

the user group is clear, reasonable and non-discriminatory, and, therefore, would be valid to apply in any zoning district which defines that the 'use' of land shall be for 'housing for the elderly'.

We feel that the same is true with respect to the definition of 'users' such as special care homes and student housing because in defining these 'uses' of land the reference to the 'users' is clear and non-discriminatory.

I would also point out that the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code does, in certain circumstances, allow housing authorities or landlords to discriminate on the basis of age."

RECOMMENDATION: that the above information be received.

ADOPTED.

Attachment 1

Section C - General Administration and Finance

C1) Local Government Elections Review Committee
(File No. C. 265-1)

The membership of the Local Government Elections Review Committee consists of the City Commissioner, City Clerk, City Assessor (representing the City) and the Directors of Education, and Board Secretaries representing the two School Boards. The Committee met on November 1, 1982, for the purpose of determining a cost-sharing arrangement for future voting. The following proposals were considered:

1. Cost-Sharing Involving All Three Jurisdictions

A net taxable property assessment based cost-sharing formula for future Municipal/School Boards election costs is presented below:

$$E_i = \frac{N_i}{\sum N_i} \times 100$$

Where i = the jurisdiction(s) (Public School, Separate School, Municipal) involved in the election.

E_i = the percentage share of the total actual election costs (includes Voting and Voters' Lists expenditures).

N = the current net taxable assessment of the particular jurisdiction(s) involved in the election.

$\sum N_i$ = the summation of the net taxable assessments of the particular jurisdiction(s) involved in the election.

An example of the application of this formula to the current election follows:

i = all three jurisdictions, Public and Separate School Boards and Municipal.

Saskatoon, Monday, November 15, 1982

1982 Property Assessment

N (Public School) =		\$339,940,800
N (Separate School) =		126,742,110
N (Municipal) =		466,682,910
$\sum N_i =$		<u>\$933,365,820</u>
E (Public School) =	$\frac{339,940,800}{933,365,820} \times 100 =$	36.4%
E (Separate School) =	$\frac{126,742,110}{933,365,820} \times 100 =$	13.6%
E (Municipal) =	$\frac{466,682,910}{933,365,820} \times 100 =$	<u>50.0%</u>
		<u>100.0%</u>

Applying these percentages to the approved 1982 estimates for Voting and Voters' Lists which total \$238,800, would result in the following cost sharing:

Public School:	\$238,800 x 36.4% =	\$ 86,900
Separate School:	238,800 x 13.6% =	32,500
Municipal:	238,800 x 50.0% =	<u>119,400</u>

Total Election expenditures (1982 Approved Estimate)		<u>\$238,800</u>
---	--	------------------

2. Costs Involving One Jurisdiction Only

In the case of a single jurisdiction, all costs would be the responsibility of that jurisdiction.

3. Costs Involving The Two School Boards Only

The application of the net taxable property assessment formula would result in both School Boards sharing all costs accordingly.

The net taxable property assessment would be that indicated on the revised roll, and confirmed by the Court of Revision, in the year in which the voting takes place.

The Committee is continuing its study of the situation where the City and one School Board are involved. With the municipal ward system, the City may possibly require less polling places than the School Board, to a cost disadvantage to the City. The Committee will be reporting on this situation in due course.

RECOMMENDATION: that City Council approve of the cost-sharing arrangement as detailed above.

ADOPTED.

C2) Enquiry - Alderman Dayday (November 1, 1982)
Report on postponement of election for Mayor
and Aldermen due to death of candidate - Local