

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
10th Day

February 17, 1969.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — May I introduce through you to this Assembly a group of students from John Lake school which is located in the Avalon area of Saskatoon, and is named after one of the pioneers of Saskatoon. I know that you join, Mr. Speaker, and all Members will join in hoping that these students enjoy their visit this afternoon and find it profitable and have a safe journey on their homeward return.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly a group of students from Wood Mountain. They represent from grade 7 to grade 12. They are situated in the top two rows. To those of you who know something about early Saskatchewan history, Wood Mountain will be a name that you will have read about and remembered. These students go to school within four miles of where the original North West Mounted Police post was built in 1874 and was there until 1918. During that time Sitting Bull and the Sioux Warriors were situated there after the massacre of Colonel Custer. At one time in this area they had over 5,000 Indians camped in this area.

I would like to congratulate their teachers Mr. Waldie and Mr. Tataryn for bringing them in today. We hope that they are going to have a very pleasant and rewarding afternoon.

Before I take my seat, I spent some time trying to locate this group. I was in the Library looking for them and somebody said, "That must have been the group that was in here awhile ago." He said, "I would like to compliment this group because they seemed to be more interested and better behaved than most groups that come into the Library." I would like to congratulate the students on that.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I am sure the Assembly joins with me in wishing them a very safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO PREMIER THATCHER

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I am sure that all the Members of the House on

both sides will join with me in saying welcome to the Premier as he returns to his seat in the Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I can say to the Premier that we missed him. To be perfectly honest about it, at times I can say we didn't mind missing him. All of us will hope that his return does mean that he is fully recovered from his disability a little while ago from his sickness and wish him well in that respect.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MISQUOTED FIGURES — LEADER POST

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to mention that I have been misquoted in this morning's issue of the Leader Post, February 17th, regarding figures on the cost of hospital utilization fees. I prefer, Mr. Speaker, not to associate it with the quoted figures. Also, Mr. Speaker, an error in a statement attributed to me in the Saturday, February 15th issue, in the speech from the Member of Regina North East. I would ask for a correction from the Leader Post.

ANNOUNCEMENT

50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to rise and call the attention of the Members of this Assembly to a most important and noteworthy milestone in the history and development of human relations. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, today to the 50th Anniversary of the International Labour Organization. This is somewhat hard to understand in view of the fact that Canada has been closely allied with its growth since the formation of the organization. Indeed Canada's attendance at the first ILO Conference 50 years ago marked this country's first independent participation at an international conference. Thus our membership in the ILO is linked with our emergence as a full-fledged nation of the world. Moreover, Canada's ties with the ILO were re-enforced on the strength of the fact that the organization survived World War II, on the basis of the refuge it found in Montreal during the war and the early post-war years.

The International Labour Organization was founded by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 as a means of contributing to universal and lasting peace and the promotion of social justice. The International Labour Organization, Mr. Speaker, is one of the few League of Nations bodies which survived the Second World War and in 1946 became the first specialized agency associated with the United Nations.

The primary aim of the organization throughout its existence has been to bring governments, employers, workers together to freely debate and resolve their most critical differences and problems by discussions and agreements, and in this way to set up basic labor standards intended to protect the mutual working and living conditions all over the world. It is the only

February 17, 1969

international, inter-governmental, tripartite organization in which the employer and the employee are equally represented with governments.

The International Labour Code as developed by ILO since 1919 includes nearly 300 instruments which set forth basic world standards in the field of industrial relations, employment conditions, social security, human rights, vocational training, labor standards and industrial safety.

Annual conferences serve as the world forum where government, employer and worker representatives of 118 member nations meet to discuss and resolve their most urgent problems. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has been well represented on the Canadian delegation to these conferences over the years. Other tripartite meetings of world experts develop code safety practice, training courses for management and worker, commissions to investigate complaints of violation of fundamental rights, conferences to standardize world labor techniques, agreements to protect special employee groups and so on. In addition to the setting of employment standards the new problems and challenges presented by today's technologically oriented world of works have caused the ILO in recent years to initiate operational and educational projects, such as the provision of technical assistance in underdeveloped areas and the establishment of specialized technical institutes.

The ILO in 1969 will adopt a world employment program, the objective of which is to provide for every person opportunities for jobs and skills of value to his community and reward for himself. You notice that Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is taking great steps in this area. This program was given its first impetus by the Ottawa Plan for Human Resources Development adopted in September 1966, and the ILO American Regional Conference in Ottawa which I was privileged to attend. An ambitious plan for anniversary celebrations in Canada has been developed by the Federal and Provincial Governments, and national employer and employee organizations.

One of the important events to take place in this connection will be a tripartite conference in Ottawa later this year, at which government representatives will meet with the employers, and employees, and other industrial relations experts to discuss frankly the removal or obstacles of the ratifications of additional ILO Conventions.

Unfortunately largely on the basis of the Federal-Provincial constitutional difficulties Canada has been able only to ratify 24 of the 128 conventions, each of which sets standards which ratifying countries commit themselves to adopt by legislation. There is a growing awareness in Canada on the part of governments, employers and employees that a need exists to implement more of the basic ILO standards throughout all legislative jurisdictions and in this way promote the just society for all who earn a living in this country, regardless of region, race or occupation. Again we should commend the Government of this Province for the steps it has taken in that direction.

Many other special programs are scheduled, including university industrial relations conferences on an ILO theme, radio and television programs, special articles in magazines and newspapers, a travelling exhibition, essay contests, the issuance of an ILO commemorative stamp, and so on. Two assistance

programs are planned by Canada for the anniversary year; the promotion and support of a multi-functional Caribbean Regional Centre to train labor relations administrators and a contribution of experts and grants to the ILO World Employment Program.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, it is an honor and a privilege for me to join with the Prime Minister of Canada, my counterparts in other provinces and officials in approximately 100 countries of the world in paying tribute to the great organization on its anniversary year. May I conclude by expressing the hope that every Saskatchewan citizen will mark this historic occasion by endeavoring to become more familiar with the work of the ILO and by supporting in every way possible the principles embodied in the ILO motto, "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere."

I regret that I have held the House so long on this very important subject, but I thought it should be mentioned to everyone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — May I very briefly say that I am pleased and so are the Members on this side of the House, to join with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) in greeting the 50th Anniversary of the International Labour Organization. As the Minister has suggested this inspiring world body, which is representative of employers, employees and governments, has made an enormous contribution to the welfare of working people and society in general. I think it is a matter of pride for the labor movement that the formation of the ILO in 1919 was the result of deliberations and a series of meetings that were headed by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labour, a name very well-known I am sure to Members of this House.

The membership of the International Labour Organization has increased to 117 in the last year, 1968. Its comprehensive activities include perhaps as the most important feature, and the Minister of Labour has already referred to this, the approval of conventions which member countries are asked to adopt and to adhere to. These conventions have resulted in the upgrading and the improvement of income, working conditions, safety, benefits and security in general. The significance is that there has been a universal raising of decent standards for people across the world as the result of the work of the ILO. I would recommend, Mr. Speaker, and it is especially appropriate for us on this anniversary year of the ILO that Saskatchewan would adopt many of the ILO conventions which have to this time been followed and adopted by the International Labour Organization. This is surely the most tangible recognition we can give to the spirit and the purpose of this great international organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is organizations like the ILO which by their persistence and continuous and progressive steps taken in co-operation by the many member countries that have given us a better basis for the eventual realization of world-wide peace, harmony and good will. Let us in Saskatchewan attempt to do our best to live up to these fine ideals and accomplishments.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

DOMINION HIGH SCHOOL CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP PLAYOFFS

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Saskatchewan residents and Members of this House, if they are not already aware of it, are proud to know that today Saskatchewan is hosting the Dominion High School Curling Championship playoffs. People of the Battlefords and North Battleford are especially proud that we are the host city. The 44 clean-cut young men arrived in North Battleford this weekend and they will be battling for the Canadian Championship throughout this week.

At this time I would like to thank the Government of Saskatchewan for hosting a banquet for them on Wednesday evening. I think that this is fitting when we have a national event that the Government should make this gesture. We are pleased in North Battleford that they have. I am sure too that this type of thing, this type of sport is going to go a long way to bring provinces closer together and help to make all of us better acquainted and better Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

A DEBATE ON COMPOSITION OF PROCEDURAL COMMITTEES

MOTION — STANDING ORDERS AND PROCEDURES OF THIS ASSEMBLY

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — I move seconded by Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):

That a Special Committee consisting of Mr. Speaker as Chairman plus eight Members, to be named at a later date, be appointed to consider and report from time to time upon the advisability of making changes in the Standing Orders and procedures of this Assembly;

That this Special Committee be empowered to sit after prorogation of the Legislature during the inter-sessional period;

That this Special Committee be instructed to include in its reports drafts of proposed Standing Orders drawn to give effect, if adopted by the Assembly, to any change or changes that may be proposed by the Committee; and

That this Special Committee be further instructed to submit its final report to the Assembly not later than the tenth sitting day of the next ensuing session.

Mr. W.S. Howes (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on the motion before us, I am reminded of what Winston Churchill once said, I believe, "Democracy is a terrible form of government, but it is the best yet devised by man."

A democratic form of government, Sir, is typified by our Assemblies and our Parliaments. To make the Parliament and Assemblies work we have to have rules. I have felt since being a Member of this Assembly that contrary to the opinions of many, our business is conducted with dispatch and the right of Members to speak is not infringed upon. However, Sir, as the years go

on changes become necessary. Modern communication and transportation call for change. The need for change is evident all through our society and I believe that some changes are necessary here. I do not believe that changes in the rules governing the operation of this Assembly can be made unilaterally by the Government side. I feel that changes must be by the Assembly as a whole and I can think of no better way to study the changes that might be necessary than by the appointment of the Committee that is proposed by this motion. I, Sir, do not look for radical changes in the rules, but I do look for improvements, if this committee is established. It is certainly my intention to support this motion, and I trust that all other Members will do the same.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to give very hearty support to the resolution itself and the comments that the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes) made in introducing it. The resolution and his words will get a very warm response from all the Members on this side of the House.

As he has indicated, times do change. While we have got along reasonably well in the House, I think, and have been able to guarantee the basic and traditional rights of the representatives of the people here, certainly there is a good chance that we can do better if we take a hard look. This seems to be the appropriate device for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I personally have had the opportunity of seeing the rules work from two sides, over there and over here. I think Members opposite may be a little better prepared in a few years when they have a chance to see them work from over here as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Don't hold your breath!

Mr. Lloyd: — In the meantime I am the first to admit that there are changes in one's point of view which do come about as a result of a new and sometimes refreshing kind of experience.

I want to say a word or two about what I hope the Government has in mind and will have in mind in setting up a study. I hope that it is not conceived that the work of the Committee will be restricted by any sort of narrow interpretation of the Rules or any just technical working aspects of the rules.

If I may, I would like to take a few minutes to put on record some of the feelings with respect to the possible scope of our study. It seems to me that what we are aiming to do, and the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley has suggested this, is to find a more effective way of discussing the public business to the extent that we here are charged with that discussion. One can put it another way. We are looking for the best means of making the most profitable use of the time and the talent of the Members of the Legislature. I hope that in doing that we consider the words of the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley who spoke of improvements in communications and changes in

communication. I hope we are also looking for ways in which we as Members of the Legislature can communicate better with the public. When we are making decisions here we need an opportunity to be better instructed as to what the public thinks and feels about measures. I also hope that we may have an opportunity to pass on our point of view and our interpretation more effectively to the public than perhaps our present rules and procedures enable us to do.

All Hon. Members know there has been a very extensive discussion of this whole matter in the House of Commons in recent months. Some of us at least have had an opportunity of reading some of the discussions there and some of it is very worthwhile reading. One of the Members there speaking reviewed suggestions made by the writer Bagehot (I am told that is the right way to express it, and I should have discussed it with the Clerk) in a book written many years ago called, "The English Constitution." Bagehot sets out in this book a number of the functions of Parliament, which of course apply to legislatures across the country. He pointed out that one of the functions was what could be called 'an expressive function,' that is, the Members of the Legislature are expected and required indeed to express the mind of the people on all matters which come before us. I think we can do things which will put us in a better position to express the mind of the people on matters which come before us.

A second function he referred to was a teaching function. By this, I think he meant the responsibility of MLAs to help people understand what legislation is about. Passing the law is one thing. The law never really becomes fully operative until it is understood by large numbers of people throughout the area.

He speaks thirdly of an informing function which is I would think much the same. The point I want to make is, that if we are going to carry out an informing function, then we have first of all to be well informed ourselves. This means that we may have to use new methods. It means that there may well have to be new opportunities for inquiry which presently we do not have. I think here, Sir, of the kind of research staff and the kind of research opportunity which is available to Members of the Legislature.

In order to do these, I hope that the Government is thinking about how we can make more complete use of committees in the House, both during the session and between sessions. I would be apprehensive indeed, if there is any thought that the Committee would be restricted so that we couldn't discuss that sort of thing, that somebody on the Government side would indicate that to us, before we finish the discussion here.

I think that in particular there is a good case to be made for the use of inter-session committees which will meet at places other than just in Regina. May I give two examples of how I think there would be some benefit to this. This would be a way in which we could carry out both the function of equipping ourselves to express the point of view of the people and our function of being informants for the public generally. I think particularly of the matter of consumer difficulties. The consumer is certainly a group which is becoming more and more recognized and thankfully more and more articulate. I think it would be worthwhile if we had a committee which would meet in

various places in the province at various times in the year. People would then have removed some of the barriers of geography which prevent them from talking face to face with Members of the Legislature.

We have this very serious problem of safety on our highways. A committee of the Legislature might well regularly meet in parts of the province outside of the city of Regina, and hear there what people have to say about this problem and their suggestions about it. I use these only, Mr. Speaker, as examples. I hope this is the sort of thing which can be discussed in the Committee.

I think too that it would be well for us to look at the way in which we carry out a discussion which we are going to embark on or be embarked on tomorrow, namely, that of the Budget. The pattern in our House has been to have our debate about the Budget, take a vote on whether or not the Budget was approved. Following that we go into a detailed discussion of the Estimates. In fact, we haven't as yet had an opportunity to learn much about the proposals which the Budget document contains. I wonder if it wouldn't be well to think about a shorter initial Budget Debate, leave it in abeyance, then follow by a discussion of the Estimates when we might admittedly have some more speeches, but shorter ones and more to the point and leave the conclusion of the Budget Debate until such time as we have concluded our discussion of the Estimates and then have, I think, a much more meaningful vote on the Budget following a much more meaningful discussion of the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do is simply to outline some of the scope of the inquiry. I am not quite clear from the resolution but I hope that things like this will not be excluded by whatever terms of reference are subsequently developed. On the whole picture, Mr. Speaker, may I simply again say that we on this side of the House welcome the resolution and will look forward to an opportunity of taking part with the Members from the other side of the House in discussion of this very important topic indeed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

THE ELECTIONS ACT

Hon. D.G. Mr. Steuart (Deputy Premier): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) I would move, seconded by the Hon. Premier (Mr. W.R. Thatcher):

That a Special Committee of nine Members, to be named at a later date, be appointed to consider the advisability of simplifying the procedures established under The Election Act, (Chapter 4, R.S.S. 1965) and to report thereon with recommendations;

That this Special Committee be empowered to sit after prorogation of the Legislature and during the inter-sessional period;

That this Special Committee be further empowered to engage legal counsel and such advisers and assistants as may be required, and in addition, if considered necessary or desirable, to request the assistance of staff employed by departments or agencies of the Government;

That this Special Committee be instructed to submit its report together with draft Bills embodying its recommendations to the Government on behalf of the Assembly on or before December 31, 1969, in order to facilitate action being taken upon any recommendation it may desire to make arising out of its consideration of the matter referred to it, the said report to be submitted to the Assembly not later than the 10th sitting day of the next ensuing session.

Mr. R.A. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Government on the introduction of this motion for the overhauling and updating of The Elections Act and The Controverted Elections Act. I think that Members on both sides of the House are very pleased that this motion has come forth at this time. Perhaps I might say that since the announcement was made by the Government, I took the trouble to quickly thumb through The Elections Act. I found that it had been updated a good deal in 1965. The procedures regarding absentee voting and so on have been made a good deal simpler. However, there are many areas in The Elections Act that could stand further review, updating and streamlining, as the motion says, simplifying the procedures so that the public is better served when an election is being held in the province.

I would hope to see (and I don't know at this time what the terms of reference are going to be) that some of the following subjects would be discussed, and I'm sure they will be touched on; that is, whether the time between the issue of the writ and the date of election can be cut down further than the present 34 days. Also, I hope the matter of the number and complexity of the forms would be discussed with a view to reducing the number, making it more simple and thereby also reducing the cost. A very important section, and probably peculiar only to The Elections Act of Saskatchewan, is the section wherein on the ballots the name of the political party is designated as well as the name of the candidate. This is not the practice in the Federal system and I don't think it is the practice in the British system. It is peculiar to this province. Perhaps this matter should also be discussed in view of the political parties which change their names and ones which appear and disappear, and so on. It certainly could do with a thorough review.

Preparation of the Voters' Lists in a different manner might be another subject which would come in for scrutiny, whether the Federal practice of sending a printed voters' list to each family is a better system than the present one which we have in our Act. Then, of course, there are the rules of residence which have to be updated from time to time. Accepting what is a legibly marked ballot is always a point of contention at every election.

Perhaps the overhauling of The Controverted Elections Act is by far the more important of the two Acts. It seems now in two elections that, for almost half the time that the Legislature

sits, some Members are never sure whether they really are a Member of the Legislature or not. I think that The Controverted Elections Act — I hope that this is in the terms of reference — can be considered in such detail that there will be some certainty within a very limited time after the polling is held by which a Member knows whether he is a Member or not.

I am very, very happy and very pleased to lend all the support I can to this House for the passage of this motion which will, as the terms say, simplify the election procedures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, as you're aware, I've experienced some difficulties with The Elections Act. In fact, it is now a year and a half, since I have been declared elected and there is still an appeal in the Appeal Court waiting final disposition of the election in the Nipawin constituency.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to speak in support of the resolution asking for a committee to be appointed for the specific purpose of bringing to the Legislature recommendations regarding the revision of The Saskatchewan Election Act and The Controverted Elections Act.

I think it is apparent to all of us that there are some discrepancies in the present regulations. It is not reasonable that it should take from one election to another to finalize the election of candidates. In fact, right now there are still two Provincial constituency elections to be finalized. Of course during the last Legislature the Member for Canora (Gordon Romuld) sat in the Legislature for three sittings before he was finally declared elected.

Mr. Speaker, the long delays and final decisions are in no way fair to the electors, to the defeated candidate or to the elected candidate. Regulations and definitions of the present Election Act were suitable for the days when people were of a permanent residence and knew one another quite well. Since World War II living conditions, living arrangements and community life have changed constantly. Migration of rural people to cities, industrial development, have encouraged people to move from one area to another. Increased attendance at universities and of course the concentration of health services in the cities have all contributed to the creation of very many, complex election problems.

Mr. Speaker, the previous Government imposed regulations in The Election Act to provide for transferred ballots. The regulations only served, at that time, to add to the confusion and to further delay the election proceedings and final count. My experience with the election regulations, court hearings and delay in proceedings indicates that the clarification of terms and more precise regulations are needed. It is important that Saskatchewan people have an Election Act that is easily understood and adaptable to modern-day living conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is urgent that a general overhaul of The Election Act take place before there is another general election in Saskatchewan.

I should at this time perhaps take more time to be specific

about the needed changes, but I feel it would be more appropriate that the discussion take place in the Committee that will be established to bring in these recommendations to the Legislature. I want to assure this Legislature that I will support such a committee and work with the Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Before the debate continues any further, may I draw attention to the fact that a previous speaker did make a reference, though a slight one, to a case that is before the Courts. A case that is before the Court or which is subject to an appeal to a higher Court is not a proper subject for discussion in the Legislature, but I am sure any Member who wishes to do so may quite easily make a case by citing a case or cases that have already been settled by the Courts. If a Member chooses to refer in debate to cases which the Courts have decided finally and from which there can be no further appeal, he does not infringe upon the sub judice rule.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, may I say that I will be introducing an amendment to the proposed resolution at the conclusion of my remarks.

I want to say that I wholeheartedly concur with what has been said thus far by the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) and the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff), but I feel that they have left out a very important area respecting the review of The Elections Act and I hope that the proposed amendment will cover, in fact, that area. That is the whole question of election expenditures and the controlling of election expenditures. Mr. Speaker, as I've said, I will be making the proposed amendment at the end of the brief remarks that I have to make, but it will be to the effect that the Special Committee be also empowered to review and to advise on the best practicable way to set enforceable limits to expenditures in election campaigns. If I might, Sir, with your permission, I should like briefly to address my remarks why I think that proposed amendment is so important.

At the outset, Sir, I would like to draw the Members' attention to the difference that I think is imparted to the meaning of the resolution by this amendment. Whereas the main resolution deals only with "simplifying procedures," under the relevant statutes, the proposed amendment would have the Committee further empowered to study the entire problem, and I emphasize the word 'problem' of election expenses for candidates and political parties in Saskatchewan. In the light of today's modern world — we've been hearing that term quite frequently, especially with expenses of mass communication media, their increase and their tremendous cost thereof election expense is a more important topic of concern for electoral reform.

Mr. Speaker, it's been often said the area of election expenses for candidates and parties constitutes a complex problem which affects the very basis of our democratic system. The problem, as I said, has been magnified greatly in recent years because of the advent of mass media, and particularly television. Costs of choosing a democratic government have sky-rocketed. To illustrate the point about the fantastic costs for electioneering, I need only refer the Hon. Members to the costs of the

elections federally. In 1958, for example, costs were \$9.4 million, it's estimated. In 1962, the cost went up to \$10.8 million. In 1963, it went up to \$12.4 million and in 1965, it went up to \$12.9 or nearly \$13 million. And on top of this, one has to add the expense of free-time political broadcasts and many other, sometimes unreported expenses or expenses that get overlooked in the question of reporting them. I'm not familiar with the costs of a general provincial election but I think all the Hon. Members will agree with me that even those costs must be, by necessity, extremely high. And they've increased in recent years because, as I've said, of television, and they will continue to rise. As a result of these increased costs, democratic governments, I submit, Mr. Speaker, must ask themselves this question, "Are we pricing ourselves out of a true democracy where everyone has the opportunity, indeed, the right to be heard with respect to their views?" Now it's acknowledged, I agree, that political parties and candidates do need funds. However, there has been a mistrust respecting these funds. When Canadians often ask the question of where do our political parties obtain their campaign funds, I'm fearful that they are left with an unsavory feeling about it all and a rather unsatisfactory explanation. Now herein lies much of the complexity that I referred to earlier, namely, the duty to inform the electorate on the issues of the day on one hand as opposed on the other hand to the often conflicting suspicion that candidates and political parties receive huge, hidden sums of money in return for political favors. This traditional distrust must be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment will be offered because it is, in my view, of the utmost importance that in today's democratic world the true issues of the electorate be registered by confidence in their leaders. Also, the often overburdening influence of mass media in favor of one party over others, should and must be discontinued. All views in our society must have a chance and a right to survive, and this amendment in my view would thusly allow this proposed Special Committee that we're deliberating this afternoon to examine the entire area of election expenses. The Committee should report, in my view, Mr. Speaker, on the desirability of disclosing funds that political parties receive as well as the sources from whence those funds come.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — To me, as I have said, this is of utmost importance. May I quote, Sir, briefly from the 1966 Report of the Committee on Election Expenses. This was set up by the House of Commons and on page 35 it says this:

The disclosure of funds and their sources seems to the Committee to be indispensable if the electorate is to have confidence in the democratic system.

That Committee was made up of many very distinguished Canadians including Dr. Norman Ward of the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we read and hear much these days about control of political parties in our society. He who pays the piper calls the tune is an old but, I think, so true statement.

Members of the Liberal party opposite, for example . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . unions, Roy?

Mr. Romanow: — . . . have been frequently and loudly, — I see it's beginning to start again — claiming that members of the New Democratic party are supported by so-called labor bosses in big eastern unions. Why, last year, the Premier, and in fact he even started this afternoon just briefly, was involved. I recall, in free-swinging accusations about supposed huge sums of money being donated to the Saskatchewan New Democratic party by Eastern and American unions. More recently, the Member for Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) said something to the effect that the NDP chose to remain silent in deference to the supporters, the Eastern labor bosses and those who control them, or words to that effect.

Well, at the same time, many others have often felt that the Liberal party opposite really was a tool of a very few corporate and individual donors in Saskatchewan, and I'm not just making this observation out of the air, Mr. Speaker. One of the sources of this belief by people in Saskatchewan is the following finding by the same Committee on Election Expenses that I referred to earlier, page 232, and it said as follows:

The national Liberal party has traditionally raised the great bulk of its campaign funds from a relatively small number of donors, both individual and corporate. This has meant that fund-raising efforts have been concentrated in a few major urban centres with most of the party's funds coming from Ontario and Quebec.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, such suspicions and accusations, if they exist around the province, must and should be cleared up, if the Saskatchewan farmer and the average citizen of the province are going to be satisfied that the party he elects really represents him and not some big corporation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are prepared to have our sources and amounts of our donations a matter of public record.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, hopefully, our Special Committee will recommend that party funds and sources be made known. Then and only then will all Saskatchewan see who pays the piper and what tune is being called. I am sure that my friends opposite have nothing to hide or to fear and will be supporting the proposed amendment.

But if they should refuse, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people will only have to judge what they alone are hiding or what they are afraid of. In short, we on this side of the House challenge the Members to put their money records where their mouth is, as the saying goes, and to support the extension of the powers of this Special Committee so that hopefully some revelation of campaign sources and funds can be made.

There are many other areas of direct concern in the question of election expenses. Very briefly, for example, should there be a limitation on the expenditure of each candidate and each political party? The Election Expenses Committee, I referred to earlier, states that in its recommendation that each candidate should be prohibited from spending in excess of 10 cents per elector in his constituency, including the cost of television, newspaper, and the like. I personally feel that some direct financial limitation should be placed on all candidates and parties. This is one major way that the election contest will be based, truly, Mr. Speaker, on issues and not on slick promotions of the party that is best heeled.

Another question is whether a special tribunal or registrar should be set up to scrutinize expenditures and control the action of parties and candidates? This tribunal or registrar or whatever body, would have the right to prosecution, the right to investigation, the right to ensure that unscrupulous tactics are not being carried out. The point is that special machinery should be considered on the question of election expenses.

I should like this proposed Committee to direct its attention also to the possibility of election expenses being entirely paid out of the public treasury. Can it be said, for example, that this contest of ideas that elections supposedly are, can be placed on a more democratic footing, if sources of funds are available equally to all candidates who seek public office? The best argument advanced, in my view, is that direct state subsidies would free political parties from allegiances to private interests. Also, it would aid in the development of a better democracy.

Another question is the matter of tax incentives. That's a contradictory position. These are questions I'm throwing out for the consideration of the House when the Committee is struck. Should there be tax incentives for the elector who decides to contribute to the party of his choice? I have not made up my mind on these particular questions but they should be studied and examined by the Special Committee. The area is a difficult and complex one but an extremely important one.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed amendment will give Members the opportunity to truly come to grips with the entire problem of electoral reform. The proposed Committee must be meaningful. It should not be a committee which merely looks at some specific procedural aspects of The Elections Act but ignores the vital and important area of campaign contributions and their proper regulation in our society. We don't want the people of this province to yell "sham" at a committee which does not look at all aspects, the entire election aspect in Saskatchewan which I fear this Committee might be guilty of if Members of this House don't accept the proposed amendment.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the main resolution, I can only say that Members on this side of the House welcome the Government, the Premier and his Members to our position. Members will recall that last year it was my privilege to introduce a Resolution that called for the establishment of a special committee to do exactly the thing that this proposed resolution considers, namely, a review of The Elections Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — About one year ago, Members opposite who adopted and embraced the views now, one year later, at that time they had a somewhat dimmer outlook on the proposed Resolution. One has to ask: what made them change? Was it the Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) charm and persuasive wit in Cabinet? Was it the Minister of Welfare's (Mr. MacDonald) devastating logic and progressive thought, two traits he's been long known for? It really doesn't matter but nevertheless here they are, Mr. Speaker, one year later, speaking (if you strip all the sides), to a New Democratic party resolution and we welcome them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But, just so that we keep in proper perspective from whence this new found position springs, I should briefly like to review some of the postures taken by some of the Members opposite but one year ago. Very few took part in the debate from the Liberal ranks, you will recall, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) from Saskatoon was one, however, and he's reported on page 1160 of the Reported Debates as following. He said, and listen to this . . .

Mr. Coderre: — On a point of order, the hon. gentleman is mentioning a previous debate that's been held in this House and that is contrary to regulations. You cannot refer to a previous debate whether it was held last year. It has been said in this House and not refer specifically to a debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — On a point of order, you can't refer to a debate that took place in a previous session of the House. You can't refer to a debate that has taken place in this session of the House, but you can refer to what was said and what was done in previous debates back to 1905 if you can get back that far.

Mr. Romanow: — As I was saying, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying and just to put it in proper perspective I was quoting the words of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), as given to the Members of this House but one year ago, and he said, on page 1160:

I cannot stress too strongly the last thing needed insofar as any amendments to The Election Act or revised Election Act is concerned, is to have an inter-sessional committee where something can be done without the public knowing about it.

We all have high hopes that this Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that this Government's advocacy of this Special Committee now does not mean that it will embark on a course of conduct as the Minister (Mr. Estey) put it "where something can be done without the public knowing about it."

Then there was our ever-modest Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) who never formally entered the debate although the wisdom of his comments were recorded on the records for all posterity. At page 1161 of the Debates, from his customary seated position

which seems to be the place where he does his best thinking, he frequently interrupted the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) with taunts that were quoted as follows: ‘good lawyers win close elections’ and the like. Well, all I can ask is: will he sacrifice his concern for good lawyers — which I share from time to time — this time in order to establish a good and representative Elections Act?

Then also, Mr. Speaker, we had the wise words of wisdom from our beloved Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). At page 1168 of the Debates, the Minister heaped scorn after scorn on the Opposition and particularly myself and after having said a few words in support of the Resolution, he recited his long experience of long ago in an Elections Act debate where he said “only one amendment was allowed.” Then he said this about an inter-sessional committee:

We were so concerned we brought in a model Bill drafted by the Inter-sessional Committee and agreed to unanimously. We tabled it together with our recommendations to the House. It is since interesting to note that the work of that Inter-sessional Committee was pigeonholed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Government fails to act on most things in this province but I sincerely hope that it has, in fact, changed its attitude because I wouldn’t want the Minister’s fear of last year to come through this year and the report be pigeonholed. In very brief reference, I must — and I’m sorry he’s not present today, I know he is away on very important business — refer to the remarks of the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). I must give him credit, though, as he tackled the problem with some more academic thought. Nevertheless the Attorney General scoffed at our suggestion last year, dismissing it as follows. He said:

If we appointed an inter-sessional committee with respect to nearly every one of the Acts that are considered from time to time, why we would have a lot of inter-sessional committees.

He further said that he would be concerned if we needed this type of committee merely to deal with the administration of the Act. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what does the main resolution purport to deal with now, the administration of the Act? On a standing vote the Resolution was defeated by the Government Members opposite. However, it would appear now that our arguments aren’t as weak as the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) would want to have from time to time. We’ll be very interested to see how he votes for this New Democratic party resolution. The Liberals changed their minds rather quickly and rather often. One of my friends says that they change their minds more often than Za-Za Gabor changes husbands and it is so true, only she has more purpose for changing husbands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s it is of utmost importance that the decision of all the people be determined with dispatch. However, The Election Act must always be flexible, so that as many persons as possible are allowed to register their democratic views. This is of paramount importance. At the same time if we can obtain these results quickly and accurately, then

February 17, 1969

I think the deliberations of this Committee will be to a great part successful. It is important to remind Saskatchewan that Members on this side of the House, when they were in government, pioneered many electoral reforms and they ought not to be forgotten.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, Oh!

Mr. Romanow: — Oh, don't say, "Oh." The vote was given to 18 years of age citizens. Take them away? Of course they wouldn't! That was our electoral reform and it was done by the CCF when we were in power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Provisions were also made for people who were unable to get to the polling station, hospital polls, also to the advanced polls. These were electoral reforms. It is correct to say that as time goes by some of these reforms are obsolete. Like all things they need review and change and I presume that is one of the reasons why this Committee is being set up. Imperfections have arisen in The Election Act and The Controverted Elections Act that simply aren't consonant with today's technology. I feel it is most important that Members of this House decide the principle of the resolution and try to avoid discussion in detail of what they would like to see the proposed Acts involve, so that those Members who serve on a committee can do so with open-mindedness. But may I be allowed the indulgence of Members to make briefly some general observations about the directions that I would hope this Committee would go in tackling the review. It will be very brief.

Firstly, The Election Act should at all times be flexible, and sufficiently malleable to permit the true will of the people to be heard as I said. We should shy away from proposed reforms that strait-jacket the electoral process in a manner that limits or makes it more difficult for citizens to exercise their ballots. Such things as a permanent voters' list, I think, have great dangers. They tend to rigidify the election process and take away from the flexibility that I talk of.

Secondly, there should be consideration given to the incorporation of broad and extensive remedial provisions. It can be used by the average person who works under the Act. The present legislation is a legal jungle whereby legal contests and technicalities often thwart true intentions. Specific remedial relief must be written into The Election Act or courts are going to rule that they are powerless to allow any of these changes on their own. It seems to me that we must have this remedial power in order to allow the average voter, the candidate, the political party, if they make an inadvertent error or technical mistake, to amend the error, to make the changes so that in fact it will be properly heard and so that all people will have a chance to have their arguments before the electorate.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that there is a place for the judiciary in the future Election Act. But as I have already stated, there must be a special section that will clearly define when a court can and should act as an appellate. We all have faith and confidence in the courts. I advocate this right of judicial review, knowing full well that its institution

means to a certain degree a new set of legal criteria and thus a new set of implications and complications and technicalities that may thwart the will of the people. But again, with proper wording, the key word is 'flexibility' and these provisions can be properly incorporated.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the thesis of my proposition this afternoon has been that democracy must not be stopped on mere legal technicality. Above all we must not allow this Committee to propose recommendations that will allow the democratic wishes of the majority to be determined by luck or by inadvertence.

Mr. Speaker, I have already made my points respecting the review of the election expenses and the proposed amendment. If we approach the proposed review and the spirit of co-operation and open-minded frankness, as I'm sure Members on this side of the House are, all Saskatchewan will be the winner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose an amendment to Motion No. 2, seconded by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), the amendment to read as follows:

Insert after the word "recommendations" in the first paragraph the following words:

"And further that this Special Committee be empowered to review and to advise on the best practicable way to set enforceable limits to expenditures in election campaigns."

I will urge Members to adopt the Resolution as amended.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a very few words on the amendment. I want to reserve my right to speak on the motion itself if debate continues on this. I simply want to highlight once again what is sought to be done by this amendment. There are really three problems with respect to election expenses: there is a matter of disclosure of election expenses, the matter of limiting the amount of election expenses, and the matter of whether or not some or all of those election expenses should be provided from public funds. I may say incidentally that it seems to me very nearly self-evident that the election expenses provisions in The Election Act ought to be reviewed. It may be that we wouldn't need an amendment to do that. I would venture to guess that all of us who have filled in a report on our election expenses have wondered, and have done a little bit more than wonder, whether the report was right. This is particularly true if you happen to sit for a multi-member riding such as one in Regina or Saskatoon, where a lot of the expenses are shared expenses or pooled expenses and where it is very difficult indeed to say what expenses ought to be attributed to Constituency A and what to Constituency B., when television shows are shared, leaflets are shared and perhaps joint meetings are held.

Turning back to the three points which I suggested ought to be considered, if we're realistic in saying that we are going to consider our electoral expenses, there are then these three questions: disclosure, limit, and source. I do suggest that in a democratic society the people are entitled to know the source of election expenses. I know that allegations are made from time to time, and I think there is a good deal of

February 17, 1969

truth in some of the allegations about where election expenses come from. We on this side of the House are willing to indicate to the House or to the public or to anyone else who wants to know where our money comes from, how much of it comes from trade unions, how much of it comes from corporations and how much of it comes from individuals. We feel that other parties would be prepared to do the same. I don't think any of us have that much to hide, and accordingly I don't think any of us is in any position to resist a proposal that there be disclosure of the sources of election funds.

The question of whether or not there should be a limit is, I think, one which equally ought to commend itself to the House. I don't think we should put elections up to the highest bidder. I think they are seeing the problems of that in the United States at this time, not so much at the level of the actual election, but at the level of the primaries, of seeking the nomination. It now is becoming reasonably obvious that only a person with very substantial sources of income can contest his party's nomination for the presidency. There were some suggestions of that during both the Liberal and the Conservative leadership campaigns, and no doubt there will be equal suggestions of it if, as, and when other parties including our own have a leadership campaign. I make no suggestion that one party is the repository of all of the virtues. I want to suggest very forcefully that this is a problem which concerns every party and no party ought to take unto itself the mantle of being holier-than-thou. I want to say that I believe there ought to be limits to election expenses and I believe that any adequate analysis and examination of our election procedures will include an analysis of this. It may be that it isn't practical. It may be that we can't cut off a provincial political party from its federal counterpart. It may be that it can't be done, I'm not saying that it necessarily can be done. But I suggest the Committee ought to have a look at it.

The third point I am raising is whether or not any part of the funds ought to come from public funds. Here again I think that the answer is, Yes. There have been many experiments along this line. Members will be aware, if my memory serves me right, that this is done in Great Britain and it is done in the Province of Quebec. I don't know whether we would want to hold up the Province of Quebec's election procedures as our model, but I think there are lessons to be gained everywhere. I think that this is a suitable area for a committee to look into. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that all Members of the House ought to support the amendment, not with any idea that we are somehow going to reveal dark secrets which are now deeply shrouded, but with the idea that the public ought to know — within limits, obviously, because citizens have some right to privacy and obviously a bit of weighing of interests has to be done — that the public has a right to know where there is some limit on the amount of money which can be spent in order to seek public office. And I'm suggesting that the public has an interest in seeing that some of these funds are provided from public funds where the source and the amount are open for all to see. With these considerations in mind, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the amendment ought to commend itself to all Members of the House.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment proposes as follows:

“That this Special Committee be empowered to review and to advise on the best practicable way to set enforceable limits to expenditures in election campaigns.” I think the main province or the main governmental area, which has tried such an experiment, has been in the Province of Quebec. Hon. Members will recall that it commenced paying election expenses from public funds. It has also tried to limit the amount of expenditures that could be spent in any particular campaign. I have discussed the success or otherwise that Quebec has encountered, with former Premier Lesagé and former Premier Johnson. They both felt that paying certain expenses from public funds had worked fairly well. On the other hand, they both told me that putting a ceiling on expenditures simply hadn't worked out. They hadn't been very successful in finding a practical way to limit election expenses. I don't think there is any doubt in the world that some time in the future we are going to have to try and find ways of limiting expenditures. Because with television, radio, and newspaper advertising going up the way that they have been going up, it's most difficult to find the finances that a party needs in a campaign. Thus I can't see very much wrong with this amendment. It would as I say permit the Committee to look into the picture and see if there is a practical way of improvement. I don't see any harm in the Committee trying, and on behalf of the Government I accept the amendment.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say very much about this resolution but I do have a couple of thoughts that I would like to pass on to the House in this regard.

First of all, I don't like to be suspect of the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and I certainly hope that I'm not being by questioning his remarks today on this particular speech in the House. It reminds the Members on this side of the House of Tiny Tim tip-toeing through the tulips. But there are a couple of suggestions on this resolution that I have to make. They are two very strong objections that I have to the method in which the NDP collects its election funds and I would hope that this Committee will be able to have a look at them. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I object very strenuously to compulsory contributions to any political party. I don't like the thought, Mr. Speaker, of my daughter or my son going out in the next year or two and obtaining a job and being forced to support the political party, the Socialists or the NDP, not because they believe in that political party, not because they agree with its policies, not because they accept its programs, but because of the vocation that they choose. I think Mr. Speaker, that this is a terrible indictment first of all of the Socialists and second of all of our political system. Therefore, I would hope that this particular Committee would evaluate these matters.

I agree with this amendment and I'm going to support it. I would hope that this Committee would look into the avenue of compulsory contributions to a political party. We in Canada are supposed to have a freedom of choice to vote or support a political party of our own choice. The Socialists or the NDP in Canada force people because of the vocation or the job and the union that they belong to support it by compulsory check-offs. I would hope that they would examine this area.

Second of all, Mr. Speaker, one of the things, that bothered me very much in 1967 and 1964 when I had the opportunity to run

in Saskatchewan for membership of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly, was the fact that I used to watch on television members of the Socialist party and Members of the Liberal party debating the issues of the day. No sooner would the Liberals spend his five minutes and the Socialists spend his five minutes then the union would come on and spend a half an hour spending money contributed by the union members for political education. Who do these unions belong to? Are they independent people examining and scrutinizing the issues of the day or the political problems that belong to Saskatchewan or Canada? No, Mr. Speaker, they are dedicated Socialists and Members of the NDP who are not only extolling the problems of the unions but are deliberately presenting a political broadcast with union funds, collected for political education. How, Mr. Speaker, does a limit on the amount of money spent in the election of a political party control the bedpartners, the spouse of the NDP across the way? Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this particular Committee could examine very, very carefully the affiliated bedpartners and spouses of our Socialists when the election writ is issued and how much money they spend in supporting the political campaign of our friends opposite. If these kinds of things are examined and as the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) says, "We want to examine it in its broadest scope, we want to look at all the implications so that our democratic society will have the free expression of the political parties and that we will make it available for all the people of Canada and Saskatchewan to run." I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that they would examine those two aspects and that this isn't a cheap — and I don't like to be suspect — I would hope that this isn't a cheap method of the NDP gaining some political advantage by having the election expenditures of the free enterprise-parties controlled and reviewed by the public and yet the political expenditures of the Socialists and the NDP hidden within the union funds and the union expenditures.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say too much beyond what has already been said, but the last speaker, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) has brought me to my feet with what I think are red herrings and haring off in directions that get us nowhere in this debate at all. I want to suggest this, Mr. Speaker, that, if the Minister has honest worries, why doesn't he have honest worries when it comes to the corporate donations that are made to his own party. Because I want to tell him this that those contributions are made, not when the company shareholders have voted on those contributions. They are made when a few people in the head office of the corporation have decided to make that contribution. I say, "Yes" let us have the type of investigation that he is talking about and we will find out just where the offences are taking place. I want to say this that, if political donations are made by trade unions and they are of course made by trade unions in this country, they are made after some consensus and some decision taken by that trade union; taken in convention, taken by the people themselves. I want to ask the Minister: when did any corporation give its shareholders the opportunity of voting on a donation that your party used? And he has piously suggested that we should do something about unions making broadcasts that bear on political education. Shouldn't we be examining this? Shouldn't we be curtailing this, I think he suggests. All right; I want to say this quite categorically, that for every one cent spent by a trade union in political education in North America, probably 50 times that amount is spent by corporations in the same type of political education to the public of this country.

The great corporate power lobbies in North America

have been doing this for 50 years and getting away with it and their shareholders don't pay for it. The people who pay for it are the public of the United States and Canada, and the Member who has just made his speech knows it. I'm quite in accord with him, but if the Committee meets to discuss these matters, let the Committee look into these aspects too. It bothers me to see the Minister who has just taken his seat raise questions of this kind, always harping about the trade unions, never talking about corporate donations, never talking about the corporate misuse of funds that have taken place and everyone knows about this because of the continual investigations that have taken place in the last 50 years with respect to the old parties of this country. I hope that he will vote for this amendment as his Leader has said and I hope that the type of investigation will reveal what I'm suggesting it will reveal. I'm quite sure that so far as the trade union contributions are concerned he will find in this province they are not a large part of the contributions that are made to the political funds of the NDP. Certainly in my own constituency and I'm a pretty well known unionist, I wouldn't want to depend at all exclusively on the funds of trade unions. It is the funds of the citizens at large that I can say have helped to elect me. I think that is the situation in any constituency in this province. Insofar as the average constituency is concerned the union contributions in this province to election campaigns are so relatively small as to be, I think, insignificant when it comes to the average constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I may not be able to give as fluent a rendition in this subject as many of the Members who have spoken thus far. The director of political education of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor gets my ire up when he starts speaking of such things as fund raising. On many occasions I have had union people, good hard-working employees come into my office and tell me, "My union dues have been raised \$1 for political education purposes. I have had no choice about it, I cannot withdraw from it." Shareholders of companies who own the stock and they know that their company supports either the CCF, the NDP, Social Credits or whatever it is, can withdraw willingly their shares and invest it somewhere else. But a union member can't withdraw because he jeopardizes his right to work. And you know yourself, my good friend, that there are members of some unions in this province who have asked to withdraw their political assessment and they have been denied this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — You dare stand up and give these types of accusations re contribution to party fund. I heard this in 1944 when I was in the Service. I was told then that big corporations gave contributions to parties for favors. I heard that handful of Socialists overseas propagating this type of propaganda. "You know the guys who have got the money are exempt from service. You know the guys who have got the money who are paying the shot are back home sitting there by themselves." I heard this often. When I came back from overseas I decided I would have a look at this situation. In 1948 I made my first attempt into politics. And I took action at the local level. I was the poll captain.

February 17, 1969

I had to raise every cent there was to be raised at that level on behalf of the party that I am now supporting today. I had to raise some for the province and I had to raise some for the constituency. In 1951 I sought the constituency nomination because I figured well, what these Socialists had been peddling for 25 and 30 years, trying to say that this magic wand comes from some capitalist sort of funds. At least it doesn't come from Moscow in our party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — In 1952 I was elected the president of Gravelbourg constituency. And my assessment every darn year for four years while I was president was \$1,000 from the constituency that we had to raise either in the form of banquets one way or the other to keep our central office and organization going. But still this peddling of dirt that had been done by the Socialists in 1944 was still in the back of my mind. So I decided maybe I should get into the game more. When I became a MLA I thought about this famous sauce fund that the Socialists had been always peddling about. So I got in as a MLA and I thought that now I'll be in and see if there is a pot. But there was no pot. I still had to raise funds from my constituents by memberships, banquets, etc.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — So then I had the good fortune of being in the Cabinet of the Government and again I say, every penny of the Liberal party that has been raised has been raised by the hard work of Members throughout the province. But when you come and tell me, as the young Member from Saskatoon said, the person who pays the piper calls the tune, I know who calls the tune on that side. I condemn you through your politically oriented unions of extorting funds that are so important. I know, I've heard from literally hundreds of poor working people who are forced to contribute because they would lose their job by such Socialists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, the Member who has just spoken, the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), five years ago lost a car that he has been looking for ever since and he has just informed us that he has lost a pot as well or that he has been trying ever since he got elected to find a pot. As usual, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) deals with irrelevancies and makes accusations.

Mr. Coderre: — I can name them.

Mr. Smishek: — All right, the Minister says he can name them. I challenge him to produce the names of people who have asked to withdraw from unions because of political contributions. I challenge him also to produce the list of unions or any local union which has placed an assessment on its members of \$1 a month for political purposes. I happen to know the situation as it exists in Saskatchewan. There is not a single trade union or

organization in this province that has voted \$1 per month per member toward political contributions, towards political party contribution or towards their own PEC activities. So uninformed is the Minister of Labour that he got up and made reference to the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) as the political educational director. It happens to be that the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw is not a political educational director. The Minister knows full well that he tries to becloud the issue.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members opposite, any trade union which does affiliate or wants to affiliate to our political party, the affiliation fee is only 5 cents per month per member. I want to make reference to the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) who said he doesn't want his daughter to be contributing to a trade union which decides to affiliate to a political party. She doesn't have to. All that a member has to do is ask the union not to contribute on his behalf. That's all that is required. There is no such provision, Mr. Speaker, in a case of corporations. The rank and file shareholder of any company does not have that right to say, "Don't contribute on my behalf."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — But in a trade union that right is guaranteed by its constitution. Mr. Speaker, you know the Liberals talk about trade unions making contributions to the NDP and they do. We admit that. We think it is a right that a trade union has. We believe that it is a right that rank and file union members should have to contribute if they so choose or not to contribute.

The interesting thing is that the Liberals never want to reveal their sources. They are much more particular as to who receives the money. You know the Dorian inquiry investigated a few years ago some situations in Montreal. The inquiry revealed that Liberals were receiving money from trade unions, but that they were much more particular. They were interested in getting money from such people as Hal Banks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You got money from Jimmy Hoffa.

Mr. Smishek: — No, we didn't get any money from Jimmy Hoffa. In fact as the Members know it, it is always easy to get up and make all kinds of allegations without proof on the part of the Members opposite. What we want to do by this resolution is investigate the facts. We as a New Democratic party are prepared to reveal the sources of political contributions, from where we get the money. I challenge you to produce the same kind of information and let the public be the judge and let them weigh the facts, Mr. Speaker. For goodness sakes let's not get into irrelevant issues.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Member permit one question. In order to assure the political freedom and members of unions, would you support a right-to-work legislation so that they would be sure to be protected?

Mr. Smishek: — What has that got to do with the right of the unions to contribute or not to contribute to a political party? You know it is the usual thing. The Minister doesn't know the difference between a political contribution and the right-to-work legislation.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — I have entered this debate with rather mixed feelings I might say. I happened to be responsible for bringing forward a resolution on behalf of the Members on this side of the House on some aspect of electoral reform for a number of years now. I have seen them being turned down each year with astounding regularity and with a little bit of the same flare of the debate that we have had this afternoon on this particular motion by the Government Member.

I might say that at the beginning of this session I was favorably impressed with the promise to study the desirability of the most appropriate method of electoral reform. I thought this is a fairly wide, open suggestion by the Government and we would all be in favor of going along with this. However, that was the promise, Mr. Speaker. Now the reality of the situation is what we see in the motion before us. The motion in its scope is quite narrow compared to the promise which we received earlier on from the Premier. The restriction here is to The Election Act, Chapter 4, and The Controverted Elections Act, Chapter 5, plus the amendment which the Government Members have indicated that they will be supporting.

Now as it happens that electoral reform covers quite a wide field and I think that it is important that the whole width of the field of electoral reform be looked at seriously. I want to assure you that I am fully in favor of the motion and the amendment that is being offered. I think it is unfortunate that some other aspects won't be investigated by the Committee because of the narrowness of the terms as they exist here. One of the first things that I want to mention, of course, is the matter of a fixed election date. I think that this is a legitimate topic and I just throw it out for consideration of the Members. That subject should receive some consideration by this Committee. You will find if it were to be considered, the people of Saskatchewan would be considerably in favor of a fixed election date. However, with the Committee not in a position to investigate this matter, the people of Saskatchewan will not have brought before them the pros and cons of a fixed election date.

My mixed feelings also will be illustrated here by another topic that is not considered. This is the matter of constituency boundaries and the drawing of constituency boundaries and, I am suggesting, of course, by an independent commission. I think that it is very important that this matter be dealt with by an independent commission, and barring that, Mr. Speaker, I think that the least that should be done in this area is that the matter should be considered by this Committee. I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member from City Park (Mr. Charlebois) is not taking part in this debate because he had something to say in previous years in debates as they came up. It is interesting to note that his and my constituency are the two biggest constituencies in Saskatchewan.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Nutana Centre): — What about Nutana Centre?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Not according to this list you are not. This is from the office of the electoral officer in the Buildings here. Now we have the volunteered information from the Member of Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey) that he has a big constituency as well. It is unfortunate that the city of Saskatoon is under-represented in this Chamber. I don't mean to say that we are under-represented by quality. Mr. Speaker, at least I can speak for this side of the House on that matter, but we are under-represented as to quantity. This is a matter that should be receiving consideration by a committee of this type. I just want to refer, Mr. Speaker, for a brief moment to some of the comments that have been made prior to me rising in this debate.

I listened to the comments of the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and I couldn't help but think that they were a broad generalization and gross exaggeration. I am sorry that he is not in his seat to hear my comments but that is what I feel about his comments. The Committee on Election Expenses had a study of election practices and expenses in Canada and the Committee revealed a considerable number of figures on what they found. This was a bi-partisan committee that had members from different political parties on it and studied the matter, I thought, most thoroughly. In their study of the political parties in Canada they found that the CCF party, which is now the New Democratic party, was the party most eager to open their books, to talk to them, to give them all the information that they had at hand. They also found that the Liberal party was supported — I believe that the Report says, and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong — by roughly 200 to 300 corporations, the main contributors to the purse of the Liberal party in Canada.

Now we see the Minister standing up and talking about the relationship that exists between the NDP and trade unions which have decided on their own to support the New Democratic party. There are provisions and they are open, everyone can see them, I would say that that is a legitimate connection, but at the same time he completely neglected to talk about the illegitimate connections that exist in this country. They are between the Liberal and Conservative parties and the people that support them.

I realize that illegitimacy should not be something that is held over the head of a child. The parents should have some responsibility in this case. This would be the Liberal party, the Conservative party and the corporations that support them, but claim to be lily white. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I do support the amendment and the resolution, but I am sorry that the resolution is not wider in its scope. I hope that the Committee has — and I believe will have — access to all kinds of information in the drawing of their draft legislation. I will be most interested to see the results of their discussions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words in connection with this amendment. First of all I am pleased to see that the Premier and the Government have changed their minds

because in the past they have always been opposed to similar resolutions when they have been presented by the Opposition. In other words they are maturing and I am very happy to see that happening.

I would like to point out that really all we are asking in the amendment is to bring about some electoral reforms. I think that is the intention of the resolution in the first place, but I agree with the Member who just spoke that it really doesn't go far enough. I can't help but go on record in this House concerning my own constituency. I have a constituency which is called Prince Albert East-Cumberland, and I always like to put a hyphen in there because Cumberland constituency is attached to the Prince Albert East constituency. In other words it is two constituencies in one.

I think that the Premier, last year, did say that he would have to do something about it, as I recall it and I hope he does, because it is not fair to the people of that area. If we are going to bring reforms into The Election Act and because The Election Act concerns itself with boundaries for different constituencies, I would like such a Committee to consider this aspect of the situation, so that, if we are going to represent the people well and properly in this Assembly, one Member shouldn't have two constituencies as compared to another Member who may only have one-half of a constituency. I may point out to the Hon. Minister from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) that there are constituencies — small ones — that have only about 6,000 or 7,000 voters, whereas I have one that takes in nearly half of Northern Saskatchewan and has 12,000 or more voters. Something should be done about it.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well, you have nothing to say, Mr. Minister from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), because you only have about 300 or 400 votes. I notice that the Government is bringing in this motion and there could be something bothering the Government, but I haven't found out what it is. I haven't hired any investigators to find out what is bothering it because it wants this change made before the 31st day of December, 1969. In other words I presume that there is going to be an election in 1970, very early. That's fine! I think you should call an election and the sooner the better.

I would say this, that after listening and having said a few remarks that I agree with the amendment and that I agree with the resolution. I am surprised at the two Ministers who spoke from the Government's side, the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). When they charge that we on this side of the House somehow or another get all kinds of election expenses paid us by labor, I think that they are badly mistaken. I can tell the Hon. Minister in this House that I wasn't able — unless I had spent my own personal money which belonged to my family — I wasn't able to pay one cent for television in the last election, whereas my friend opposite, the respected Minister from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) was on television every hour of every day. I am wondering and the people are wondering even now where the money came from. I think that what should be done in all fairness is that people of Saskatchewan should know who is paying.

Whoever pays for a campaign then let us expose our costs. We don't want it done as it was done in Ottawa under a Premier of Canada at one time, the Hon. MacKenzie King, when it was brought out that the Beauharnais Company gave \$750,000 to the Liberal party and \$250,000 to the Conservative party. This took some digging out by Members of the CCF of that day to expose the contributions. It doesn't have to be done this way. You can have honesty in elections. You can have good government without having to accept bribes from Corporations as is sometimes being done. Nobody can tell me that the party opposite represented by the Government is not getting money from sources that they don't want to expose. I am happy that the Premier is willing to have this study because in the past people have been suspicious and I have been suspicious.

I can tell you of an incident. I walked into an office after the last election to pay my bills, accounts that we had to pay on our behalf. I was told by the clerk, "How come, Bill, you are paying these bills when the Liberal party's bills are being paid from Toronto?" And remember, Mr. Minister the time you jumped to your feet and made an issue of that and challenged me. Too bad that I didn't get the name of the company that paid your bills. But that is neither here nor there. We now have a chance to have a committee to study the situation, to make recommendations to the Government and let the dirty past remain dirty but let's go ahead and in the future be an example to the coming generation as to how governments are elected and how they are govern.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in regard to this resolution. Just as the Member from Cumberland was speaking he raised a question or brought to mind a point that I don't know whether we can discuss under this particular committee or not. But I recall the number of civil servants under the NDP that were going to the northern part of this province trying to force people into voting for them or threatening them that they might lose their jobs. Now I don't know whether the scope of this Committee can take that into account, but this comes into the same role of election contributions. You contribute your job or else you get fired and that is what happened under the NDPs.

Another matter that I want to raise while I am on my feet is the fact that the Members opposite used The Commonwealth paid for out of the funds of the people of this province. Three quarters of a million dollars of the taxpayers money went into The Commonwealth and a good part of it during election time. Those are some of the other things that should be brought out in this Committee. If the Member for Cumberland wants to start washing some dirty linen in this Committee, as it appears that he does, we can bring up an awful lot of linen from the other side of the House that will have to be washed before this Committee gets finished with its report. But I am glad to be able to support this resolution and also the amendment because certainly there are some changes that have to be made in The Election Act, if we are going to avoid some of the pitfalls that were deliberately laid by Members opposite when they were the Government.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 1 — **An Act to amend The Co-operative Production Associations Act, 1967.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading to this Bill, it is a minor amendment which is being added on to the present section. I think that most of the Members have the explanatory notes. The Section now reads: "Unless a bylaw otherwise provides, a person of full age of 16 may become a member of an association, but such persons shall not be eligible to act as a director." Now this new Section is to make it possible for a person of 18 years of age where young people are members it is to make the provisions similar to all the other Acts. The Credit Union League people have asked for it, etc.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to it, but how does this affect the responsibilities that a director — the Act spells out certain responsibilities including at times financial. Now the way that I understand it, an 18-year-old is a minor. I just wonder about this.

Mr. Coderre: — I appreciate that, but there is a Federal Act that does control that, insofar as the legal age to handle funds or to be bonded or anything else. But there are some situations, for example, in the Co-operation Production Association which could be a family co-operative, maybe the father and the mother and the family would like to have their children involved, so they'll pass supplemental bylaws where the members so feel that it should be. It gives them the opportunity to get involved so that when they do come of legal age though now legally they are not bound. Everyone knows that from the legal point of view that they cannot legally sign documents that can be accepted. But it is desirable to be directors in some cases whereby they can be as legally binding, as an example, the family co-op.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 2 — **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of a Bill to amend The Credit Union Act I think that the explanations are probably in everyone's hands. There is basically no change in principle. You will find that there is one Section that amends and makes it possible for credit unions again by supplemental bylaws to make payments for a per diem allowance expenses to any member of any committee. You may find large credit unions, for example, Sherwood, where there is a greater involvement such as supervisory committee or credit committees, greater involvement than just the directors, I must say that is something that has been asked by the Credit Union League. The other amendment would make it possible for the credit union again to pass a supplemental bylaw to make minors over 18 eligible to serve on boards or committees. I think that it is recognized that our young people are capable to act on some committees, again keeping in mind that the Federal Act will not make them liable.

Then there is another Section which I think can be best explained jointly. It is the amendment of Sections 60 and 61, is to make it possible for a credit union to grant loans for business purposes to all members without excluding the larger businessman. Some businessmen had started with the credit union for services and over the years had accumulated assets in excess of \$100,000. Now it seems to be an automatic cutoff of \$99,999. And as soon as he got one cent over in assets then stated he was excluded from doing business with his credit union. There have been several cases where this has happened and this has been asked by the Credit Union League. And it is only taking out the \$100,000 figure. I think that it is a very good amendment because I think that a man, who has been with the credit union for a great number of years, has used it, improved his assets, certainly he should not be excluded from this because of one penny. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act to amend The Co-operative Associations Act.**

He said: In rising to move second reading of this Bill, again the explanations have been passed on and I am only repeating probably just for the general purposes. Each and everyone of us has the explanatory notes which are, I think, much more complete than possibly I could give to you. However, the Act again provides for a person to be the full age of 21 before he can act as director, manager, treasurer of an association. However, in order to bring in conformity to all others it is lowering the age to 18. This has been asked by the student co-operative residences where we note a great majority of students are below the age of 21. This is a special request I think that in this area we hope to try to make it possible for these students to be their own secretary where legally they are not, but insofar as the Act is concerned it will make it possible for them.

And there is another section. Of course, it is only to clarify the requirements of Section 35. As you know we are now entering an electronic age and some regulations in The Companies Act clearly specify what procedures and methods should be used to do accounting where they have computers. This is only clarifying it for that purpose and making penalties where anyone does falsify an entry in it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. Coderre moved second reading of Bill No. 10 — **An Act to amend The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act.**

He said: Again with this Act, Mr. Speaker, there is at present a section of the Act which says memorandum of association may be amended by the directors' approval in this case by three-fourths, and the case of bylaws by two-thirds. It is changing the percentages of it, that's what it is about it. It is proposed to repeal Section 14 for amendments by members of associations. At the present time the two subsections are somewhat in conflict with one another. You will note that one Section makes one provision and the next Section does contradict

it. By striking out Section 14 it clarifies it completely. There is another section which proposes to repeal the present Section 3, another, Section 45 which sets out the books and records again because of the computer and the mechanization coming in accounting. This is making provisions for that. The Marketing Associations Act has not set out the methods that the auditors have to do when they audit the books. This is the Section that does set out in detail what auditors must do as is the case in any corporation or otherwise. It also sets out in detail the methods of dissolutions, and this is a rather important aspect of it. You will find that in a dissolution of association as is the case in Section 51 dealing with amalgamations there is no specific mention of the approval of the Registrar being required, although subsection 52 makes mention of the Registrar's approval, so that after the amalgamation has been approved by the membership it has to be approved by the Registrar. There is a time lag very often between the meeting and the approval so that they cannot proceed and delays result. Therefore the Registrar now under this present Section could give the approval, temporary approval, when ratified by the membership so that it does come into effect.

Another section in the Act makes provisions for the appointing of liquidators. In the absence of anything in the Act to guide the liquidators, The Companies Winding Up Act has been used. There were no provisions under this Act to appoint a liquidator and there is now a provision to appoint a liquidator without going to The Companies Act to wind up a co-operative. There is another section, Section 69, which provides that organizations incorporated under the legislation, other than co-operatives may, in certain cases, become registered under The Co-operatives Marketing Act. The Saskatchewan Co-op Creamery, for example, is registered under a special Act. There are some cases where they can make provisions where they can register in both ways. Possibly under the proposed Federal Act you may find that there is a possibility where a company now registered in Saskatchewan, or a co-operative now registered in Saskatchewan would have difficulties. So we are making this provision to register under the Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. Coderre moved second reading of Bill No. 11 — **An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act.**

He said: There are two principles in this Bill. One is that in 1962, when The Superannuation Acts of the Public Service and the various Crown corporations were changed, for some reason or the other the Act of the Workmen's Compensation Board was not changed in order to bring the ceiling to the \$6,000 which the other agencies then had. The result that it left one person without getting maximum pension where all other members or agencies of the Government were allowed the \$6,000. This is rectifying this error because this Act was not changed in 1962. The second part of the Act is to bring it into line with the changes that are now taking place in The Superannuation Act to raise the ceiling to, I believe, \$8,000.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Bill No. 11 appears to do for employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board that which Bill 13 accomplished for the Public Service in general. I think those are really the main

changes with deference to what the Minister (Mr. Coderre) has said in putting emphasis on another point. I could say without prolonging too much of the time of the House that we on this side of the House support the main principles in Bill 11 as they are stated in Bill 13. However, I do have one caveat and I will be expressing that in a moment or so.

As I understand it there is an extension of the pension maximum to \$8,050 in tune with salary movements and the need to provide larger pensions for that section of the Public Service that has a greater income than the average wage and salary earner within it. In keeping with this, the \$10,000 previous maximum was raised to accomplish that movement. There are some improvements I believe for war service employees which are described. I will not at this point talk about them because I think they can better be discussed when we get to the suggested amendments to Section 14 of Bill 11 from the provisions that will apply in the case of Bill 13. The Minister should inform the House what is intended to be accomplished by the principle of the amendment on Section 14 on page 2, because by the Bill, subsection 3 of Section 14 is repealed and this subsection is inserted. I will quote this precisely. The amendment would say that:

An employee to whom subsection 1 applies who retired after the first day of January, 1968, and before the first day of January, 1969, who is eligible to receive a yearly allowance of less than \$6,000 shall receive a yearly allowance of \$6,000.

Now just think about that wording for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister (Mr. Coderre). What is said here in plain language is that anyone who retires in the Workmen's Compensation Board during 1968 who had a pension of less than \$6,000 would automatically receive a yearly allowance of \$6,000. I don't see how you can come to any other conclusion. It says, "Who is eligible to receive a yearly allowance or less than \$6,000 shall receive a yearly allowance of \$6,000."

Now this is a most peculiar provision. It says that employees who retired in the year 1968 only, who would be receiving this yearly allowance of less than the \$6,000 in this section only, would receive a pension of the full \$6,000. On the face of it this says if there is a worker who retired in the year 1968 who got a pension of \$2,000, then he would get \$6,000 by the virtue of this change.

I don't think this is what can be intended for all the employees of the Compensation Board. But this is what the bare bones of the wording says, so it must be that there are one or two employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board for whom something special is to be done, because it doesn't have, Mr. Minister (Mr. Coderre), a universal application. We must know who is the person who is to receive this special consideration that is suggested by this Section and if there is more than one person affected. The House should certainly know what the provision means, because it appears, as I say, on the face of it, to discriminate as between employees who retired in 1968 and employees who retired in 1967 and 1966. This Section does not occur in the companion Bill 13 for The Public Service Superannuation Act. I would be grateful if the Minister will acquaint us with what is intended here.

Mr. Coderre: — Your point is well taken, and I recommend this section because one person who has served the Board for over 38 years was left out of the provisions of the Act because of an oversight by the former Board when other Acts were amended in 1962.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — I would just like to add a comment or two. I think there may well be a drafting error in the Bill. It may well be that \$6,000 was not meant to be the pension but the maximum. I suspect from reading it that that is what is intended and it looks that a drafting error has crept in.

I want also to mention a matter with respect to this Bill and with respect to a couple of the other Bills. I am confining my remarks, Mr. Speaker, to this Bill, but some of the remarks might be equally germane elsewhere. I've had a couple of suggestions from people that we ought to be looking at and I throw these out so that either the Minister (Mr. Coderre) or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), if he joins this debate or when he joins a later debate, might consider them. My suggestion is that we ought to consider the situation where people are now receiving \$6,000 but would in fact receive more money if they had been allowed to receive their maximum. For example, it is possible for people with 35 years service who have worked for a \$10,000 figure during their highest six years to earn a pension of \$7,000. A little calculation will reveal that 2 per cent for 35 years works out to 70 per cent and 70 per cent of \$10,000 is indeed \$7,000. Some of these people have raised with me the possibility of whether or not they might be enabled to get the pension which they would have got, had not this \$6,000 limit prevailed, now that the limit is being raised for others. I admit that this is an extension of the principle of the Bill and I am raising it because it has been raised with me. Another question which has been raised with me is whether or not there might be any possibility of making the \$11,500 ceiling in any sense retroactive so that people might contribute in respect of past periods of service during which they have earned \$11,500 and thereby increase their pension. I realize once again that these are new principles and I am raising them so that when the Bill is considered in Committee the thoughts expressed in these principles might have been considered by the Ministers concerned and we can have a more fruitful discussion.

I want to say that I agree with the basic proposals of increasing the limits on pensions. It is undoubtedly true that a good number of pensioners are feeling the pinch and if we can increase the maximum pensions which public servants may earn, I think this is desirable. Furthermore, and this is highly relevant, the competition for senior public servants is getting tougher and tougher. One of the attractive things held out to senior public servants by other jurisdictions, universities and others, is their more attractive pension provisions. If we are to compete and keep our senior public people we then must have our pension provisions somewhat more attractive, and one of the limiting factors has undoubtedly been the maximums. I accordingly welcome the proposals contained in this Bill and I will be supporting it.

Mr. Coderre: — On the subject matter that the Hon. gentleman from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said I think this Bill can be dealt with by a person much more conversant on the matter than I

am. Insofar as the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), in 1962 all Superannuation Acts were changed to raise the ceiling from \$6,000, but the Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act was not changed, therefore leaving the ceiling at \$4,250. This involved one person and one person only. The party that I am speaking of was the first member who ever worked for the then Workmen's Compensation Board when it was started some 39 years ago. He is the only one that has ever qualified for this high pension because of the position he held. When it became evident that he was retiring last fall, that he could not qualify for the maximum, so consequently it is only rectifying this error that took place in 1962 or omission as the case may be. Even when you allow the \$2,250, plus maximum, I believe in the number of years, he still does not come close to this amount as others in the same category got. I think it would be an unfair situation for one person, because of an omission not to receive what he should receive. And this is the intention of this Section and no other reason and there is only one person involved.

Mr. Davies: — Does the Minister know how many persons superannuated from the Board in 1968?

Mr. Coderre: — I have been told that there is only one person who qualified under this situation in 1968.

Mr. Davies: — May I just put this additional supplementary question to the Minister? Is he aware that, as this is now written, it applies to all employees superannuated in 1968? It has to.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Public Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, as has been intimated, Bill 13 is a Bill to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act and to increase the maximum pension benefits thereunder. As has been intimated this Act is difficult to understand and sometime I hope it can be rewritten. It is based on a period of 35 years service with a maximum of 70 per cent pension, but there is another clause in the Bill which states the 70 per cent pension shall be paid on a \$10,000 salary and that the contributions shall only be paid up to a \$10,000 salary. The Act then goes on to state that regardless of the contributions you make your maximum pension shall be \$6,000. In other words a man could pay on a pension of \$7,000 but he would only be legally entitled to a pension of \$6,000. Now what we are doing in the first amendment to this Act is to allow contributions on and after I think it is May 1st, 1969 to be paid on a salary of \$11,500. We are removing the \$6,000 ceiling and therefore the maximum pension that could be obtained after 35 years of service would be \$8,050.

There is another section being amended in this Act that deals with war services. Under the present Act those who resided in Saskatchewan at the time of enlistment and subsequently after enlistment within a fixed period as set out in the Act

February 17, 1969

join the Public Service of our Province, can have their service credited by paying their contributions during the years which they were in the services with the Government picking up its portion. Our amendment provides this, that a person who resided in Canada at the time of enlistment joins the Public Service of Saskatchewan, can on paying his share and the Government's share without interest purchase the benefit of his war service.

Other Sections of the Act deal with a situation which has arisen in connection with university employees and is now working greatly to the detriment of about half a dozen senior employees at the University on the academic side who were formerly in the Government service. Those people did not and do not receive the deferred pension under our Act, because the deferred pension came into our Act in 1964. Therefore, we are conferring the benefits of the deferred pension on that group who have gone to the University and are acquiring a pension at that institution and at the same time have pension rights in our own scheme. For example, before we amended this Act a person could go to the University, come under its pension provisions, retire from that staff with a pension of \$7,000 and have earned a pension of \$3,000 in our pension fund but we wouldn't pay them a five-cent piece of what they are entitled to, because their pension exceeds the allowable limit under our Act. This removes that inequitable situation.

We are also amending the Pensions Act to provide that the reciprocal section shall have the words, 'University of Saskatchewan' added to it. If a person leaves our Public Service to go to the University he is entitled to take his contributions together with the Government portion if he so desires.

Now there is one point that I want to comment on because at the last session the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and myself gave an undertaking that the matter would be studied. It is not in our Act, and that deals with the question of the interest which the Government will pay on monies put into the pension. It's fixed by statute at three per cent. This matter is now under study in relationship to other provinces and a study is also being made of our pension schemes in the wider sense to see if other improvements can be made. It may be that sometime in the future this interest will be raised, but I want to remind you that there are two provinces in Canada that don't pay one bit of interest on pension contributions and one of them is a rather large and I believe prosperous province.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one more point which I think should be mentioned in regard to this Act. During the year by amending our regulations under the Superannuation Act we cut the penalty for optional retirement in half. For about 25 years a person who retired at 60 years of age or with 30 years of service received the pension they were entitled to less 30 per cent. We, by amending the regulations, have reduced that penalty to 15 per cent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is all I have to say in connection with this Act and I move that this Bill No. 13 be now read a second time.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — I would like to ask a question of the Minister (Mr. Estey). How is this going to affect deferred pensions?

Mr. Speaker: — The Minister is closing the debate but he may answer the question when he closes.

Mr. Baker: — Oh.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when speaking on Bill 11 a few minutes ago, I expressed general support for legislation that the Minister has now explained and I thank him for his explanation. The changes I understand have been discussed with the Government Employees Association and probably I believe, Mr. Minister (Mr. Estey), indirectly with other unions in the Public Service and Crown corporations. I believe these provisions, while they may not meet with the 100 per cent the union requests, are accepted to the extent that they have overall approval of these groups.

The extension of the pension maximum to \$8,050, (I believe that is the sum), is in line with salary improvements. And, of course, the raising of the maximum on which contributions are paid to \$11,500 simply provides the basis to effect the \$8,050 limit.

There has been, as the Minister knows, a fair amount of complaint among the higher salaried employees in the Civil Service who have argued that the pension contribution should be made on the whole of the salary earned and that there shouldn't be any restriction of the pension as there is now, because of the limits to contribution of \$10,000; \$11,500 as it will be by this Bill. This argument proceeds, as the Minister probably knows, on the basis that the average pension, after 35 years of service for the average government employee, is supposed to be 70 per cent of the income he earned during the most recent years of employment.

I understand that Saskatchewan is one of the few places where the higher income employee is restricted. I don't think there is much doubt that this has some bearing on the attractiveness of some of the senior positions that all of us like to see filled with the best people. I can, however, appreciate the difficulty that the Minister has in removing all restraints with respect to pensions for higher income employees, but I would certainly support, at this time, the limited changes that are offered in the Bill.

Other provisions in the Bill, such as the improvements for war service employees, (I think these are contained in 55-A, Mr. Minister), meet with the approval of Members on this side of the House. The same holds true for the Sections that have to do with the superannuation allowances and deferred pensions for persons who leave or have left the public service to enter the employment of the University of Saskatchewan.

I want to ask the Minister in Committee some questions on Section 9, as amended or to be amended. My understanding is that employees that are hired after May 1st, 1969 will not have the option of making contributions to the Public Service Superannuation Plan after they've completed 35 years of service. I've no special objection to voice on this proposal at this time, but since there is a change, I think we should go into it thoroughly in Committee.

I come now, however, Mr. Speaker, to some general sections with respect to The Public Service Superannuation Act, that deal with the benefits that are discussed in this Bill. I said before that the benefits that are provided by The Public Service Superannuation Act have been supplied by the contributions of employees only, because since the plan came into effect about 43 years ago, the employees' contributions have covered the cost of the Pension Plan. While there have been contributions from the Treasury in some of the years, the overall result in all of the years has been one of no cost to the public of Saskatchewan. This is a pretty significant thing. I'm not suggesting that the Government should have paid actual contributions to the superannuation plan that would equal the amount of the employee contribution, because, after all, the Government represents the public of this province and it seems to me that the same actuarial considerations that govern in the case of private plans should not necessarily be made to apply in the case of this pension program.

However, Mr. Speaker, we did legislate in this House a few years ago to bring in The Pensions Benefit Act. The principle of this Bill is to provide vesting rights for employees. Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree that we do have a basis of deferred pensions for Government employees who have served 10 years. The fact remains, however, that the position of an employee who has served less than 10 years with the Government, can only be described as unfortunate, because employees with less than 10 years' service with the Government can only take, on termination, their own contributions to the superannuation plan plus the very niggardly and unfair interest of three per cent per annum.

On the last matter, first, Mr. Speaker, surely in this day and age it's almost impossible for the ordinary man to borrow money at less than eight or nine per cent. In the face of that, it's nothing short of scandalous to say that we will pay to employees who terminate their service with the Government the amount only of their pension contributions which really are their savings for old age, plus the interest rate of three per cent.

Now, the Minister (Mr. Estey) said that this matter is receiving the consideration of the Government. I think it's fair to say that, when I put this question to him last year, he said that it would receive the consideration of the Government. But this doesn't butter any parsnips for the people that are in this position. I think that the time is overdue, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Government should immediately institute a rate of interest that will, at least, bear a resemblance to the kind of return that an employee could get from say, the purchase of a Saskatchewan Government Bond.

However, the main question in this kind of a discussion, to my mind, has to do with vesting rights. An employee who has served just short of 10 years with the Government and has his employment terminated or who is forced to quit after a number of years' service or who takes other employment for any reason, has expended about a third or a quarter of his useful working years. Now, I say that he should be provided with the amount of money that is equivalent to his own and his employer's contributions to a pension plan for that period, plus of course, the higher rate of interest that I have suggested should be paid, so that he can then be in a position to purchase a deferred pension benefit. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, when an employee in

this position eventually retires, his overall pension benefits are going to be reduced by the amount that the employer's assumed contribution to the pension plan would have purchased if they had been made.

I would appreciate it very much, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister (Mr. Estey) could provide us in Committee with figures that indicate the extent of employee turnover in the Civil Service because this will show the Members the extent and the seriousness of the condition I am describing and suggesting remedy for at this time.

I know that there are some difficulties in securing the conditions that I think should obtain. However, the fact is that we have accepted the principle of vesting rights for employees in legislation that has passed this House, and I think that it is more than ever incumbent upon the Legislature, for that reason, to recognize in our own employee's pension plan, full vesting rights for employees. I think that we have to set an example. We have to do that which we have indicated should be done in the first steps that we have taken in pension benefits' legislation in the House.

Now, if this can't be done, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the Government immediately, I suggest that some improvements could be instituted that go part way. One way in which we could make a good beginning would be to pay the employees who terminated employment after less than 10 years with the Government, the assumed Government pension contribution, roughly equivalent say to that which the employee is now paying on a graduated scale from one to ten years of service; that is, if the Government does not feel that it can proceed to provide the full vesting rights for all time served, I think, the least that should be done is to provide vesting on some graduated basis.

I would, Mr. Speaker, appreciate a statement from the Minister (Mr. Estey) on this matter. I would also be grateful if we could have further information on the lines that I have suggested when this matter is discussed in Committee. In the meantime, I'm glad to be able to support the principles of the Bill so far as they go. I think most of the other matters I have in mind with respect to some sections can be canvassed thoroughly in Committee.

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can add anything to what I have already said. As has been intimated we will have time to discuss it further in Committee.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 14 — **An Act to amend The Marriage Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us, namely, an Act to amend The Marriage Act, comes about largely because of the new Canada Divorce Act which came into effect on July 2, 1968. It deals primarily with one Section of that Act which pertains to the appeal from decree absolute for divorce or decree of annulment. In Saskatchewan, prior to July of 1968, these appeals were

February 17, 1969

allowed. Under the new Divorce Act, of Canada, it is no longer possible to appeal from the decree absolute for divorce and the Bill brings into line some clauses of our Act with the Canada Divorce Act.

The Marriage Act is therefore being amended to remove the requirement for certain documents to be filed and I refer particularly to a certificate regarding the matter of an appeal from the decree absolute where a marriage has been dissolved. There is no plan to eliminate the requirement of the certificate where a marriage has been annulled.

Another amendment extends the authorization of a marriage licence issuer to appoint a deputy issuer. At the present time, it cannot exceed three months. The amendment will increase this period to 12 months. All the other amendments are of a technical nature and have no practical effect on the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move this Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 15 — **An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill merely carries one step further an adjustment in the pensions for those persons who have superannuated or their widows. The present amendment to the Bill which is before the House refers to those persons or their widows who retired between April 1, 1958 and April 1, 1963. As the Members know, this adjustment affects only those pensions of under \$2,400 per year and the adjustment consists of \$10 per year for each year of pensionable service up to a maximum of 35 years. In other words, your maximum adjustment would be \$350 per year. This carries out the adjustments which have been, or were made, in 1964, 1966 and 1967, and brings our retired civil servants to the same stage of adjustments as has been done for our teachers.

This Bill also applies to five other Superannuation Acts which we have. Besides The Public Service, we have The Liquor Board Act, The Telephone Superannuation Act, The Saskatchewan Power Superannuation Act, and The Workmen's Compensation Superannuation Act.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are pleased to support this Bill, especially because of what everyone knows about the very rapid escalation of costs of living during the past few years making improvements of this kind even more essential. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what costs the Government has estimated for the coverage of employees who were pensioned from April 1, 1958 to April 1, 1963, but I would hazard a guess that it would not be greatly in excess, if indeed it is, of say \$20,000 a year. I would question, also, whether the number of employees that would be affected if the coverage were extended to cover all employees who had superannuated since April 1, 1963, would be very large. If, as I suspect, the number of additional employees would be relatively small, I would like to suggest to the Minister (Mr. Estey) that he

consider a House amendment by which all the employees would be covered, that is, those pensioned after April 1, 1963.

I don't know how many employees are involved, what the sum of money that would be concerned might be. But this information of course, I'm sure the Minister could readily get from the Superannuation Act administration.

I think the Minister would probably agree that at the present time there may be anomalies created which are in the nature of discriminations. I refer to the fact that some employees who pensioned after April 1, 1963, who of course are not covered by the provisions of this Bill, might be receiving less than employees who will now be getting the additional benefits by reason of this Bill 15. To put it in another way, two employees that were doing precisely the same work could be getting different pensions because these benefits are not provided after April 1, 1963.

May I suggest to the Minister (Mr. Estey) that this question could be checked into. He might be prepared to proceed as I have suggested. In any case, I think it would be a good thing if he could provide us with the relevant information that I have requested when the Bill comes into Committee so that we can consider the effects of some of the suggestions that I have advanced here today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we might also want to ponder for a few moments about our pension legislation in the Civil Service. I think it's a pretty good example of pension legislation of its kind. It does provide good benefits on the whole. At least they're comparable, and in some cases better than pension benefits in some other provinces or governmental jurisdiction. But the fact does remain that, as I understand it, during the past 42 years the contributions of employees have exceeded the cost of the pension plan to the Government. And, as I've pointed out, there have been years when the Treasury has had to put up some money. But overall the result has been that money has not had to be paid by the public for our pension plan.

I say these may constitute reasons why the House might proceed to grant additional benefits to employees in line with the principle that is now contained in the Bill.

There are other matters that I think I could go into in Committee. I won't waste the time of the House now. Meantime, I and my associates on this side of the House are glad to support the principle of the Bill before us.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MOTIONS FOR HUMBLE ADDRESSES

HUMBLE ADDRESS NO. 1

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I move that an humble Address No. 1 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before this Assembly:

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan and agencies of the Government

February 17, 1969

of Canada with respect to the processing of damp and tough grain in Saskatchewan and the transportation of grain during the period of October 1, 1968 and January 30, 1969 inclusive.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HUMBLE ADDRESS NO. 2

Mr. Lloyd: — I move that an humble Address (No. 2) be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before this Assembly:

Copies of all correspondence between the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Prime Minister of Canada with respect to the processing of damp and tough grain in Saskatchewan and the transportation of grain during the period of October 1, 1968 to January 30, 1969, inclusive.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Government considers, and I consider, that this correspondence is privileged and I therefore must ask the House to reject the motion.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this rule of privilege with respect to motions of this kind and material of this kind is a relatively new one in the Legislature. It was, as Members will recall, invoked last year on several occasions and I find it extremely difficult to understand why the Government should use its majority to stand in the way of preventing information of this kind being given on all occasions.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker — the time is short, presumably we're going to adjourn at 5:30 — to three occasions in 1966 when there were precedents established by the present Government for returning correspondence of this kind with the Government of Canada. On February 23, on a motion moved by the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), copies of correspondence between the Minister of Public Health of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada. This was passed, ordered by this Assembly.

On the same month, and we find this on page 31, of the proceedings for that year, on a motion by Mr. Nicholson, then Member from Saskatoon, a request for correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada with respect to The Disabled Persons Allowance Act, and that was so ordered and tabled.

On page 41 of the same journal, a motion by Mrs. Cooper, then a Member from Regina for copies of all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan regarding the Canada Pension Plan.

The same Government that now sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, accepted these motions. It did not at that point hide behind the claim of privilege for these documents. The Assembly

passed the resolution. It ordered that they be tabled and the documents were tabled. I can't see why those are in any sense different from the ones which I am asking for in this particular motion. I wish the Government would not hide correspondence of this kind from this Legislature and the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 23

Messieurs

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

NAYS — 31

Messieurs

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

The Assembly adjourned at 5:34 o'clock p.m.