prince Albert and the other cities of Saskatchewan. And I would strongly urge that we amend this legislation at a later sitting in order that a ward system would become part and parcel of the civic administration and the way of electing councillors or aldermen in the other cities of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the other Members from Saskatoon in stating my strong support for the principle of this Bill which should be passed now and let's hope that it will be one small device which will increase the democracy and the participation in the cities in their civic government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. E.I. WOODS (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that I should like to say in closing this debate, some of the things that I think it is necessary that I do say in regard to some of the

remarks that have been made during this debate. One, that I should like to say to start with, is that I very much appreciated some of the kind remarks that were made by the Hon. Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) and the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and some of the other Members of the house. Some of the others, I want to say that flattery won't get them anywhere, some of the other remarks I got. I'm sorry the Hon. Member from Morse is not in his seat but I wanted to indicate to him that I much appreciated the editorial he read from the Swift Current Sun. It was, I admit, meant to be quite complimentary, but I want to say that it was purely conjecture and not to be relied upon as being any factual material because I am sure that the Editor of the Sun had no way of inferring or even any way of forming any opinion as to whether or not I had even any way of forming any opinion as to whether or not I had supported or I had not supported The University Bill. I think that complimenting me for opposing The University Bill was pure conjecture. And I want to say the same thing to the Hon. Member from Morse when he indicated that I personally was not supporting this Bill. I want to tell the Hon. Member if he were here, you can't tell how far a frog can jump by looking at it. And he can't tell from the position that I have taken or from anything that I have said whether or not I support this Bill personally. And I don't want him to go away with any mistaken ideas on that score. But I do appreciate kind words whenever they are said; they're not that frequent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Right, we don't get that many. I want to say that in regard to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, he had some thing to say in this debate. One was, why were we simply bringing in this legislation in regard to the two larger cities? Well, I think this makes sense. I think it's logical. If you're going to have this type of an electoral system in the cities, I think it is going to work best in the larger cities. They're the only ones that have any need for it, but the city where the wards will be approximately the size of a provincial constituency, I think it is logical that they be divided up into such constituencies. The smaller cities where any division would make them into ten divisions would make them pretty small. I don't think they call for the same sort of treatment. In fact, the Hon. Member for Milestone was saying that he thought that Regina and Saskatoon were too small for this sort of a thing. But I think that they are large enough and I think that there is a big difference between the cities of 125,000 or 140,000 as compared to the 30,000 and 15,000 type of cities we have in the province otherwise. And I think this is a logical and a desirable place to make this difference between the larger and the smaller cities.

The Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) also mentioned the telegram that he had received from the Jaycees in Saskatoon in regard to the ward system. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't have my copy of the telegram here today. I expect it is on my secretary's desk as I drafted a reply to it yesterday and it is now being typed and sent away. I don't think that I have much to say in regard to this because I believe the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) answered this very well. His remarks were very well taken in the House.

There was also something said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in regard to a delegation which I met here in this

House a week or so ago. I've already made my position very clear in regard to this on the Orders of the Day. I don't think there is really any need for repetition, at least there shouldn't be need for repetition. But when I hear the remarks that are made by the Leader of the Opposition and two or three other Members of the other side, I think that maybe they are among those that need hearing aids because they simply did not get it clear what had taken place. I indicated in the House the other day, Mr. Speaker, that I had received word just a few minutes before I met with the delegation, that there was a delegation here to see me in this building. It seems to me that this is the proper place for people to come to meet their MLAs and their Cabinet Ministers when the House is in session. You could have fooled me if there was any wrongdoing in this. After 17 years I guess it's too late to tell me but I never knew this, that there was anything wrong in meeting delegations in this building. And I did go to see them. I met with them. And now they say that I counselled, that I was counselling blackmail and doing all sorts of nefarious things. I want to say that I did understand that they were proposing to do some phoning in to a hotline broadcast. Actually, I didn't remonstrate. In fact, I have to admit that after being in political life and having been a Member of the Cabinet when the Medicare was being brought forward and the KODs were doing their utmost to thwart the Government in what they were endeavouring to do in that regard, all the organization and what was done in those days, what was proposed the other night in regard to a hotline program seemed to me to be pretty pale and it never occurred to me that they should be stopped and not be allowed to go forward with such a nefarious thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Pure and straightforward.

MR. WOOD: — Yes, pure and straightforward, that's right. This sort of thing has been done so much. In fact I've discussed these things with some members of the media who are dealing with this sort of thing and they say it's done all the time. And everybody knows it's done all the time. Why should we try to hold up a great big bogey and try to make something out of something that everybody in this room knows is not out of the way and that it is done practically every day of the year someplace around here.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Part of the democratic process.

MR. WOOD: — Looking for bogies under the bed. And I didn't see my way clear to and that it was necessary and it was not my place to say that they couldn't and I didn't think that it was necessary for me to say that they couldn't.

Another thing that did bother me a little more though that this was that I believe the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) said that I counselled political blackmail, that I had counselled people to say that they were not going to vote for Mayor Walker and along this line. Well, this I take real exception to. I may not agree with Mr. Walker's politics. If it came down to election time I think I would have to possibly oppose him at

May 3, 1973

the polls. Mayor Walker is a friend of mine. I consider him one of my friends and I am not going around behind his back sticking knives in him.

MR. GRANT: — . . .did it.

MR. WOOD: — All right, who are you pointing at? Are you saying that I counselled this?

MR. GRANT: — No, I am saying you are better than the other ones.

MR. WOOD: — Well, I am not saying who is better or who isn't, but I am saying that I am not counselling any sort of political blackmail in regard to Mayor Walker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — And any of the Members on the other side of the House who have said this, I will ask them to eat their words. In fact I met with Mayor Walker this morning in a meeting and I am meeting with Mayor Walker and other municipal people all the time in this province. It would be impossible for me to work with these people and go around behind their backs, counselling people to vote against them. If the people on the other side of the House would stop to think they would know that I couldn't do that sort of thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They don't.

MR. WOOD: — Bu that doesn't prevent them from saying it here in the House and having it quoted in the Press.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, it would tend to make me out to be a rather scurrilous sort of a character. All I can say that their saying so doesn't make me on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Mr. Speaker, I want to go on a little further on some of the other remarks that were said, also by the Hon. Member for Lumsden. He said that the cities were foolish to co-operate with the Government. He said it several times but I don't have the notation too clearly, but they were guilty of collusion with the Government. Again, it had quite a familiar ring to me, as I say it went back about 11 years when I heard that sort of thing being said during the Medicare discussion, when the KODs were saying that the doctors and the people of the province should not obey the Government. They counselled rebelling, they counselled going against what the Government had to say.

And what was said here in the House yesterday sounded to me like very much the same thing. It had a very familiar ring to it.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked, as I have said before, to both the mayors of these large cities and they have both

assured me of the co-operation of the councils in this regard.

Mayor Walker has said that they expect laws to be obeyed and they will obey ours. I think that I have respect for the mayors of these cities. I know that they are law abiding people that will respect the laws of this province. I can't say I have that much respect for those people who counsel that they should not obey the laws of the province.

MR. McPHERSON: — Did he say that?

MR. WOOD: — Wait until you get the transcript on this.

Mr. Speaker, it is also said that I have failed to consult with the cities. I want to say that a few days ago — I just forget in regard to which Bill — but the Hon. Members were giving some Ministers on this side of the House a bad time because they had gone to certain organizations with material that had not yet been introduced in the House. Well, now you can't have it both ways. I can say in this regard that I did have some consultations with the cities and SUMA on this. I told the Mayor of Regina, months ago, that this sort of thing was under discussion. I did have quite detailed discussions with the Mayor of Saskatoon. The Attorney General and I were up and visited with him and discussed it with him some months or so ago.

But since the material has been introduced in the House, since the Act was given First Reading in the House, we have had a good deal of discussion with the cities. We met with the SUMA representatives and representatives of both the large cities. Some of the Cabinet met with them and we had good forthright discussion in regard to the amendments to these Acts.

MR. McPHERSON: — Did they ask for a vote?

MR. WOOD: — Well, they wanted several things. We don't say that we did everything that they asked, but you can't say that we didn't have discussions with them.

At that meeting it was decided that we would have discussions with their staff in regard to these amendments. Now the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has held me up to ridicule in regard to having so many amendments brought into the House. You can't have it both ways, again. Did we have consultation or didn't we? Or did we have consultation with them that had no effect? This shows here that we did consult with them and we have a number of changes.

My staff will assure him that these changes were not necessary to make this a tidy act. These changes, there are two or three here, that were matters of policy, admittedly. We went to the two cities; we sat down and talked to them and found out what they felt was really going to be detrimental in this Bill, and we took two things out. One is in regard to having to have a door to door enumeration this year and the other was in regard to the terms of office of the mayors and aldermen for this year.

There are some other changes which my people maintain are

May 3, 1973

simply for the matter of clarification and I will agree with the Hon. Member for Athabasca, the people on my staff do know municipal law. And they don't make mistakes along those lines. There are times when things are said in other parts of the Act that they maintain they don't need to be repeated throughout the Act. And in regard to every amendment that is brought in, and some of these amendments are simply the clarification to make sure that there can be no misunderstanding. My people maintain that there was no need for misunderstanding. Some of these are simply along these lines. There are others in here that were some small matters that the staff of these two cities thought would be desirable to have in and we agreed with them and put them in.

I think that these six pages that we have here, instead of showing poor draftsmanship, shows good faith on the part of the Government in consulting with the cities in regard to these Bills.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few more items that I want to mention. It has been said by the Members opposite that we are afraid to have a plebiscite, that we won't allow cities to make their own decision on it. What we are simply saying here, Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times, we are not saying that they cannot have a plebiscite; they have had two or three plebiscites on it. We said that instead of having more plebiscites without having any illustration of what it is all about, we say, let's put it in for four years and then the proof of the pudding is the eating.

And all this matter of publicity and education that the Hon. Member was speaking about this morning that should be necessary, we feel that by simply putting this into effect for four years will have that effect and that the people will get to know the benefits and the failures of the divisional system. Inside of four years they will have the answers. They will know from experience what it is all about. They will be able to vote — I don't want to use the word more intelligently — but they will vote as people who have tried the thing and not vote as people who have heard or read something in the paper about it. I think that this is worthwhile. I think that it is worth the effort to endeavour to have this type of illustration given to the people of these two cities on this.

I want to say, that I am not saying that the governments of Regina and Saskatoon are not good governments. I don't think that anything has been said here, and I don't think that anything can be said that they are not good governments. But, I think that they are acting the best they can under the system on which they were set up. It is not their fault that they are all living in one corner of the city. It is not their fault that we don't have representation in every part of the city for the people to go to some one person with their troubles and have one person responsible to them for that area. It is the fault of the legislation that has been in effect in that regard. I am not here to say that we are saying that the cities of Saskatoon and Regina do not have good municipal government.

Mr. Speaker, there are a good many more things that I had marked down here, but I think that they have been fairly well covered by the speakers on this side. I have already moved second reading on this Bill, and I think from what I have said,

there is little doubt that I will be supporting my own motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

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

YEAS — 35

Messieurs

Blakeney	Michayluk	Richards
Dyck	Byers	Faris
Meakes	Whelan	Cody
Wood	Kwasnica	Gross
Smishek	Carlson	Feduniak
Romanow	Engel	Mostoway
Bowerman	Owens	Comer
Kramer	Robbins	Hanson
Larson	Tchorzewski	Feschuk
Baker	Cowley	Kaeding
MacMurchy	Taylor	Flasch
Pepper	Matsalla	

NAYS — 13

Messieurs

Steuart	MacDonald	McPherson
Coupland	(Milestone)	MacDonald
Loken	McIsaac	(M. Jaw N.)
Guy	Gardner	Wiebe
Grant	Weatherald	MacLeod

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. G. MacMURCHY (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you, and to the Members of this House a Grade Seven and Eight class from the elementary school at Guernsey. Guernsey is in the northwest corner of Last Mountain constituency. They are accompanied by their principal and teacher, Mr. Wayne Bush and some fine citizens of the Guernsey community. We welcome them all here to the Session. We hope that they will have a very enjoyable trip and we hope they have a very enjoyable visit in Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

BRENDA ZAKRESKI — PAGE GIRL

MR. SPEAKER: — Before we call the next item of business I should like to — if the House will allow my indulgence for a few moments.

I wish to advise the House that Brenda Zakreski, our Page Girl, is leaving this evening. So we will be without Brenda for the balance of this Session. I think on behalf of all the Members I should like to express to her the appreciation of the Members for the service they have had from Brenda and the other three Pages.

May 3, 1973

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I have received a lot of compliments on the Pages this year.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 10:13 o'clock p.m.