

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
20th Day

Monday, March 15, 1971.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students situated in the galleries; from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair represented by Mr. Brockelbank, 40 students from St. Gerard School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Melnyck; from the constituency of Saltcoats, 100 students from the Esterhazy Central School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. L. B. Stott; from the constituency of Humboldt represented by Mr. Breker, 37 students from the Muenster High School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. L. Reeve; from the constituency of Saltcoats, 26 high school students from the Saltcoats School under the direction of their teacher, The Rev. W. Farquarson.

I am sure all Hon. Members — and incidentally in connection with the final school that I mentioned, amongst that group is a grandson of the first Speaker of the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Thomas McNutt. I am sure that all Hon. Members will wish to extend to these children in the galleries the warmest of all possible welcomes, to express the sincere wish that they will find their stay here educational and informative and wish them all a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

WELCOME TO STUDENTS OF SASKATOON CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

MR. W. A. FORSYTH: (Saskatoon Nutana South) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to draw the attention of the House to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of members of the Students Representative Council of the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus. I am sure that all Members would wish to welcome these people.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

SHELLBROOK INTERMEDIATE B HOCKEY CHAMPS

MR. G. R. BOWERMAN: (Shellbrook) — Mr., Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I am pleased to inform the House and you, Sir, that the Shellbrook Elks hockey club, Saturday night retained their title as the Saskatchewan Intermediate B Champions for the third consecutive year. The playoff for this provincial championship was against the Glenavon hockey club and was taken into a two game total game series. I am sure that all Members of this House will agree that a great deal of commendation is justified for the many local hockey clubs that annually contest so vigorously in our national sport. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Shellbrook club play

without benefit of any imports from out of the constituency — that is, it is truly a local club — and as a matter of additional interest, I am sure that the Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) would want me to mention, if he were here in his seat, that in an exhibition game against the Estevan Bruins, the Shellbrook club defeated Estevan in that game, six to two.

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of the House will, along with myself, extend to this hockey club our congratulations and wishes for success in the years to come.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS

POLICY ON BOYS' HAIR STYLES

HON. J. C. McISAAC: (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) directed to me a question concerning a memorandum from the Saskatchewan School Trustees that supposedly set out a policy dealing with boys' hair styles.

I have obtained a copy of that memo and it does not set out any policy as such as he intimated and I shall table a copy for all Members to read. It does discuss the subject and refer to Section 118, subsection (37) of The School Act.

I think I could point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Department officials have for many years consistently interpreted that section of The School Act in the same way as the memo from the Saskatchewan School Trustees does. Regulations of the Department pursuant to The School Act have also contained for many, many years, provisions dealing with the duties of pupils as such, Section 12, page 9. I think both the legislation and the regulations clearly contemplate that the management of the school and the pupils was to be in the hands of local school authorities. The Department has at no time issued directives or instructions on student dress, nor do we, Sir, intend to do so now.

It is my understanding that the present policy concerning the length of a boy's hair adopted by the Blaine Lake School Unit, results from the requests of local boards and parents, including, I am so informed, the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the issue is a local one that can well do without the cheap political tactics of the Member for Shellbrook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister said that I indicated that the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association had established a policy and this was not the point at all. The record is clear in that regard. I said that it was my information, from the information that I had, that the School Trustees' Association had directed a letter to the unit boards. I did say that as a result, that the local school board, in fact it was this morning, is suspending boys who were coming to school with long hair. Now that is the way it stands.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DINSMORE HOCKEY CLUB

MR. G. G. LEITH: (Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House of a couple of hockey games that were played between Dinsmore and Lafleche. The first one was played at Assiniboia and Dinsmore won that first game six to three. They went back to Rosetown arena Sunday night and after one period of overtime, Dinsmore won that two-game series. I want to congratulate these people from my constituency. I want to give my condolences to the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch and I think that we shall probably meet again.

My congratulations, Sir, to them.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry) — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) has intimated that I should like to set the rules for the Blaine Lake School Unit in respect to the length of the hair boys should wear.

I am concerned as a parent, and rightly so with my boy's hair. As far as the rest of the boys are concerned I have no wish to dictate to any boy in the Blaine Lake School Unit as to what the length their hair should be. As a parent I feel that my authority lies within this jurisdiction.

Therefore, the remark, Mr. Speaker, made by the Minister, that I as a Member of the Legislature, or a taxpayer of the Blaine Lake School Unit and a parent, should like to dictate policy in respect to other boys' hair is incorrect. This I feel is not within the bounds of my jurisdiction or interest.

MR. SPEAKER: — I must draw to the attention of all Hon. Members that the Minister of Education made a statement and it was replied to by a Member of the Opposition. Really those are the only comments that should be made on the statement. I thought that the Member for Redberry was rising to ask a question. Usually his questions have a rather long preamble and in this case he didn't have a question.

GRANT PROGRAM — THE HOUSE BUILDING ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement today. Hon. Members will recall that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) indicated in his Budget Speech the intention of the Government to continue the grant program under the House Building Assistance Act, passed last year, which provides a grant up to \$500 to any individual who constructed a new housing unit during the period of July 1, 1970 to March 31, 1971.

This latter date was subsequently changed to June 30, 1971. The Government, and I am sure the building industry, have been well satisfied with the response generated by this program. I am informed that as of yesterday, 762 grant applications have been paid or are in the process of being paid. In addition in excess of 150 more applications are in various stages of processing for eventual payment, making a total of 912 families who

have been assisted under this program.

I should like to inform you today, that due to the continued interest in this program, the Government has decided to extend this program to September 30, 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — This extension will enable many more individuals to complete dwellings already started, as well as enable others to start a new home as soon as practical, this spring, and be assured that they will be able to qualify for the grant assistance. It is our confident hope that the continuation of this program will provide the stimulus needed to get the building industry into high gear, and equally important, serve to help to reduce the ranks of our unemployed citizens.

MR. E. WHELAN: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the Minister's announcement, but when I put a question on the Order Paper, although a half a million dollars had been voted for this particular grant, less than half of it had been spent as of February 1, in spite of the fact that there had been tremendous difficulty in the economic area and grievous unemployment. The program itself was delayed last year as it didn't begin until July 1 and the delay in starting prevented contractors from making any sort of plans. I hope that it is more successful this year.

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to reply that the program was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. WHELAN: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Leader of the Opposition) — Point of order, where the Minister can make a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: — No, he can't.

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — The Member said that the program was delayed.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. D. V. Heald that Bill No. 12 — **An Act respecting Elections of Members of the Legislative Assembly** be now read a second time.

MR. E. WHELAN: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on this before it was in second reading but I did not have the opportunity to study the contents of the new Bill thoroughly.

The area of students' right to vote should be looked at carefully, particularly the section of the Bill that deals with

those that are out of the province residents and who have never lived in the province, who do not intend to live in the province but only reside here for the purposes of education. The Act has been changed to allow such students to vote if they have been attending school in the province for six months. This is a change in the Act and I sometimes think that we should have a good look at it. I question whether it is advisable. Up to this date, students residing in the province for education purposes, have not had full residence rights unless they were from Saskatchewan and had resided here prior to taking up residence in an educational institution. The advisability of allowing voting by students from all over Canada, because they are here for education purposes, and have resided here for six months, is a new procedure and one which I think we should examine carefully.

In regard to a recount procedure, the procedure in this Act is new in some respects. When we are in Committee we shall question some of the sections but, basically the availability of recounts should be without cost to the participants and should be more generous than the Act indicates. The main principle which should be observed is that the decision by the electors should be accurate, fair and final. This should be in the best interests of all the constituents.

Cost of achieving this should be borne by those who benefit, namely, the voters. Payment of a \$300 deposit by a candidate challenging the outcome, according to the Returning Officer, should be required only when the margin is much greater than that set out in the Act.

Let me place on the record the position we should take regarding recounts. While there is a definite improvement in the procedure, we on this side of the House have reservations with respect to preservation of the public interest in recount procedure, particularly in close elections. Voters have the right to know who the successful candidate is; although this should be determined as quickly as possible, there should be no 'sacrifice of the rules of justice, Mr. Speaker.

The principle that the interest of the candidate and the political party is secondary to the interests of society as a whole must be observed. Any election that is won by a candidate by 50 votes or less is sufficiently close to be the subject of recount proceedings. In this situation, any elector should have the right to institute proceedings for a recount. Upon request, in these circumstances, the recount should be pursued by officials of The Election Act in the public interest. Servicing of legal documents and costs of a recount where the difference is 50 votes or less should be the financial burden of the entire province. Where the difference is more than 50 votes the situation is slightly different. In such cases, a properly interested party should be allowed to institute recount proceedings. The costs in this case could be removed from the state and the petitioner made responsible for the costs unless the judge rules otherwise. As a matter of fact, some of us feel that the cost of a recount' should always be the financial responsibility of the state based on the view that elections, as I have said before, that elections are the property of the people and consequently the responsibility of the public. However, one must admit that such an approach, unless there is a vote margin indicated in the legislation, for instance 100 votes or less, might lend itself to frivolous and vexatious actions brought for political mischief. It is necessary to determine the sincerity of a proposal for

recount. If it works sufficiently and justly with a maximum marginal figure, it is our hope that one day the entire recount financial burden will be the responsibility of the general public.

May I turn for a moment to election expenses. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of one Canadian province and a royal commission report by the Federal Government have made a very careful analysis of election expenses, establishing the principle that the cost, to some degree, of elections should be borne by the general public. One province in Canada has the formula which when applied pays for a percentage of the cost of elections if the candidate obtains 20 per cent of the vote. A ceiling restricts the amount that can be spent on a per vote basis.

We predict that eventually this principle will be introduced, accepted and practised in every province and at the federal level. To have omitted this, to have omitted the beginnings of such a progressive policy in this Election Act is a serious neglect. And incidentally a beginning was suggested unanimously by the committee. Failure to recognize the need for progress in the application of the democratic principle is most disappointing.

There are three aspects of election expenses: (a) the control of election expenses; (b) the revelation of the source of contributions; and (c) consideration of alternative methods of financing election campaigns to assure equality of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the Election Committee Report proposes that a ceiling be placed on both the party and candidates' expenses. This legislation ignores this recommendation. We regret that the Committee report ignores sources and fails to consider means, other than private contributions to finance election campaigns. Generally it may be said that the position in the Act is that politics and elections must be prosecuted by private interests. The argument advanced is that there is some onus on individuals to find their own funds and espouse their own views. The Government, by the legislation, apparently believes that the present manner of raising funds is of no concern to society as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, we hold that the position adopted by the Government is archaic and undemocratic. It can be likened to prosecutions of criminal offences in our society. To adopt the reasoning of the majority, a person who was assaulted by another should finance the prosecution of the assault out of his own funds. To hold otherwise would permit a person not assaulted and thus not directly concerned to question the wisdom of society in financing the private cause of the assaulted person. The rich would be able to prosecute offenders and would have the protection of the courts while the poor would likely abandon prosecution for economic reasons.

Rightly our democratic society has determined that offences against an individual are offences against society. Similarly it is our view that society should follow the same reasoning when it comes to election expenses. We cannot afford to assume that elections are the sole responsibility of private persons or pressure groups and society as a whole has no direct interest or concern in them. An extension of this view would be that elections are designed purely for private causes to be aired. However, what is espoused in elections is the concern of all, but for that, private views may become the governing philosophy of the day.

March 15, 1971

Mr. Speaker, there is another important aspect of election financing — a persistent suspicion that contributors influence candidates. What is suggested is that there may be an unconscious or subtle conflict of interests between the public duty of the candidate and the interests of major contributors. Frankly, it is our view that such suspicions are not well founded. However, it is our view that this belief leads to cynical suspicion of political parties and the political process, Mr. Speaker.

Candidates can no longer be thought of as seeking office in their own right. They are supported by individuals, corporations, unions and a variety of organizations. The solicitation of campaign funds is not a matter of secret operation. Thus elections and candidates must be as public in every facet of operation as possible. At the same time we must encourage all citizens to take part in democracy. They should be active in political parties. Their duty does not rest with the casting of a ballot on election day. This suggests that there must be a balance in any new system of financing elections between public involvement and private participation.

In regard to election expenses, we on this side of the House should like to see contained in the legislation, and we recommend: first, the bulk of election expenses should come from the public treasury. Political parties should be limited in their expenses so that they never exceed, for a party during a general provincial election, 25 cents per elector in the aggregate of the constituencies in which the party has official candidates. The election expenses of each individual candidate should be similarly limited to, say, 60 cents per elector, in the constituency, say, up to a figure of 10,000, then 50 cents per elector up to 20,000 and 40 cents per elector in excess of that number.

Mr. Speaker, The Elections Act should be amended so that all expenditures must be made only by an official agent whose duty it is to keep a careful record of all disbursements. Mr. Speaker, in every constituency where a candidate obtained 20 per cent of the valid votes cast, he would be reimbursed from the treasury' according to a formula. The formula in use in the Province of Quebec is suggested as a basic model which can be adopted to Saskatchewan needs. The Quebec formula, were it to apply in Saskatchewan, would operate as indicated in the following examples, taken from the 1967 provincial election results.

In the constituency of Regina Centre: the law would place a ceiling on expenditures of \$6,059.50 in a general election based on a calculation of 10,119 voters. If the candidate succeeded in obtaining 20 per cent of the votes cast, he would be entitled to a reimbursement of \$4,035.90. Accordingly, a candidate would get all of the money he spent on the election returned to him if he chose to limit his campaign to \$4,035.90. If he wanted to spend more, he could do so up to the allowable maximum of \$6,059.50.

We have applied the formula to the constituency of Saskatoon City Park. Here the allowable maximum would be \$9,458.50 based on 16,917 voters in that constituency. Of this amount, the candidate would be entitled to \$6,075.10 from the treasury if he obtained 20 per cent of valid votes cast.

The Committee analyzed several ridings when we met, Mr. Speaker, rural and urban, and we applied the formula that I have just set out. It was found that permissible expenses were in line with actual expenses in the general elections of 1964 and

and 1967. Thus the formula would not result in any substantial shift from prevailing patterns for election expenses.

The advantage of this proposal in a democracy is clear. Financial reasons no longer act as a bar to participation. All political parties and candidates are put on the same financial footing. The need to seek funds from private and secret contributors is eliminated. The possibility of undue influence is largely removed since the money comes from the public treasury. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the amount received from the treasury and the amount allowed to be spent is large enough to encourage financial participation on the part of the electors. Further, there is a built-in limitation to campaign expenses — one of the objectives unanimously agreed to by all Committee members.

It may be argued, Mr. Speaker, that the treasury could not afford such an expense. To this we say that it is a small price to pay to ensure better operation of the democratic process and to acknowledge that elections are in every sense public property. Indeed, amortizing the cost over four years makes the burden on the taxpayers a very light one.

Some Committee members suggested that this would encourage frivolous candidates to seek office at public expense. The danger exists but it is our view that no committee or legislature should set itself up to decide what political party or person is frivolous. That is a decision for the electorate at the polls on election day. We have confidence in the safeguard which would require a candidate to obtain 20 per cent of the vote to qualify for reimbursement.

Second, the office of Registrar of Election Expenses should be created. It should be separate from the Chief Electoral Officer but similarly appointed. The duties of the person in charge could be likened to those of the Provincial Auditor. He should only be removable on an address to the Legislature. The powers of the registrar must be clearly defined. The political parties should register with him. This registration would not have to be complex. It is already being undertaken in some provinces in Canada.

Third, political parties and candidates should be under legal obligation to reveal the sources of their campaign funds. Mr. Speaker, it is our contention that every candidate and political party should file with the registrar, as a public record, statements naming each person or organization from whom a contribution has been received totalling \$100 or more. In the State of California in the United States a similar bill was introduced in that legislature. We are not here attempting to define the exact ways and means of control to ensure full revelation. The important part is the adoption of the idea that we are putting forth in principle. Regretfully, the majority of the Committee could not subscribe to such a view — we wish that they had — presumably on the argument that donors are best kept anonymous.

We think that the Election Act should be amended whereby election campaign contributions in amounts of \$100 or more must be revealed. The ceiling of \$100 is not arbitrary and could be varied if desirable.

We believe that this Bill before us should establish the

March 15, 1971

principle. Control of election expenses, the revelation of sources of contributions and public participation in financing an election campaign would be handled by an overseer or registrar. These reforms in our election machine are fundamental and should be included in this Bill. They are radical and new to the Province of Saskatchewan but we believe they would strengthen democratic government.

It is with keen disappointment that I must refer to the fact that the recommendations of the Election Review Committee regarding election expenses were entirely ignored by the Government. While limited in their application, they would have represented an introduction of the principle which has been adopted by a Royal Commission, a Federal Royal Commission on Election Expenses, and which has been adopted by the Province of Quebec. It would seem that holding committee meetings at length and coming to decisions as important as this, which are ignored, is an exercise in futility.

I wonder if I could turn for a moment to control of the mass media or some allocation of use of the mass media on elections. Although the Committee made specific recommendations regarding control of mass media in elections, again the recommendations are generally ignored in the legislation. The mass media hold a very important position of trust within the democratic system. Except for the CBC, they have grown up in the control of private individuals. Yet their duty is a public one. There can be no argument that this gives rise to conflicts of interest, not all of which are resolved in favor of the public. Because of the nature of their stewardship, we believe the owners of the media have a responsibility to make their facilities more accessible to political parties and candidates, particularly during an election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in what I say here should be interpreted as a desire to change or abridge freedom of editorial opinion or a desire to restrict the reporting of election news. The problem lies in the fact that direct access to the privately-owned means of mass communication is resolved in roughly the same way for political parties as for deodorant manufacturers. The party or the candidate, or the manufacturer, with the biggest advertising budget is in control. It is also noted that the area of control over the media generally lies within the purview of the Federal Government. However, strong representation by this Legislature to the Federal Government would have considerable weight.

At election time we recommend that radio and television stations make available more prime time, without charge, to political parties and candidates. Fair and full opportunity to debate the issues of the province at election time can only be guaranteed in this way. Political debate should not be commercial. Television and radio station operators should not so view it.

The proposed election registrar should play an important part in planning and allocating time, in co-operation with the media, to ensure fairness to all. We recommend that time be apportioned on the basis of the percentage of the popular vote obtained in the previous general election. The registrar would be the person who would notify candidates and political parties of the times and, in case of disputes, would be the sole arbitrator. He should be given wide powers to ensure full co-operation

by all concerned.

Mass media operators will argue that much free time is now being provided. Mr. Speaker, with respect, it is our view that such time is at hours inconvenient to the public. It is tucked away, as a general rule, at an hour when the station has nothing better to occupy its programming schedule. At elections, free time is generally time left over.

If there is a co-ordinated and planned program of allocation of time, there will likely be less competition among political parties to bid for air time, thereby reducing the quantity of political broadcasts.

With respect to newspapers in Saskatchewan, more space must be devoted to the insertion of policy statements and position papers of those who seek office.

In another area, it is our view that the 48-hour ban on broadcasting that presently exists should be applicable also to newspapers if the intent of the law is to be meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, we recommend that this Legislature urge federal authorities to do all that is proper and necessary to encourage the mass media voluntarily to agree to provisions of time and space, on a formula devised by the registrar and implemented with the co-operation of the media. Where provincial legislation is needed to promote the general aims of this proposal, it is recommended that the Legislature make the proper amendments to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, the Committee made certain recommendations which have been ignored in this legislation. These recommendations were in respect to re-designing the ballot; specific and lengthy recommendations regarding election expenses, setting out a specific limit for expenditures by the party and by the candidate; registration and definition of political parties has been ignored; certification of a candidate has been completely omitted; the appointment of an Election Registrar; control of radio and television time has been omitted. These recommendations were in whole or in part ignored by the Government. In my estimation this is unfortunate and must be a disappointment to all members of the Committee.

In summary, let me say this. This Election Act has failed to establish the status of the electoral officer; it has declined to guarantee the right of access to electors in apartments; there is no indication that there should be election rights to all who seek elected office; we have some doubts about the recount procedures; election expenses have not been dealt with, in this area the recommendations of the Committee have been totally ignored; and the role of the mass media and its place in an election campaign has been omitted from the legislation. In reality, Mr. Speaker, the whole absentee ballot procedure has been to a large degree ignored and one cannot help but wonder about those who would vote in this manner, who might be disenfranchised when one recalls that approximately 3,600 voted in the 1964 election by absentee ballot.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have said clearly for a long time that elections should be held on a fixed date every four years. After the next election when we become the government, we intend to include in the next Election Act a

March 15, 1971

specific date, one every four years, and hold a general election at that time. This is New Democratic Party policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, at every possible opportunity for years and with enthusiasm. Members opposite have insisted that this party is financed in a mysterious manner by international unions and by secret means. Well, we have thrown down the challenge and we say to them, "Put it on the books, divulge the source of funds, do it as a requirement of law." Mr. Speaker, where are these accusers who are so brave, who make so many accusations? There is no reference here, no inclusion in this Bill. Is it possible that Members opposite, by their actions, are getting their money in areas and from people whom they want to remain anonymous? I say to them, if you don't want this suspicion to hover over you and if you don't want to be suspected of being dominated by the corporations, put it in writing now when we write this Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Too many times, too often, for political hay you have made speeches about the source of funds. We are prepared to stand up and be counted; we are prepared to have our financial supporters recognized and our source of funds divulged and we are prepared to put it in writing in this legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, that principle is not contained in this Bill, and this, I submit, is because the Members opposite cringe with the fear when they think of the public shock if their books were opened.

Explanations — we have heard them all. Excuses, we are not prepared to make any for them. And for ourselves, we say to the public, "We will open up our books and let the public see them any time." Mr. Speaker, there is no response, their silence on this legislation enunciates their fear and verifies the public suspicion and, Mr. Speaker, it condemns them.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot support this motion. The Election Act, the Bill that is before us, represents only a tidying-up procedure. No new, progressive ideas are included. The people of Saskatchewan and the members of the Committee who worked on the Act must be disappointed. I will not support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. MATSALLA: (Canora) — Mr. Speaker, in making reference to the Throne Speech which indicated that the Government will propose certain far-reaching changes in The Election Act, I for one, being a member on the Committee on Electoral Reform, and I am certain other members of this Committee and most Members on both sides of this House, expected greater changes than were revealed and explained by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) when he moved second reading to Bill 12, The Election Act.

The changes proposed by the Government are in actual fact minor changes. They are far from the far-reaching changes suggested in the Throne Speech. The recommended major changes, Mr. Speaker, by the Committee, as a whole, fall into the areas of election and campaign expenses, change in ballot form and recount procedure. The Bill before us would appear to have accommodated the Committee's recommendation on recount procedure but I must say that the proposed compromise on the ballot form is a disappointment. The ballot form as proposed in my opinion is not an improvement. If anything, it is a form that lends itself to greater error and more rejected ballots than the old form of ballot. The greatest cause for error could be the vertical bar separating the name of the candidate from the square space designed for the voter to place his or her 'X.' There are bound to be many voters who will mark their ballot in the name space rather than the square space, particularly in the case of older people. The Committee's recommendation for the changed ballot was based on the argument that the ballot must be so designed so as to reduce every possible chance of error on the part of the voter in marking his ballot, and in that way exercise his franchise to participate in our democratic process of electing a government.

Our Committee, Mr. Speaker, also took the view that the new ballot would reduce the number of disputed ballots in an election. In making its recommendation our Committee studied the trends in ballot designs and found that the one selected as shown in the Committee's final report would best serve to keep rejected ballots down to the minimum. I'm at a loss to understand why the Government decided to retain the occupation of the candidate on the ballot. Our Committee felt that candidates prior to election are known well enough as to their occupation and hence there is no need to clutter up the ballot with unnecessary information. Candidates, Mr. Speaker, are voted for by their name and personality and party affiliation and not because they are from some special occupational group. I feel that there is absolutely no reason for showing a candidate's occupation.

Our Committee, Mr. Speaker, — I hope I am speaking for most of the members, — is disappointed that the Bill before us doesn't in any manner deal with controlling of expenses in election campaigns. This is one area of our Committee's work where we were looking forward to the so-called "far-reaching changes" in electoral reform. The Government evidently ignored our recommendations and saw fit not to deal with this very important area of much needed reform. For the benefit of all Members of this House I wish to make reference to the Committee's report and read to the House some pertinent parts of the report on ways of setting enforceable limits to expenses in election campaigns. I quote:

After considerable deliberation the Committee recommends an overall ceiling on party expenses on the one hand and on candidates' expenses on the other. It leaves to the parties and the candidates the right to spend the money in whatever ways they see fit and with whatever emphasis and practices they deem expedient. This major recommendation necessarily calls for methods to implement this control and from this flowed the recommendations to define and register political parties, to formally register nominations and to set up the office of Election Registrar to administer the rules.

To limit expenses of this new office the Committee feels

that the work of the Election Registrar is not continuous but would involve detailed work at a certain period especially before, during, and following an election. As such the duties could be combined with an existing public service position on a light nature.

The Committee recommends that election expenses for a party during provincial general elections be limited so as never to exceed 25 cents per elector in the aggregate of the constituencies in which each party has official candidates. Upon close examination of the method of controlling election expenses it is felt that this method is most effective.

The Committee recommends that the election expenses for each candidate be limited so as never to exceed 50 cents per elector in the constituency during provincial general elections and 75 cents per elector in the constituency for a by-election held in that constituency. Since the ceiling for election expenses for both the party and candidate is determined by the number of electors it is felt that this formula would treat the large and the small, the rural and the urban, the sparsely and the densely populated constituencies in an equitable manner.

Your Committee recommends that the publishing of all opinion polls be forbidden from the time of the issuance of the writ to the election day. It is felt that publicizing the results of opinion polls might be used as a method of influencing public opinion. The Committee also feels that the restricted use of opinion polls would help reduce candidate campaign expenses.

The Committee recommends that consideration be given to increasing the amount of public information time on radio and television for political parties during election campaigns. It is felt that such allocation of time is to be based on a formula determined by consultation with the political parties and the Election Registrar.

The Committee feels that an increase in the amount of public information time on radio and television would help decrease the campaign expenses of the parties and the candidates.

I want to make reference now to the minority report submitted by my colleagues, Mr. Romanow, Mr. Whelan and myself. Committee members on this side of the House have a number of reservations to the majority report tabled by the Committee. I should like to deal with these and put them into the records of this House.

Now first of all the neutral status of election officials. I quote:

The Election Act at present provides that the Chief Electoral Officer is to be appointed by, and serve at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, in effect the Cabinet. Returning Officers are appointed in the same manner. The majority decision of the Committee to retain this system perpetuates a structure which fails to guarantee the neutrality of the electoral machinery.

In our view, it would have been more enlightened to recommend that the Chief Electoral Officer and other officials be removed from direct Cabinet control and given greater independence and autonomy in the discharge of their duties. This independence could be achieved by providing that the Chief Electoral Officer be appointed by the Legislative Assembly, removable only on address of two-thirds of the Assembly. The advantages of this procedure are: (a) the initial appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer would require considerable co-operation among the political parties and the likelihood of his ever being removed for political reasons would be greatly diminished; (b) the Chief Electoral Officer would not be the subject of partisan political debate; (c) he would be better able to fulfil the role of neutral umpire in decisions affecting elections; and (d) he would be able to build up a permanent staff of qualified and independent Returning Officers and other election officials directly responsible to him and through him to the Legislative Assembly.

The present method of appointment reflects the view that the electoral machinery is a legitimate prize in the spoils system. Although we do not suggest that this power has been seriously misused, we believe the possibility of arbitrary political appointments or dismissals should be eliminated. It is our conviction that adoption of a system of appointments similar to that provided for federal election machinery would enhance the prestige of provincial election officials and improve the impartiality and fairness of democratic elections.

Now we move to the next point, the right of access to electors in apartments. The report says:

The majority of the Committee recommended that no landlord shall prevent a candidate or a person acting on his behalf from having access to an apartment or similar building.

It is incorporated in the draft Act. We are in full agreement with the principle of this recommendation. We respectfully disagree, however, with the majority decision not to mention the proposed new section in the Committee's written report. The principle involved is too important to be left out of legislative discussion. Apartment living is on the increase in Saskatchewan cities. Newer buildings are frequently equipped with electronic security systems designed to limit access. Further, in some other jurisdictions landlords have refused on a purely political basis to permit candidates access to tenants. The right of the landlord to refuse access to his building is outweighed, at election time, by his duty to ensure that all tenants have the opportunity to meet and speak to candidates directly. The power to veto such personal contact should not rest in an individual or a corporation.

The proposed section would rectify this situation by making it an offence for a landlord to prevent a candidate from having access to his building. We believe it could be reworded more clearly to define the rights and duties. For example, the right to visitation could be

limited to that period between issuance of the election writ and polling day. The definition of candidate's agent could be more stringent.

In the main, however, we disagree only with the majority decision not to discuss the recommendation in the written report. Penal legislation should be explained and publicized before it becomes law. Similarly tenants have the right to know the nature of the proposed reform. We urge support of this recommendation.

Now we move on to equal rights to seek elective office.

Subject to the basic qualification such as residence and citizenship, the right to seek election theoretically applies to all. In practice, many persons dependent on wages or salaries cannot obtain leave from their employers to campaign for elections or if successful to serve in the Legislature. The legitimate concern of an employer to have first claim on the working hours of an employee is understandable. Nevertheless, his measure of control does permit him to deny opportunity to seek office to an employee whose political views are contrary to his own.

Again, there is potential conflict between private rights and public rights. We believe that it is necessary to resolve the issue on the side of public rights and guarantee the basic freedoms of working men and women. The extent of dislocation which employers are likely to suffer is relatively small. There are only 59 constituencies. Often a person fails to win his party's nomination or if nominated may not be elected. Therefore, the aggregate employee time lost to employers would not be great.

The undersigned believe the Legislature must guarantee that political office does not become the private domain of the well-to-do, the self-employed and the professionals. Such representation would not be representative of Saskatchewan. We therefore strongly recommend an appropriate amendment to The Election Act which would permit a candidate as a matter of right to obtain leave from employment to campaign, and if elected to serve in the Legislature.

The fourth section of this report deals with recount.

In general we are in accord with the changes recommended respecting recounts. The existing system for recount is very technical and burdensome. The Committee members wisely chose a system that, while still complicated, has built into it several advantages to ease the chance of technical objection barring the determination of the wishes of the electorate. However, the undersigned do have reservations with respect to the preservation of the public interest in recount proceedings, particularly in close elections. In close elections the voters have a right to know who the final winner is. Although the determination of that winner should be made as quickly as possible, there must be no sacrifice of the rules of natural justice. Therefore if an election is so close that a recount is needed, the interests of the candidates and the political parties are secondary to the needs of society as a whole.

Any election that is won by 50 Votes or less by a candidate is sufficiently close to be the subject of recount proceedings. In this situation any elector should have the right to institute proceedings for recount. Then the recount should be pursued by officials of The Election Act in the public interest. Service of the legal documents and costs of recount, in a situation where the difference is less than 50 votes, should be the burden of the entire province.

Where the difference is more than 50 votes the situation is slightly different. In such cases, a properly interested party should be allowed to institute recount proceedings. The burden in this case could be removed from the state and the petitioner made responsible for costs unless the judge orders otherwise.

Some of the undersigned still feel that recounts as a whole should be the burden of the state, based on the view that elections are the property of the people and, consequently, the responsibility of the public. However, it is recognized that such an approach might lend itself to frivolous and vexatious actions brought for political mischief. In any event, some experience with operation of the more limited system, that is 50 votes or less, is desirable to determine the success of the proposal. If it works out efficiently and justly, it is our hope that the Legislature will look at the possibility of making the entire recount burden a public responsibility.

Now to deal with election expenses.

This part of the Committee's decision is incomplete. There are, in fact, three aspects of the problem: (a) the control of election expenditures; (b) the revelation of the source of contributions; and (c) consideration of alternative methods of financing election campaigns to assure equality of opportunity.

The majority report makes recommendations only with respect to (a) above, that is, the control of election expenditures, proposing that a ceiling be placed on both party and candidate expenditures. We concur in this recommendation but regret that the main report ignores revelation of sources of contributions and fails to consider means other than private contributions to finance election campaigns.

Generally, it may be said that the position of the Committee majority is that politics and elections must be prosecuted by private interests. The argument advanced is that there is some onus on individuals to find their own funds to espouse their views. Concurrently, the majority of the members adopted the attitude that the present manner of raising funds is of no concern to the society as a whole. With the greatest respect, we hold that the position adopted by the Committee majority is archaic and undemocratic. It can be likened to prosecutions of criminal offences in our society. To adopt the reasoning of the majority, a person who was assaulted by another should finance the prosecution of the assault out of his own funds. To hold otherwise, would permit a person not assaulted and thus not directly concerned to question the

wisdom of society in financing the private cause of the assaulted person. The rich would be able to prosecute offenders and would have the protection of the courts while the poor would likely abandon prosecution for economic reasons.

Rightly, our democratic society has determined that offences against an individual are offences against society. Similarly it is our view that society should follow the same reasoning when it comes to election expenses. We cannot afford to assume that elections are the sole responsibility of private persons or pressure groups and society as a whole has no direct interest or concern in them. An extension of this view would be that elections are designed purely for private causes to be aired. However, what is espoused in elections is the concern of all, for that private view may become the governing philosophy of the day.

There is another important aspect of election financing — a persistent suspicion that contributors influence candidates. What is suggested is that there may be an unconscious or subtle conflict of interest between the public duty of the candidate and the interests of major contributors. Frankly it is our view that such suspicions are not well founded. However, it is this belief that leads to cynical suspicion of political parties and the political process.

Candidates can no longer be thought of as seeking office in their own right. They are supported by individuals, corporations, unions and a variety of organizations. The solicitation of campaign funds is not a matter for secret operation. Thus, elections and candidates must be as public in every facet of operation as possible.

At the same time, we must encourage all citizens to take part in democracy. They should be active in political parties. Their duty does not rest with the casting of a ballot on election day. This suggests that there must be a balance in any new system of financing elections between public involvement and private participation.

We therefore recommend as follows: Firstly, the bulk of election expenses should come from the public treasury. Political parties should be limited in their expense so that they never exceed, for a party during a general provincial election, 25 cents per elector in the aggregate of the constituencies in which the party has official candidates. The election expenses of each individual candidate should be similarly limited to, say, 60 cents per elector in the constituency of up to 10,000 then 50 cents per elector up to 20,000, and 40 cents per elector in excess of that number.

The Election Act should be amended so that all expenditures must be made only by an official agent whose duty it is to keep a careful record of disbursements. In every constituency where a candidate obtained 20 per cent of the valid votes cast, he would be reimbursed from the treasury according to a formula. The formula in use in the Province of Quebec is suggested as a basic model which could be adapted to Saskatchewan needs. The Quebec formula, were it to apply to Saskatchewan, would operate as

indicated in the following examples:

Regina Centre Constituency. The law would place a ceiling on expenditures of \$6,059.50 in a general election based on a calculation of 10,119 voters. If the candidate succeeded in obtaining 20 per cent of the votes cast, he would be entitled to a reimbursement of \$4,035.90. Accordingly a candidate would get all of the money he spent on the election returned to him if he chose to limit his campaign to \$4,035.90. If he wanted to spend more he could do so up to the allowable maximum of \$6,059.50. Saskatoon City Park constituency. Here the allowable maximum would be \$9,458.50 based on 16,917 voters in the constituency. Of this amount, the candidate would be entitled to \$6,075.10 from the treasury if he obtained 20 per cent of valid votes cast.

The Committee analyzed several ridings, rural and urban, in the formula set out above. It was found that permissible expenses were in line with actual expenses in the general elections of 1964 and 1967. Thus, the formula would not result in any substantial shift from prevailing patterns.

The advantage of this proposal in a democracy is clear. Financial reasons no longer act as a bar to participation. All political parties and candidates are put on the same financial footing. The need to seek funds from private and secret contributors is eliminated. The possibility of undue influence is largely removed since the money comes from the public treasury. At the same time the difference between the amount received from the treasury and the amount allowed to be spent is large enough to encourage financial participation on the part of electors. Further, there is a built-in limitation to campaign expenses, one of the objectives agreed to by all Committee members.

It may be argued that the treasury could not afford such an expense. To this we say that it is a small price to pay to ensure better operation of the democratic process and to acknowledge that elections are in every sense public property. Indeed, amortizing the cost over four years makes the burden on the taxpayer a light one.

Some Committee members suggested that this would encourage frivolous candidates to seek office at public expense. That danger exists but it is our view that no committee or legislature should set itself up to decide what political party or person is frivolous. That is a decision for the electorate at the polls on voting day. We have confidence in the safeguard which requires a candidate to obtain 20 per cent of the vote to qualify for reimbursement.

Secondly, the office of Registrar of Election Expenses should be created. It should be separate from the Chief Electoral Officer but similarly appointed. The duties of the person in charge could be likened to the Provincial Auditor. He should only be removable on address to the Legislature. The powers of the Registrar must be clearly defined. The political parties should register with him.

This registration does not have to be complex.

Thirdly, political parties and candidates should be under legal obligation to reveal the sources of their campaign funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA:

It is our contention that every candidate and political party should file with the registrar, as a public record, statements naming each person or organization from whom a contribution had been received totalling \$100 or more. In the State of California in the United States a similar bill was introduced to the legislature. We are not here attempting to define the exact ways and means of control to ensure full revelation. The important thing is the adoption of the idea of the principle. Regretfully the majority of the Committee could not subscribe to such a view, presumably on the argument that donors are best kept anonymous.

We respectfully differ and recommend an amendment to The Election Act whereby election campaign contributions in amounts of \$100 or more be revealed. The ceiling of \$100 is arbitrary and could be varied if desirable.

In conclusion, all of the foregoing will result in a more responsible role for the political party and individual candidates. It will mean the introduction of an overseer the registrar, who will have the important duty and authority to ensure fairness and equality, in our opinion all of these reforms are fundamental. They are radical and new to the Province of Saskatchewan. They will, we believe, strengthen democratic government.

Another point raised in this report is the mass media in election.

The general comments of the main report are supported. However we wish to make some additional recommendations concerning newspapers, radio and television. The mass media hold a very important position of trust within the democratic system. Except for the CBC they have grown under the control of private enterprise. Yet their duty is a public one. There can be no argument that this gives rise to conflicts of interest, not all of which are resolved in favor of the public. Because of the nature of their stewardship, we believe the owners of the media have a responsibility to make their facilities more accessible to political parties and candidates, particularly during an election campaign.

Nothing in what we say here should be interpreted as a desire to change or abridge freedom of editorial opinion or a desire to restrict the reporting of election news. The problem lies in the fact that direct access to the privately-owned means of mass communication is resolved in roughly the same way for political parties as for deodorant manufacturers. The party or the candidate with the biggest advertising budget is in control. It is also to be noted that the area of control over the media

generally lies within the purview of the Federal Government. However, strong representation by the Legislature to the Federal Government could carry considerable weight.

At election time we recommend that radio and television stations make available more prime time without charge to political parties and candidates. Fair and full opportunity to debate the issues of the province at election time can only be guaranteed in this way. Political debate should not be commercial. Television and radio station operators should not so view it.

The proposed registrar should play an important part in planning and allocating time in co-operation with the media to ensure fairness to all. We recommend that time be apportioned on the basis of the percentage of the popular vote attained in the previous general election. The registrar would be the person who would notify candidates and political parties of the times, and in case of dispute, would be the sole arbiter. He should be given wide powers to ensure full co-operation by all concerned.

Most mass media operators will argue that much free time is now being provided. With respect, it is our view that such time is at hours inconvenient to the public. It is usually tucked away at an hour when the station has nothing better to occupy its programming schedule. At elections, free time is generally time left over.

If there is a co-ordinated and planned program of allocation of time, there will likely be less competition among political parties to bid for air time, thereby reducing the quantity of political broadcasts.

With respect to newspapers in Saskatchewan, more space must be devoted to the insertion of policy statements and position papers of those who seek office.

In another area, it is our view that the 48-hour ban on broadcasting that presently exists, should also be applicable to newspapers if the intent of the law is to be meaningful. Therefore, we recommend that the Legislature urge Federal authorities to do all that is proper and necessary to encourage the mass media to voluntarily agree to provision of time and space on a formula devised by the registrar and implemented with the co-operation of the media. Where provincial legislation is needed to promote the general aims of the foregoing it is recommended that the Legislature make the proper amendments to the proper statutes.

Now dealing with constituency boundaries.

One of the important principles of elections is that there be an equality of worth of the ballot. The size of constituencies is thus very important.

One of the outstanding features of today is the rapid flux of population within the boundaries of a particular political unit. Constituency boundaries often neglect to register such population movements with the end result that large population groups may become electorally disadvantaged relative to other population groups. A

legislature that presumably represents the population cannot allow a situation to develop where it may be accused of electoral discrimination.

Yet it is understandable that legislative assemblies may not always be acutely motivated to change electoral district boundaries in the light of population changes. Furthermore, where a legislative assembly itself presides over electoral boundary changes, charges that such changes are unfair or self-interested may be ultimately very harmful to the concept of representative democracy even if such charges are not true. The undersigned recommend: (a) that the matter of electoral boundaries be placed in The Election Act; (b) the establishment of a permanent Electoral Boundaries Commission to be appointed by the whole Assembly and to report its recommendations to the Assembly; and (c) such a Commission to be charged with redistribution after each decennial census in accordance with a set of guidelines similar to, but in detail not identical with, the legislation respecting such Boundaries Commission at the federal level. Through the establishment of such a commission, we could be assured that the votes cast in an election may be of approximately equal value. Situations where the electors in one constituency are electorally worth only one-third or one-fourth as much as electors in another constituency tend to destroy a basic tenet of represented democracy, that everyone has an equal vote.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that this proposed Election Act is a large document of many changes, although minor, one would require to make a longer and a more careful examination of the document. To do this adequately it is essential that more research work be done. To allow for this, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Is leave granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No.

MR. SPEAKER: — Leave is not granted.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising . . .

MR. WOOD: — On a point of order. I say I am rising on a point of order. Leave does not have to be granted to adjourn the debate if the Hon. Member made a motion — I assume that he made a motion when he asked leave to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — We'll call a vote on it.

The adjournment was negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21

Messieurs

Blakeney
Bowerman
Kramer

Meakes
Berezowsky
Smishek

Brockelbank
Baker
Pepper

Messer
Wood
Davies
Dewhurst

Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk

Matsalla
Wooff
Kwasnica
Byers

NAYS — 29

Messieurs

Thatcher
Howes
Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Heald
McIsaac
Guy
Barrie
Loken

Grant
Coderre
MacDonald
Estey
MacLennan
Gallagher
Hooker
Heggie
Breker
Leith

Radloff
Weatherald
Mitchell
Gardner
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry) — Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to participate in the debate on a Bill which I think is of utmost importance to the people of Saskatchewan at election time. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, was that the Opposition would be given ample time to prepare our case in respect to this Bill No. 12. Now over the weekend the decision has been made that Bill No. 12 must be proceeded with.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time since the election of this "holier than thou" Government that their majority has been used to muzzle the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Might I, Mr. Speaker, bring to the attention of this Legislature the fact that up and until 1964, some 1600 minutes were allocated to broadcasts of two major debates from this House — 1600 minutes, Mr. Deputy Premier. When the CCF was the government they allocated 1600 minutes to the two major debates on radio. What has happened now? In six years — over 600 minutes 10 hours of legislative broadcasts over the radio have been eliminated. Why? Mr. Speaker, is it due to the fact that there is a slack in the economy?

MR. MacDONALD: — It is because we cut the debates.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — In an answer given to a question from the Members of this House — how much was spent annually for the winter ball? The answer given was \$5,000. This Government, Mr. Speaker, can find \$5,000 to hold an annual winter ball.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — At the same time your reason for discontinuing the broadcasts by some 600 minutes is that they are too costly. Mr. Speaker, the reason is not that these broadcasts are costly because thousands upon thousands of dollars have been wasted by

March 15, 1971

this Government . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — . . . on highways, on political propaganda, and on everything else to put the Government into a good light.

MR. GALLAGHER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't know what the Member for Redberry is saying has to do with The Elections Act. I think he is completely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order: I have to agree that the point of order is well taken if the Member can't get him back into order . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, I am making specific reference to the fact.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What fact?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — That the Government has denied adjournment of debate on Bill No. 12.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — It's been settled. It was settled in this House by a majority vote.

MR. MacDONALD: — Carry on, Dick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I'll make another attempt, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, in an initial statement when I commenced my remarks this afternoon, I stated that we in the Opposition were not aware that the Government would disallow adjourning the debate on Bill No. 12 today. It was felt that we should be given ample opportunity to study the voluminous Act, and the changes as they concerned the revision of The Election Act for the ensuing election which seems to be in the offing, and I hope that the Premier makes up his mind to call it soon. I hope he calls it soon.

MR. MacDONALD: — About a year and a half!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — This Bill No. 12, Mr. Speaker, is of vital importance to the people of Saskatchewan during an election and to the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, prior to my election to this Legislature I had an opportunity of acting as returning officer at two different provincial elections, in 1952 and 1956.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No wonder . . .

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Well, if there is any Minister who wants to speak, I'll sit down and give him a chance.

MR. MacDONALD: — Absolutely, sit down!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, personally, I didn't see . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order: Maybe nobody else would like to hear the Member, I am trying to hear what he says!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — In 1952 as returning officer under the 1952 Election Act I found no difficulty with the Election Act, it worked well! Redberry constituency after the 1952 election had a recount; there had been no recount up to that time for a period of 21 years in Saskatchewan. The 1952 Election Act, Mr. Speaker, did not create any problems.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — You should have . . . Saskatoon . . . 81,000 votes out of 43,000.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I'll take my time, Mr. Speaker, if they are going to object. We had no problems during the official recount. The district judge summoned the returning officer. In a matter of three days a recount was completed; the winning candidate was declared elected to take his seat in the Legislature. At that time the CCF candidate won.

Again in 1956, I had the privilege of acting as a returning officer under the 1956 Election Act and there were no difficulties at that time. It wasn't until the gentlemen opposite formed the government in 1964, when lo and behold everything went to pot: After the 1967 election some of the candidates weren't seated for more than a year.

MR. MacDONALD: — Whose Act?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned this on previous occasions . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — It was your Act!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — You were the Government, Mr. Minister of Social Welfare: The Election Act in 1967 just became inoperative. It just stopped functioning. There were disputes, and legal technicalities . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Bad Act!

March 15, 1971

MR. MICHAYLUK: — That's right: The Hon. Member for Kelvington is here, but it wasn't until 1969 that the things were under duress and pressure and public opinion to call a by-election. It took two years, Mr. Speaker, to decide in the Kelvington constituency which party would send a Member to this Legislature.

MR. MacDONALD: — We need a new Act, Dick; it was a bad Act:

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Bad Act, absolutely; It only turned bad when you took it into your hands. Everything went bad when you took the Province into your hands, Mr. Minister of Social Welfare. The economy went bad also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Government for setting up an independent committee to revise The Election Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Yes, they were going to make The Election Act look good: But, Mr. Speaker, many points and many changes that were recommended by the Members of the Committee from this side of the House were ignored. Mr. Speaker, I think that there should have been embodied in the new Election Act or in the revised Election Act the term or the number of years that the Government could hold office. It should be clearly stipulated whether the term should be four or five years. The Liberals had never any respect for election acts or tradition.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Fair play!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Or fair play. We can go back to 1944. The then Liberal Government held office longer than was granted to them by the constitution. They held on to office for six years. Yes, they voted themselves an extra year.

MR. GALLAGHER: — Who suggested it?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — What happened after 1944 when the CCF was elected? As regular as the clock every four years the Saskatchewan electors expected an election. Everything went haywire, Mr. Speaker, with the election of these holier-than-thou gentlemen opposite. First term, was it four years, five years, six years? Oh no, Mr. Speaker, only three years. It didn't take you long to mess up the economy, only three years. But prior to this there were several changes in The Election Act. First of all, they changed the cities into constituencies. You did that! You did it in Moose Jaw, you did that in Saskatoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You didn't agree with that, eh?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I'll come to your point, Mr. Minister. Yes, I agree to single constituencies, but not to gerrymandered constituencies.\

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . votes for one person.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, we have had several amendments since 1964. This Session of the Legislature we are drastically revising the Act. I don't say a complete revision of the Act, but certain important and vital changes.

Now in the minority report, Mr. Speaker, there was a recommendation that some Saskatchewan voters may vote on an absentee ballot when away from home. I stated that in 1952 and in 1956, as returning officer I found no problem with absentee ballots. That Election Act gave every resident of Saskatchewan regardless of where he was on election day the democratic privilege of casting his ballot for the candidate of his choice, for the constituency in which he lived. The Hon. Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) stated in his remarks that in 1964 there were some 3,646 Saskatchewan residents who were able under The Election Act of that year to exercise their democratic privilege and vote for the candidate of their choice in their constituency, even when they were away in other parts of the province. Now, the Government may say that absentee voting was difficult to administer. This Government's Bill, Mr. Speaker, retains the right of the people to vote in hospitals, they are making it possible for patients to vote in geriatric centres on a similar basis as that for absentee voting.

MR. McPHERSON: — What is wrong with that?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — There is nothing wrong with that. What is wrong with absentee ballots then? This is my question. There is no difference. The old Act gave provision that electors may go to a polling booth anywhere in Saskatchewan, if out of his constituency ask for a ballot, take the necessary oath or declaration, and register his party affiliation or the name of the candidate on that ballot. The ballot was placed in an envelope, whereon the elector's name or the declaration was made. It was then signed by the poll officials and these ballots were forwarded to the Chief Electoral Officer who forwarded the ballots to the constituencies where the voter declared he was the rightful voter and had the privilege of casting his ballot on election day.

We are muzzled here, by not being given ample time to prepare our debate in respect to this Act. You are denying several thousands of Saskatchewan people by not permitting the continuance of absentee ballots in provincial elections. There was, Mr. Speaker, nothing wrong with absentee ballots. This provision gave the Saskatchewan electors the democratic privilege to exercise their franchise. We made it possible for all electors to vote. We made it possible for Saskatchewan voters to carry out their democratic privilege, yet, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen opposite in this Government are denying this. What happens to people who in the period from the time of the issuance of the writ, are transferred to other parts of the province? It may be necessary for some voter to travel hundreds of miles back to the constituencies to vote at advanced polls. The expense to these people, Mr. Speaker, far outweighs the cost that would have been incurred had the absentee voting privilege remained. I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that this process has been discontinued because of this, thousands of our people will probably be disenfranchised, only at additional expense and time, will they be able to exercise their democratic privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my second point in my argument is that

many of our people will not have the right and the privilege which they had. I am not saying they are disenfranchised. No! But supposing somebody from the Redberry constituency who is working for the Highway Department is transferred to Shaunavon constituency during the period from the time the writ is issued and election date. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a worker travelling from Shaunavon, from Val Marie to Blaine Lake or to Edam, to cast his ballot in an advance poll? The gentlemen opposite have no consideration for that inconvenience.

Mr. Speaker, I had mentioned that many people have lost, or will lose their privilege because they are not in the constituency where they may vote. The Election Act says that an employee must be given so many hours by the employer to go and vote. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, how many hours an employee would require to travel from Val Marie to Blaine Lake? Is that provision granted by this Election Act? Is there any provision to cover the cost of travelling great distances to vote at advanced polls? Oh, no! It may be just during this period that many shifts in the Province of Saskatchewan will be made. These shifts will make it very inconvenient and costly for people to go back to their constituencies to exercise their franchise.

Mr. Speaker, there is another way that people will be disenfranchised, not legally, but technically, because of the gerrymander carried out in Saskatchewan by a redistribution committee. There too is gerrymandering on a local poll basis. Mr. Speaker, may I just cite several examples. Looking at the Redberry constituency in 1967 polling subdivisions, we see some very queer figures and shapes with respect to polling subdivisions. Some of the voters in my constituency had to travel 18 or 20 miles to a polling centre just because The Election Act did not specify, that where more than two townships of a particular constituency form a poll, that the poll should be centralized in the polling subdivision. Does this Act, Mr. Speaker, make that provision? In polls where support for the NDP was strong, some of the voters have to go as far as 22 miles, because the poll, centre was set up at the end of the polling subdivision. The Election Act of 1967 made no provision to make it mandatory for the returning officer to centralize the poll so as to make it convenient for all the voters to reach the polling centre. In the western part of my constituency, the Jackfish and the Marlin areas, there are two other areas where there is a 2 to 1 preponderance of NDP support. People from the former Marlin poll went to Jackfish, because the Act didn't provide, Mr. Speaker, that the returning officer was obligated to have a poll centralized. Some voters from the Marlin poll had to go from the Medstead corner down Highway No. 4 to Cochin backtrack to Jackfish — a distance of about 27 miles. The other half of the poll, Mr. Speaker, the north half of Marlin poll adjoining Turtleford had to go to Minnihaha poll which was about 12 or 14 miles away.

If we look again at the map of Redberry constituency let's look at Poll No. 1. This Poll No. 1, Mr. Speaker, includes an area of almost three townships. All the area north of the North Saskatchewan River, including the village of Borden. In the last election electors voted at Borden. This one poll looks like the Last Mountain constituency or about that size anyway. These people will have to go probably 25 miles to vote. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister in charge of The Election Act would be willing to incorporate an amendment in The Election Act, whereby under statute it should provide a central polling place for the people in polls of this size.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — But if this was logic to the returning officer in the Redberry constituency, let's go north 12 miles, an area which adjoins Highway No. 12, Mr. Speaker. It is near a black-topped highway and they have a poll area six miles square, while a poll below, 12 miles down, includes three townships, in contrast. What is the reason? This is why, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that an amendment should be made to this Election Act, that the returning officer have polls centrally located to make it convenient for all voters to have the same opportunity to cast their votes.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that in the 1952 Election Act and in the 1956 Election Act, there was no problem at arriving at a decision whether a voter was qualified who had taken a declaration or an oath on polling day. There were very few disputes. In my constituency we had a number of ballots that were in envelopes. Some of these ballots were from voters who were away from the constituency, and voted by absentee ballots. Then there were voters who were challenged at various polls and their ballots should have been placed in envelopes sealed and opened on the final count, so that their eligibility could be determined.

Another unjust feature under the Act occurred in my Redberry constituency in a hospital vote where the difference was only 18 votes. When the declared ballots were opened and counted the objections by my opponent to the eligibility of these people who were residents and qualified to vote were very unjust. Let me give you a few instances.

MR. CODERRE: — Let's get into Committee.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Let's go to Krydor again, Mr. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of this House some of the frivolous objections that were used. I wonder whether provisions are made in this Act to overcome this. There was an 81-year-old resident who had lived in the same community as my opponent who knew him as well as he knew me, yet during the final count, my opponent's agent objected to the opening of this ballot on the ground of age. So, during the final count his ballot was left unopened. Revisions to this Act were made a number of times. Yet there was no provision in the Act to make it mandatory for the candidate or the agent raising an objection to prove that the voter was ineligible. The onus was left on the voter.

I think that many similar instances in other constituencies of the province and particularly in Kelvington could be named. A 26-year-old voter's ballot was not counted in the final count. At the time this voter was in the Saskatoon hospital and my opponent, who knew this voter, objected when his hospital envelope came up stating to the returning officer that this voter was not a British subject. The returning officer, because the Act made no provision and laid no onus of proof on my opponent, would not count that ballot.

Another instance concerned a 69-year-old gentleman in the town of Blaine Lake whom my opponent knew. When this man's

declared ballot envelope was brought out to be counted, my opponent stated, "He is not qualified because he was not a resident in the Redberry constituency when the writs were issued." I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this Election Act will make provisions to rectify this. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that these objections were not factual, objections of this type are unjustified, and because my opponent was allowed to raise these frivolous objections, which he knew were unfounded, we had to go to the District Court for a recount.

The cost was almost \$1,000. My supporters in the Redberry constituency, Mr. Speaker, had to spend almost \$1,000 for legal fees for the recount because of these frivolous objections of my opponent who knew that these people were eligible. Yet the Act made no provisions to put the onus on the challenger to prove that these people were not eligible voters.

A voter from any constituency in a hospital, an eligible voter, takes an oath, votes for the candidate and the party of his choice. Yet a candidate or an agent for the candidate refuses to allow the returning officer to count a ballot of a qualified and eligible voter from the constituency.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether this Bill has provisions to disallow such unjust practices in the final count. Remarks have been made by speakers on this side of the House that The Election Act should make provisions so that the Chief Electoral Officer be appointed by the Legislature.

MR. BOLDT: — How come you didn't do that?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Well, the Minister of Highways, the other day stated that what was good for Rosthern is good for Redberry. You well know, Mr. Minister, Redberry is not in as favored a position as Rosthern is. Everything ends in Rosthern, but when one gets into Redberry it is a different kettle of soup.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Chief Electoral Officer should be appointed on a permanent basis by this Legislature and should be dismissed by this Legislature by a two-thirds vote. It is proper to appoint political appointees for highways, but for a post as important, as Chief Electoral Officer, this Legislature should be empowered to make a choice.

The Election Act, Mr. Speaker, should include an independent commission set up by this Legislature to redistribute the boundaries of the constituencies. If this Act does not provide for a commission this will be done after this Government has the gall to call an election and our party forms the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the right of a candidate to call for a recount where the majority is 50 votes or less has been removed. I hope this is retained. The fact is that the government wants to rush this Act through the Legislature and the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) was not permitted to adjourn the debate, so that we would have little time to study changes in the Act. This is one reason why I am questioning some of the provisions. I did not have enough time to study the amendments which the Government is proposing. You have denied,

and you will deny, thousands of Saskatchewan voters the right to vote. You have denied me as an elected Member to peruse this Act and to state my case. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what is in this proposed Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Now I know the reason why they didn't put you on the Inter-Sessional Committee. You don't know what you are saying.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, a committee for the redistribution of constituency boundaries should be set up under The Election Act. This would prevent destruction of democracy, the denial of representation by population. This would prevent one Member requiring four and one-half votes to sit in this House, while another Member only requires one.

Mr. Speaker, may I just take a few minutes and show to this House what exactly is going to take place whenever the election is called under this new Election Act. Will it equalize representation by population? If we look at some of the constituencies, Mr. Speaker, the population for which this Act I am sure does not make fair provision, as I had hoped that it would have. Let's take a look at three constituencies in north central Saskatchewan. Let's take the constituency of Melfort-Kinistino. I know that my hon. friend, the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault is an able man. Under what equitable basis of the Election Act does he have to be elected by 13,145 voters more or less, while in Last Mountain, the Minister of Labour's (Mr. MacLennan) constituency will elect a member with only 5,150 voters. Well» at least he thinks that he will be elected, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Melfort-Kinistino will require 6,550 votes to sit in this Legislature, and the Minister who will after the election be sitting on that side of the House, requires 2,500 votes.

An Election Act, Mr. Speaker, should try to prevent this. In a democratic country the democratic process should be protected as history records the long struggle to entrench this democratic process. I as a citizen of this province and of this country, enjoy and treasure this process that is now being destroyed by the gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — 2,500 people can elect a Member in Last Mountain, 6,500 can send a Member to this Legislature from Melfort-Kinistino, and 9,000 people will be needed to elect our leader. This and similar situations an election act should prevent. An election act should make it possible for every elector, be he in Redberry, Turtleford, Saskatoon Mayfair, North Battleford, Moose Jaw North, to get to the poll as conveniently as possible. Not an act that makes it possible for the returning officer to gerrymander the polls and make it impossible for some people to get out to cast the votes they are entitled to. These are some of the aspects that this Government should have looked into.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I said that I had been denied the opportunity of expressing my opinion on this Act because of its immensity, and because of some of the important changes which affect the election, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

March 15, 1971

The adjournment was negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21

Messieurs

Blakeney
Bowerman
Kramer
Messer
Wood
Davies
Dewhurst

Meakes
Berezowsky
Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk

Brockelbank
Baker
Pepper
Matsalla
Wooff
Kwasnica
Byers

NAYS — 29

Messieurs

Thatcher
Howes
Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Heald
McIsaac
Guy
Barrie
Loken

Grant
Coderre
MacDonald
Estey
MacLennan
Gallagher
Hooker
Heggie
Breker
Leith

Radloff
Weatherald
Mitchell
Gardner
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate again for the second time the Members of Government are denying this side the right and the privilege to prepare a debate on this new Election Act.

MR. MacDONALD: — Dick, you can go on for three days.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — And it seems that the Government wants two things, this Bill and the mill.

MR. MacDONALD: — We want to listen to you, Dick. There's no way we want to cut you off.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — That's the only thing that you want. You want this Bill and the mill because you can't stand on your record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, in asking for an adjournment of this debate a few moments ago I had several very vital important things that I thought should have been included in The Election Act. One is, Mr. Speaker, the sources of financial contributions made to political parties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — This should have been included. I can recall,

Mr. Speaker, that on previous occasions when the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — It's nice to bring the House to order, isn't it, Mr. Speaker.

On previous occasions the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) brought in resolutions that sources of financial contributions to political parties be disclosed. Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite had ample opportunities to prove their sincerity if they concur in what the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) is now saying. You disclose yours he says and we shall let you disclose ours. Why did you vote against the resolution when it was brought before the House?

MR. STEUART: — Put yours on the table, Dick: Tell us the truth though, Dick;

MR. MICHAYLUK: — We need not go far, in the Province of Manitoba a number of years ago, Mr. Speaker, a commission was set up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — What were the disclosures made by the committee? It reported that the breweries of Manitoba contributed to the Conservative party, to the Liberal party, to the Social Credit party. The CCF received no funds.

MR. STEUART: — They sure did here, Dick! They sure did in Saskatchewan;

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of contributions and sources of financial contributions to political parties should be mandatory and should be incorporated in The Election Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — It is easy, Mr. Speaker, to make broad, sweeping statements that, "You get your sources of revenue from the international unions." Our New Democratic Party books are open for inspection to all our members in Saskatchewan and they show the sources of our contributions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — We have nothing to be ashamed of and I don't think that at any time contributions have exceeded \$1,000 by the Saskatchewan labor unions.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Wait a minute; Wait a minute, Dick. You know that's not true.

March 15, 1971

AN HON. MEMBER: — Let's open your books. We'd like to see them.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Yes, they're open. They are open to everybody.

There is another aspect. I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that there is no provision in The Election Act for the provision that expenses be borne by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for free time on radio and television for all political parties after the writs are issued. Something very dramatic with respect to costs happens in Saskatchewan after the writs are issued. The costs on radio and television are not doubled in price but quadrupled, and sometimes as much as ten times greater than they normally are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Here is a party, Mr. Speaker, and a government which does not include in The Election Act that it be mandatory to show where it got revenues and which voted against the resolution brought into this Legislature to disclose the sources of its election funds. They are on TV and radio day after day, week after week come election time. Even at this time, Mr. Speaker, all that the Saskatchewan voter has to do is turn on a television or a radio — SaskTel, Saskatchewan Power, Hospitalization and Medical Care Plan — propagandizing on behalf of these gentlemen opposite. And, of course by not revealing their sources of revenue the only conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I can arrive at is that their sources of revenue are unlimited and they do not want to disclose who their friends are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — We have to compete with this free enterprise financial machine, Mr. Speaker. I think, Mr. Speaker, that to make it ' fair to the electors of this province and to the parties of this province, that under statute each party be allocated equal radio and television time, paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — This is not included in this Act, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the Members opposite will consider when we get into Committee of the Whole that some of these aspects be included as I have suggested.

MR. MacDONALD: — Carry on, Dick!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — My suggestions are that the returning officer be appointed by the Legislature; that political parties reveal their sources of party campaign funds; that TV and radio time be allocated on equal basis to all political parties; that absentee ballots be again introduced for Saskatchewan residents regardless of where they are in the province on polling day.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I should like to mention had it not been for the denial and privilege to adjourn.

This Act contains 259 clauses yet when the Hon. Member from Canora asked for adjournment he was denied this right. He was a member of the Revision Committee and should have been granted this privilege as many of the recommendations in the minority report are not included. I too had hoped that ample time be permitted to Members on this side to discuss Bill 12 and its proposals. It seems that the Government wants to cut off discussion.

MR. MacDONALD: — Why didn't you prepare it?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I'll have a lot more to say when this Bill No. 12 comes before the Committee. I'll oppose the Bill on second reading.

MR. MacDONALD: — Why didn't you prepare it, Dick?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. THIBAUT: (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but when our chief critic, Roy Romanow, the Member for Riversdale, who sat on the Committee and who through no fault of his own is unable to be in the House, under doctor's orders, this is how much sympathy this group can give to a man who . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — . . . is the Deputy Leader of this Party. Also to deal with The Election Act of this Province, one of the most important Acts before this House and before the people of this province, we cannot get an adjournment. They talk about democracy. When I look at it — some 120 pages — there is a lot of work to go through all of a sudden. We cannot do justice to it in such a short time. We have to presume what's in the Act, which is not fair, not fair to the people on this side of the Legislature and not fair to the people of this province.

Now, there are many things that were said and I'm going to deal with a few. We heard about a gerrymander and every once in awhile, you say, "Well, what did you do in Saskatoon?" I can remember a Member by the name of Sally Merchant who came from Saskatoon and she was elected for a multiple seat and if it was wrong to have multiple seats, I don't quarrel with it. If it was wrong, two wrongs don't make a right. It does not justify your Party in going ahead with an election on the present basis and I am disappointed in a way that in this province, the redistribution Bill, was not given as much publicity as it deserved because it was the uprooting of the foundation of our democratic system, the worst that has been seen in Canada. We talk about the gerrymanders of the Province of Quebec, that they would cross the street to take a few families to get them in a different seat. But to go ahead with an Election Act with the redistribution, a Bill before us like this is just sheer nonsense. At least in the Province of Quebec they tried to keep the numbers even. The boundaries were crooked, but the numbers per constituency — they tried to keep them reasonably straight, so they were not completely crooked, the numbers were at least straight. But here, the boundaries are crooked, the figures — I don't know what language we could use — I don't know of any

March 15, 1971

word in the French language or the English language to describe 3,400 voters in one seat in Regina and close to 18,000 in the other. Call it gerrymandering, I know in my country they call it downright crooked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — I don't say that but that's what my people say. It's the first time that I can recall that a retired Member of this Legislature is appealing to the Governor-General to do something about it. I'm satisfied that the people across the way know that this is not fair. They know it. How can you adjust? I always like to put it this way to people when they say, "How do you like serving in public life?" I say I want to do it in this way and the time will soon come, it comes faster than we want to where we have to look at what's happened in the past. If I voted for this Redistribution Bill, Mr. Speaker it would be one part of my life that I should want to have forgotten

Over the years I have invited students to attend the Legislature. I took great pride in telling students,

'Let this trip to the Legislature not be only a trip to come to see a great big building — I want it to teach you something. I want it to arouse your curiosity in government and I want you to go back and take the Speaker's notes' — the little brochure — and I said, 'this is very good.' But up until this Redistribution Bill had taken place I was able to tell my students, 'You have representation by population and guard it well.' I cannot honestly say that anymore. I should have to lie to them if we carry an election on with the Redistribution Bill the way it is

You may call me to order because I'm not speaking about The Election Act, but I think the two are tied together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — I know many teachers who have asked me for maps so that they could show it to their students and God bless them that they are able to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — I think that out of all the bills that appeared before this House, even when it was Medicare, the KODs — the kicking on the doors — and you name it, the worst this Legislature has ever done is the Redistribution Bill. Today, it will not even permit us to wait for a man who is in hospital to come into this Legislature and speak on this so important Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

MR. THIBAUT: — You call it freedom. I don't know what you could call it, there's no name for it.

Now, I can see that for the Government across the way, the honeymoon is over. For three years it spent money like a bunch of drunken sailors and then it went to the people, "Look how nice it is. Give us another chance." Today it is bankrupt in every way you look. It is even bankrupt as far as leadership is

concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — They have plenty of trouble there.

Now, we mentioned absentee ballots a moment ago. I could never see anything wrong with absentee ballots. I attended the recount of absentee ballots and as far as I was concerned, there was absolute secrecy. It gave the people who were moving around a chance to vote. But here again, there is a motive behind it — doing away with the absentee ballot. The Government feels that labor people who move around to work, naturally would vote NDP. So that's another little corner of the gerrymander. That will take out maybe another four, five or one hundred or thousand. People in hospital, well, they would get a right to vote. But to me it is making nothing but a mockery of democracy.

Now I want to mention another area that I hope will be reconsidered. The Committee did not recommend this form of ballot. I hope if we go ahead with this Act that the vertical black line in here will be removed because I'm going to tell you, you will have more spoiled ballots with this thing if you insist on the cross being placed in this little white square. You have people whose vision is not too good. They will ask, "Whose name is at the top and whose name is at the bottom of the ballot and whose name is at the centre of the ballot?" They may have a difficult time to mark their ballot. As far as I am concerned if it was marked anywhere in the area, even on the name of the candidate, that ballot should be allowed. But we are going to make it tough and I hope that you will see fit to remove this vertical line on the ballot if you are going to push this Bill through.

Now we've heard about campaign funds. I had hoped that something would be done about that.

But there is one other area that has to be looked at and an example was during a by-election where the radio station in that city where the election was being held kept coming on the air and saying, "Guard the country against Communism. Get out and vote." The inference all day during the election was that one of the candidates was a Communist. If you call that fair play, I don't know who is responsible for having got this thing going all day, but whoever it was, was certainly dishonest. Because neither one of these candidates could be labelled as Communist. I'm all in favor of radio and television reminding people to go and vote on election day. I think that should be done. Vote for democracy. Yes. Remind the people to go and vote, perhaps information as to where the polling places are would be all right too. But that information can be had. There are too many people who do forget to go and vote. There would be nothing wrong with using the radio and even television to advise people that they have got so many hours left to go and cast their ballot. Some radio stations do it already and I think we should congratulate them for it.

Now, I don't want to take too much time as I think there are a number of speakers on this side who want to say something. I think that since so many of the recommendations of the Committee have not been carried out in this Bill that something should be done about it, giving time to the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) to say his piece about this Election Act.

March 15, 1971

Another thing that I should like to see is a fixed date for the election. You know, when I see the kind of little childish game that goes on before an election. . . People say, 'Is there going to be an election?' "Well, if we are going to have a pulp mill, we might have an election, if the deal falls through, we won't have one; if we have another liquor store in our town, we might have an election," and on and on and on. Well, let's settle this thing once and for all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — If we want elections every five years, I would say have an election every five years and set a date for it. We should not have an election date after all the money has been spent and the Government celebrates how good things are. That's the time to go to the people. Even go ahead. . . You know, the money ran out a year sooner than I thought it would. I told my Party, I said, 'You know, that guy, Ross, he could sit for four years and do nothing and the people of the province would think they've got good government in the shape we left things, but it didn't last that long. It took only three years and it put on a big front and fooled the people of Saskatchewan. Everything was fine. Two days after, austerity. Now if a fixed date for the election had been set, it would have had to go at the end of four years. I tell you you would have had a pretty pale looking group on that side facing the people with the 1968 election. They wouldn't be here today and Saskatchewan would be better off. Saskatchewan would have less pollution and we've had pollution in every area you look whether its redistribution, whether it's The Election Act — it's pollution all over the place. I think they are the fountain head of pollution.

Another thing that I want to . . .

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Your Leader says for you to sit down.

MR. THIBAUT: — No, he said to keep it up until about 3:30 tomorrow morning.

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Lead your little sheep there, Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — There is one more point I want to make and that is the redistribution of the polls. When it redistributed the polls in my constituency the last time, I'll tell you what it did. Where there was a CCF area, it made them go to the Liberal area to vote. Some had to travel miles and miles. I know that there was one poll that the CCF could never take but after that election it became NDP. Even the Liberals could not stand the smell of that one. So this is where you are losing your votes.

But with this, I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for listening to me for so long and I'll. . . Wait a minute. I would move that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I draw your attention to Beauschesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, subsection 8, citation 165:

A Member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate cannot ask to rise to move adjournment of the House.

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate which is a repetition of what some of the other Members have said but I can say to you that I am not happy with all the provisions of this Bill. I think it would have been wise to have had some of the people who have been studying the contents thereof to have had an opportunity to present the case as they see it in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I think all Members know that our Deputy Leader (Mr. Romanow) is ill in bed, under doctor's care. It has been pointed out to this House that he has been working on this Bill in order to make some positive recommendations or to present some of the opinions that we have. Like the Hon. Members opposite we don't all read the Act, we go through it and we delegate certain people to be more involved specifically. I think that since this is a democratic Legislature that the least that the House could do is to provide an opportunity for our critics to get up in the House and present the case in this debate. However, I have had considerable experience with the elections as you know, Mr. Speaker. I have been a Member now for nearly 20 years, I have fought a number of elections, I have seen many things happen that should not have happened in a democratic society. However, people are what they are, and I suppose some parties are what they are. They don't care how they get into power as long as they can get into power.

So I must say a few words about the absentee ballot. I recall in one of the polls in my constituency, it happened to be in the Prince Albert National Park where many people came from all over Saskatchewan to work. I happened to be the scrutineer at that particular poll. Under the old Act, which we had, everyone of those people who was a citizen and a voter of Saskatchewan had an opportunity to vote for the Member he wanted to support back in his constituency where he was domiciled, where he had a home. This opportunity as far as I can see in the Act is not extended. What exists here now is an opportunity to plug a poll or even a constituency. You could imagine, for example, that you may have an industry, say at Doré Lake for example, that we have been talking about — I hope they go ahead with it, it's the kind of thing that is good for the province — but let's assume that you have that kind of industry going on up there. You have a thousand people from all over the Province of Saskatchewan and it could be that these people have only been chosen to work there because of their particular party affiliation, that's been true in many cases. I don't want to refer to what has been happening in Natural Resources in Prince Albert where they had a man to check politically on anybody who wanted a job. If you want his name I'll tell you. I mentioned him here before. I can go to other departments. This is the kind of thing that is not decent in a democratic society and it could happen.

March 15, 1971

MR. STEUART: — Oh, Bill . . .

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — You don't like it, but it is true. It could happen in any industry where you could get a bunch of voters, Mr. Speaker, into a certain poll and you can plug. . . You don't like it, if you want to make a speech get up and make a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order; I can't hear one single word the Member for Cumberland is saying and I would ask the Members of this House to keep order so at least some of us could hear.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, you can't blame me, I'm speaking loud enough and I hope clearly enough.

MR. SPEAKER: — I wasn't blaming you. I just ask the whole House, both sides, to keep order.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members don't like what they practice and what we know goes on, they need not object. They had better correct the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — All that I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no provision in this Act which will give people from outside who may go to work in a certain area a chance to vote for the candidate of the constituency in which they live. Therefore, we have the right to debate and point out our point of view on this particular point.

The Hon. Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) mentioned about the setting up of constituencies in the redistribution and I am one of those who has a constituency which is affected. I represent with the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) the same city. He has a little postage stamp in which there are probably 10,000 or 12,000 voters.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There are only 9,000.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Well, I am giving him the benefit, he said it was going to grow, I'll say 10,000. But do you know, Mr. Speaker, what I have, what this redistribution did — they gave me about 16,000 voters from Prince Albert to Flin Flon, 300 miles. I've got everything in my constituency and to that extent, Mr. Speaker, I consider myself a better representative in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 p.m.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, before adjournment this afternoon I pointed out to the Legislative Assembly why it was necessary for some of us to get up on our feet and speak on this particular Bill. I pointed out at the time that we had, as I am sure the Government has, persons appointed who do some special work on these

bills because it would be impossible for every individual Member to go through every bill and through everything. It is obvious that time doesn't permit. It certainly didn't permit me to go through the Bill, had I expected that this kind of debate would develop, where the Government would use speed-up tactics against us, I should have prepared myself better. However, they have to accept what I have and I hope that when the time comes and if I ask for an adjournment, they will give me an adjournment so that I can continue my speech later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, something about the absentee ballot. I did say that I had some experience in the national park some years ago when I was a scrutineer at that point. I should like to add to what I said that my experience was that certain people were so influenced by politicians that in spite of the fact that they knew the law, they still tried to vote illegally although they had an opportunity to vote for their own constituency. I remember one case where the person was asked by me, "Where is your domicile? Where do you live? Where is your home? Where is your wife? Where are your kids?" And this person told me it was in Nipawin but he demanded to vote in Waskesiu at the park, in another constituency.

Now, it's either one way or the other but I think the democratic way — and I have the right to my opinions as the Hon. Members have the right to theirs — is for a person to vote in the area that he is resident in, where his home is and therefore the Act should say so. This Act apparently does not.

I've had many other experiences in this particular business of elections and should like to comment on some of them. One of them is the matter of campaign funds. I think I stated in this House in debate that after an election I was wondering who paid whose bills. I don't particularly care who pays whose bills but if a person like myself who happens to be a candidate, and elected, and I have to go down to a certain establishment to pay my bill, and they say to me, "Well, we're surprised that you are paying your bills. Your Opposition's bills were paid by a Toronto firm." And this is what happened to me. . .

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — . . . this is what happened in Prince Albert and if you want me to tell you where, it happened in the Prince Albert Herald offices and the girl was flabbergasted that I had to pay my bills because Mr. Steuart's bills were paid by somebody else in Toronto.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Now, I don't care whose bills were paid, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to hurt the feelings of my hon. friend but I do say that there is something wrong when we get this kind of information. It makes you feel pretty bad about democracy. All that we asked for and I think it should be incorporated in this Bill, is that there should be an exposure of where the money is received from. That to me would be much more democratic than it is right now.

Somebody or other on the other side talked about democracy — well, there are different kinds of democracies. You know, they have a democracy, or so they say, in the Soviet Union but the way they get elected there is about two to four per cent of the members, elect their members but what I want to say in this House, Mr. Speaker, is that such is not a true democracy. I believe in a parliamentary democracy which means control by the majority of the people and not a system where two or four per cent of the members can elect their representatives as they do to elect the Supreme Soviet. Now this Government should have in our law the kind of control which wouldn't allow this kind of situation. You have another law where redistribution is involved and you find that in this country governments can do the same thing, so you wonder whether the people who are in office know what democracy is. Referring again to my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, — my constituency, as I said before supper, will have a vote of about 16,000 people. It extends for 300 miles east to as far as Flin Flon and the Hon. Member (Mr. Steuart) who has a seat in the same city as I have will be able to get by with 9,000, 10,000 or 11,000 people in a little postage stamp area. This is not democratic. That's all I'm saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — It certainly is the responsibility of the Government, not of the Opposition, to see that we sustain democracy, if you believe in it. If you don't believe in it, fine, but at least tell us that you don't believe in it and that you believe in a minority government controlled by members who are elected by minority constituencies. And then we shall know where we stand and the people will know what they are voting for. And this is the purpose of this debate — to try to bring out what the weaknesses are. I think, Mr. Speaker, the best thing this Government could do right now is to take another look at this Bill and other legislation and see that the practices involved are improved substantially so the Bill will mean something more democratic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Now, it is the same thing with polls. I had some experience in the last election yet there is nothing in this law here that says how or in what manner polls are supposed to be established. I had one poll north of Meath Park where there are about six voters. There is a returning officer, a poll clerk and two or three other people and they had the poll all to themselves and this was a costly business to the Government. There is nothing in this law to prevent that. On the other hand we had a large poll of 200 people and people had to travel 20 miles in circles to get down to vote.

MR. BREKER: — Where?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — North of Meath Park and I can give you the facts. As I said you let me adjourn the debate and I'll bring you the facts and I'll show you just how vicious your legislation is in some sections of this Election Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Anyway this is what happened, Mr. Speaker. This is known to the Government. I don't have to hunt up any figures. They've got lawyers and they've got clerks and they can look it up for themselves and then come into this House and tell me that I'm wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — You can get up on your feet and speak to this Bill if you so like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it appears that I appear to be hitting the right chords.

Before supper when I began mentioning something about what happened to absentee voters, the Hon. Members there all began shouting. It sounded as if I had gone and just struck a chord and so we heard all kinds of shouts and noises and none of them were harmonious. And here again I begin to talk about something that actually happened, and Hon. Members know it happened, and again you get this discordant noise from the other side. Well, I hope they'll listen to me for awhile and if they have something to say in disagreement, they will have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to get up and say so.

I pointed out before supper and I want to impress again upon the House now — that one of the weaknesses that is contained in this Act is that there is a possibility of padding. There is nothing to stop any Member from bringing in a 100, 200 or 300 people, like you know the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). There are only about 3,500, 4,000 or 5,000 voters there compared to my 16,000. There is nothing to stop him and his party bringing in 300 or 400 voters into his constituency and I hope he doesn't think I'm suggesting he do that. I'm just saying it could be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — He could take them in there and he could promise them jobs and you would get them all voting for the Liberals for the gentleman who may be running, whoever that's going to be, it may be you.

HON. A. R. GUY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Darn good idea, Bill.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Yes, it is good and you're exactly the kind of man who would do that. Exactly, because you don't believe in democracy. You don't believe in asking these people to vote for the Members who represent their own home constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — You'll do just that. And I'll tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker, that is done, that I didn't want to talk about because it is a disgrace to the democratic system that we

March 15, 1971

are following here. But it's about time somebody said something about it and I'm going to say it right now for the benefit of the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and some of the other Hon. Members who may be using these kinds of election methods. I refer to treating with liquor. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that hundreds of cases of beer went out of the brewery in Prince Albert and the worst thing about it was that no tax was paid on it and this was distributed at election time to Indians and Métis people. And I think there should be heavy penalties in this law to prohibit that kind of thing. And the Hon. Member knows about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — He knows about it.

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — I know you did it!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — That is a lie. I did not do . . . I never game anybody a . . . even a coffee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Now we've heard this word "lie" bantered around this place before and for the second time by you, one of the oldest and most respected Members of this House.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I said I apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: — . . . Members of this Legislature and you should have known better. I ask you to apologize once again.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. The Hon. Member called me that at one time and he did not withdraw . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — And I can tell you right now and I tell every Member of this House one Member isn't going to call another one a liar as long as I hold this Chair and you'll all regurgitate if you do. Let's have no more of this . . .

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Member says is not in accordance with the facts . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — . . . childish school . . . Sit down: We'll have no more of this childish schoolyard play in this House. You're behaving like children: You should be ashamed of yourselves — half of you! And if the Hon. Member knows of anybody who broke the law in connection with liquor, he should lay the charges and if he doesn't lay the charges, he's as criminal as anybody.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say the law was broken.

MR. SPEAKER: — You did!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I was saying, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to make it clear. I did apologize to the Hon. Member. He got away with it once. I didn't get away with it, I tried. You are right, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — If he got away with it then you should have risen on a Point of Order and I should have made sure that he didn't get away with it.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — It's on record anyway. But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this — I am not saying that anybody broke the law.

MR. SPEAKER: — All right!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — This was done before voting day. When I got down to Cumberland House the day before the election I was told by the people there that they had all kinds of beer, they told me where it came from. I checked in Prince Albert and I found out it came from the brewery and no tax was paid on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — And it's about time, Mr. Speaker, and it doesn't matter who we are in this House, that we stop using these kinds of gimmicks in a democracy in order to get elected. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the Hon. Member said, I can assure you on my word of honor I have not bought a person a cup of coffee let alone a bottle of liquor to elect me. I don't need to buy coffee or liquor or anything else to get elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I didn't say the Hon. Member (Mr. Guy) did. I said it could be done and it is done and I am not saying by whom but the record is there and it can be found out and I hope the Government will pass legislation to see that beer that goes out of the breweries is taxed like any other commodity like tobacco and everything else. That's what I'm saying. I am not trying to insult anybody.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order: Point of Order!

MR. BOLDT: — The Hon. Member is making a reflection on every Member of this House and I resent this and I want to tell this House that I have never — and you people know it — why do you throw such a reflection on every Member of the House. I too, Mr. Speaker, am ashamed that the older Member here has to make that kind of statement to my colleague here that I . . .

March 15, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I don't know of anyone whom I should want to point a finger to who has done it. I wouldn't . . .

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I did not, Mr. Speaker, point a finger at anybody. I don't know what the Point of Order is. I'm saying that according to my knowledge. Sir. . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! You've not only pointed a finger at everybody, you've pointed one at me too and I'm not going to stand for it. I'll tell you that.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Do you expect me to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I paid all my bills and I never did anything that was incorrect.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I can only tell you what people have told me has happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, then what you are doing in this House is thundering well and mouthing hearsay. Now I suggest we get back on the Bill. The Bill is The Election Act of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Now, getting back to campaign funds. When we get stuff like this — as somebody mentioned before supper — we get it every minute, every hour and when you get this kind of thing it doesn't even say if it's political, like, say, this document — it's in the paper here called the Weekly News. "Do you have a question," it says, "that you'd like to ask these men?" It just happens to be the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer and it says, "If you have, plan now to phone your questions to them face to face." Double face, yes, it's one long hour, six p.m. to seven p.m. March 20, 1971 CKBI-TV and it says, "We invite you to think about the questions you would like to ask. Prepare your question today. Don't miss this valuable opportunity to question the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer of our Province. Watch, ask, listen, face to face." Who's it by? If it is the Liberal Party surely they should have the decency to say so. If it is publicity by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, surely it should say "Printed by the authority of the Province of Saskatchewan." I shall table this, Mr. Speaker, if you like. And these are the kinds of things that I say are not covered by the legislation here. Not covered and I say it should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — And in talking about democracy, I want to ask this

House, what is democracy? Democracy in my opinion is the majority decision of people and when I have to represent, or whoever is going to represent my constituency, if he has to have five times as many people to represent as the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) or an Hon. Member from Saskatoon, then I ask what kind of democracy is that?

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I know that you may have to adjust for distance and so forth but how much adjustment was there provided when Prince Albert East-Cumberland was set up and Prince Albert West. How much adjustment?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Which Member are you referring to in Saskatoon?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — I meant Regina, I'm sorry. It should be corrected, Regina.

Now I agree with the Hon. Member that if we're going to have democracy, if we're going to have good government, if we're going to have parties that have some, say, self-respect and dignity and you have a House that's going to be dignified, then it wouldn't be necessary to talk about the kind of things we're talking about, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — And, therefore, we've got to adopt democratic procedures. Certainly had I been in a court as a lawyer and I had someone to defend, surely the court there would not have told me that I couldn't adjourn as it happened today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — But to me democracy is that you give people a chance to be heard. We have not been given a chance to be heard. As I said at the beginning I did not intend to talk but I am forced to talk because of the fact that here in the highest court of this province, the Government who has a majority . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — . . . has decided to disallow our Members from speaking. I think it is wrong and I think it is about time the Government and this Liberal Party changed its colors.

I want to say one or more things that I have checked in the Act that I think are good. I think this absentee voting in hospitals, in geriatric centres is good. But the question arises in my mind — and I am sure that if the Hon. Member of, say, Saskatoon Riversdale. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . that's good Roy:

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — . . . Mr. Romanow), and he had been here he would have pointed this out as I am trying to point out. Why wasn't this

ballot extended to the people who couldn't be home for other reasons. If you are sick, fine. The Government says, fine, if you are sick, we'll allow you that right but these are only a few people. But what was the motive behind the fact that this Bill denies thousands of people the vote who in this day and age must travel from one part of the country to another to work. I know from my constituency, from Molanosa and other places, Mr. Speaker, we have native people that go out considerable distances to find jobs in the spring, and at other times of the year. And the Hon. Members know this to be a fact. Are they to be denied the same right that is extended to people who are in hospital? I say it shouldn't be and therefore this law should be changed accordingly.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the laws should be strict and when it comes down to elections we should see that elections are carried out strictly and there should be heavy penalties for illegalities. Because elections to me are probably the most important thing in a democratic society. You cannot expect to have democracy if you don't get people elected through democratic means. Therefore I say we must respect the law and the law must be strict and the penalties must be stiff enough to penalize those who want to break those laws.

As I pointed out, what happened in Waskesiu at the poll I supervised was that the person knowing the law still insisted that he wanted to vote there because he was influenced by friends in Waskesiu. He had a right to vote in Nipawin. That was the law at the time. I didn't allow him to vote. I challenged him.

I think the onus for challenging should be the challenger. I had an experience where the scrutineer gets up and challenges the vote. He doesn't say why or what for. He doesn't have to give any reason and I think the time has come when the onus should be on him and he should say why he is challenging the person.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, you'd be just as angry as I am if you knew what happened in Deschambault. The Liberal Party sent out a couple of scrutineers — and that was their prerogative — we didn't have any and that was our mistake. But these people are born Canadians in Deschambault. They are native people. They have never been anywhere else except in Canada and in Saskatchewan. Do you know that except for the returning officer these scrutineers challenged every one of my native people at Deschambault? Their vote was not counted then. And when it came up later on I said, "Why did you challenge them?" And I admit that the candidate who ran against me was gentleman enough to let the votes go through in the final count.

But isn't it a disgrace to democracy that people who everyone knows are Canadians are challenged, and challenged for political reasons only. These are the kinds of things that I think must be considered when you are passing an Act as important as this one, Mr. Speaker. That is all that I am saying. I admire my colleagues in this House. If the Hon. Member had not insulted me in the first place I shouldn't have said what I did. I am sorry for what I said, but what he said wasn't true because I didn't do the kind of thing that he challenged me for. I shall conclude with this, that it is time that we took a good look at some of these laws that we make so that they will really mean democracy as they should.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D. G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer) — Mr. Speaker, once again we have heard the usual outburst that we come to expect from the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). He tries to hide behind the facade of an old veteran Member who really has great dignity and who really comes to this House with a great feeling for democracy. He tries to hide behind the fact that he can make the most unbelievable accusations; he can smear Members in this House, every one of them, without regard, without thought and then stand up and tremble and let a tear run down his face and either run out of the House or stand up and say, "I'm sorry. They are my friends and I respect them."

He doesn't respect us. He doesn't respect himself. He says, Mr. Speaker, that people that he knows, people out of the Prince Albert brewery have done wrong. Well the manager of the Prince Albert brewery and the staff of the brewery are going to be pleased to hear this, that he has called them crooks in this House. He says that they take beer out of there that isn't licensed, the tax isn't paid on it, then that's a crooked act. That is an act of dishonesty. He said that it is then taken up by the Liberals to Cumberland House and it is passed out to bribe the voters. That is what he said in this House. Then he stands up and says, "I didn't smear anybody." I challenge the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland to come outside of this House and back up those statements and make his accusations of this crooked work, this deceitful work, this breaking of the law, with chapter and verse and date and let the Attorney General lay the charges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Boo!

MR. STEUART: — Never mind boo, I shall deal with you in a minute/

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, when the Estimates come around I will ask the Minister just that, to prove to us that beer is not used for advertising and for other personal . . .

MR. STEUART: — He is the man who made the accusations, he is the man who hides behind this House, and he is afraid and hasn't got the intestinal fortitude, hasn't got the decency. The man is going out of this House and no wonder he was moved to the back bench. I had some respect for him until he stood up here tonight. He waves a paper and says, "Who paid for this?" Well, I will tell him who paid for it. No wonder the Prince Albert Daily Herald is surprised when he walks in and pays his bill. I should be surprised if he walked in and did anything decent. I will tell you and I will tell you all that the Liberals of the Prince Albert constituency pay for that and there is no need or no legal requirement that the ad can't be placed and sponsored by the Prince Albert West Liberal Association. I shall tell this House that that bill and all other ads that we put in the Prince Albert Herald, or in any other news media such as CKBI for face to face programs are paid for by Prince Albert West Liberal Association.

Then he gets up and talks about the Department of Natural Resources. He says, "I know a man, and I could name the man,

who passes judgment on everybody who gets hired in the DNR." He has the nerve to stand in this House and talk about the political patronage in the Department of Natural Resources. The Department of Natural Resources Construction Branch literally crawls with NDP and CCF employees, starting with Mr. Gooding, an NDP candidate. What about him, Mr. Berezowsky? The Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) who never stopped campaigning, who did more work for the NDP-CCF when he was on the public payroll and finally was pushed out of the Department of Natural Resources because they were ashamed to have him on the payroll. The people of Shellbrook will remember him and deal with him.

He stands up and talks about patronage. He has the intestinal fortitude to talk about patronage. He pushed people out of his seat into the Department of Natural Resources Construction Branch. They worked on their farms and they worked for the Department of Natural Resources and it has taken us about four years to clean that mess up. He was party to it. He knew what was going on just as he knew it was going on in 1960, when in my seat in Prince Albert, I had 1,600 and he had 9,000 voters. In 1964 I had 1,700 voters and he had 9,000 or 10,000 voters. Did the little sanctimonious, holier-than-thou, wonderful defender of the saints, this charming little individual that hides behind this House with his accusations. . .

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — You are mad. Of course I am mad and I will tell you why I am mad. Because I am making accusations about you and I am naming you. You stood up and you didn't have the guts to name anybody. You smeared everybody on this side of the House. Your performance here was low and it was degrading and you should be ashamed of it if you had any decency.

Did I ever hear him stand up in this House, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. W. G. DAVIES: (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker', just a few minutes ago you ruled in connection with the remarks of my friend to my left. I am suggesting that the remarks of the Deputy Premier are much worse than the remarks of my friend on my left.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the remarks of the Deputy Premier are offensive in respect of the Member who just spoke on our side of the House and I would ask that you call him to order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! What specific remark is the Member for Moose Jaw South taking exception to?

MR. DAVIES: — The specific remark I would mention of the latter group of remarks, Mr. Speaker, was that the attitude and the demeanor of my friend, Mr. Berezowsky, was low and degrading. I consider that an offensive remark and I think that you should too.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, and I agree with the Member for Moose Jaw South that it was an offensive remark but it was no more an offensive remark than many I have been listening to day after day and week after week, from other Members of this Legislature. If you people want to do away with offensive remarks in this Legislature, take the beam out of your own eye before you pick the mote

out of the eye of someone else.

MR. DAVIES: — Sir, on a point of order. I am suggesting that this remark was contrary to the rules of the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! That's the end of that point of order. We shall just wait until somebody calls someone else a liar and then the boom will fall again. Now go ahead.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I never heard the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) or any of the other Members, now so vigorously defending the idea of representation by population voting, debate the issue last session when they had the opportunity to do so. Obviously, they did a bad job. Now by dragging in the Redistribution Bill they show that they have completely failed to grasp the whole purpose of this Bill. I never saw them rise in their places to complain when we were the Opposition and they were the Government and they have the audacity to take Saskatoon and say, there are no dividing lines. "We can't divide Saskatoon." Every voter in Saskatoon year in and year out, got four and then five votes. They thought that they were going to lose Regina so they divided it. They knew that they could win Moose Jaw so they didn't divide it. There was never a more blatant, political gerrymandering and that lasted year in and year out.

I never heard the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), who so quivers in the defense of democracy now, never heard him raise his voice and say, "We should divide the city of Moose Jaw." Now he cries crocodile tears because when we have divided it, he says that it is uneven.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, this may come well from some individuals but it comes pretty sneaky and pretty poorly from the Members on the other side of the House. I like when they talk about political contributions. For 20 years they sat in this House and in one seat sat Mr. Clarence Fines and he looked after their party financing. And I never once in all those 20 years heard them get up and say, "Let's take the gloves off and see whose hands are really dirty." Let's find out where the political contributions came from.

They got political contributions from businesses the same as they are doing now, the same as we do. But I never heard them get up and say anything about that. They denied it or tried to deny it. They know that it is the truth. I never heard the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland get up and disassociate himself from a party who gets its money, who got \$50,000, proven in this House, \$50,000 from the automobile workers of America, from the United States paid to the NDP Founding Convention. I never heard any of those farm Members get up and say, "We will disassociate ourselves from the party who obviously has sold its soul, not only to big labor, but to American big labor at that." I didn't hear any of them say that, but they stand up and say, "Let's have a law that says that we can show our political contributions."

Mr. Speaker, it is an amazing thing how sanctimonious these people get now that they are in Opposition, how righteous they are. Let's talk about this Bill and the adjournments that they

want. Let's talk about the adjournments.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Talk about the Act.

MR. STEUART: — Yes, I'll talk about the Act now. This Election Act set up a committee, an inter-party committee, a committee from both sides of the House. The Hon. Mr. Heggie, Mr. Cameron, Mr. MacDougall, Mr. Matsalla, Mr. McPherson, Mr. Romanow and Mr. Whelan. How long did it sit? It went for months, and months and months and the Bill that is before us is the result of those sittings and those hearings. The Bill was one of the first tabled in this House. I don't say that it followed the recommendations exactly, but the recommendations that are in that Bill are the recommendations that came from that committee, not all of them. So you are not unaware of it. It was one of the first pieces of legislation tabled in this House. Now why do they want to keep dragging this out, Mr. Speaker? What is their little game? Have they got caught out like spoiled brats and now they are raising a fuss? What is their little game?

Well I shall tell you what their little game is. They like to get up and not speak on the Bill and they talk about redistribution, about that terrible redistribution. Whine and cry! They have the Senior Mr. Brockelbank, the same man who participated in and perpetrated, session after session, some of the worst political gerrymandering this province ever saw. And now that he is out of office, now that he is retired, what is he doing? Mr. Speaker, he has appealed to the Privy Council to see if he can have this Act set aside. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what they need is the advice of some sound lawyer. They need a couple of good lawyers on that side. In fact even a couple of half good lawyers would tell them that the Redistribution Bill and The Election Act, under the British North America Act are the total and absolute responsibility of the province. What is it? Well it is cheap publicity and it is typical whining to Ottawa, whining to someone else when they can't get their own way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Matsalla sat on this Committee and he jumps up and wants an adjournment. Mr. Whelan sat on it and he jumps up and wants an adjournment. Why? Because they like to have one or two speakers get up, put some smear out, smear some garbage around this House, and then hope to get some publicity in the press, radio and television. Then let it sit for a couple of days and then come back and try it a couple days later. But we caught them at it and we said, "You want to debate this Bill, okay debate it." You say that we are muzzling you, no, no, we are giving you every chance to talk. Talk about this Bill from now to doomsday, but don't come into this House and try to use this House, and the rules of this House, for your own political purposes. If you want to talk about the Bill, we are not muzzling you. We are saying talk as long as you want.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good Bill. It is a sound Bill. It will bring to this province some excellent and necessary and timely reforms so that the will of the people when we go to an election will really be followed. They don't like it. They are afraid of it. Why? Why are they afraid of it, because the first time that we ever got close to a fair redistribution, was

the first time that the people dismissed them, dismissed them from office and put them in opposition, where they will remain for years.

I support the Bill, Mr. Speaker, 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W. G. DAVIES: (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to join this debate but listening to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) during the last 15 or 20 minutes would make almost any Member of the House — on this side at least — want to get up and put the record straight.

He talks about this Bill being the results of the recommendations of the Committee. He well knows that there are before this House the minority recommendations of the Members of the New Democratic Party who sat on this Committee. Not one of those recommendations are included in that Bill. And then he complains that the Members on this side of the House should see fit to want to spend some time on a Bill that has 121 pages. Talking about courtesies. What do the Deputy Premier, the Premier, and the Government Members decide to do with respect to this Bill? Not to give to us the courtesy of having our chief critic on this matter deliver his criticisms at a proper time. He is in a sick bed and he could not appear before this House this afternoon and yet the Government wilfully and blatantly decided to go ahead with this Bill.

Why do they want to drag the Bill out, says the Deputy Premier. How are we dragging the Bill out, Mr. Deputy Premier? We are having a discussion on a very important piece of legislation and one that a great many people in this province are anxious to see discussed in this House. He has the gall to talk about political gerrymandering and to bring in the name of the former dean of the House, Mr. Brockelbank.

I want to say this, that I don't think there is any political party in the history of this province that cannot take some criticism for what it had done with respect to political boundaries. But there has never been in the history of Saskatchewan such out and out, bare-faced political gerrymandering as there has been by this Liberal Party in 1967 and 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DAVIES: — The Deputy Premier says that we need some good lawyers on this side. What a laugh; Good lawyers; If we have to compare good lawyers on our side of the House with good lawyers in the Liberal Party, I think that we should come out ahead in that game, Mr. Speaker.

And the Deputy Premier talks about smearing, talks about the United Auto Workers and tries to tell this House that the United Auto Workers gave \$50,000 to the NDP. I want to tell him this. Does he know that in the Province of Ontario there are 30,000 auto workers and does he not think that 30,000 auto workers in Ontario have the right to participate in the political life of this country? Not one penny of that amount, Mr. Speaker, came from across the border. Every cent of that political fund came from the Canadian district of the United Auto Workers. The

March 15, 1971

Deputy Premier expects that a Liberal party in this country can go to the powerful corporations of this country and get donations that would make a donation like the United Auto Workers' one look picayune but does not expect that the trade unions of this country will in their own interest participate in politics in the same way. The Deputy Premier likes to talk about political contributions. I point out that the Federal Report on the Committee on Election Expenses, has a good deal to say about this. On page 237, the following is given to us in the way of information. This is not a very long quotation, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to shorten it as much as I can. It says:

Throughout the 1930s, '40s and '50s the pattern of Liberal campaign funds tended to develop rather than change. The structure became more refined but the basic patterns of organization and the basic sources of funds remained the same. Business sources continued to supply the great bulk of the campaign funds.

And pay attention to this one. After detailed study of the party's finances, the Committee reported that finances, reported in 1953, 50 per cent of the national Liberal Party's income came from industrial or commercial firms. Not from the working people, not from the farming people, but from industrial and commercial firms. 40 per cent came from businessmen closely associated with particular companies, and only 10 per cent from individuals. The Report goes on and I am quoting again, verbatim:

Conversation with fund raisers indicates that funds raised for the 1957 campaign came largely from 300 to 400 donors; the donations ranging in amounts up to \$75,000.

Not \$50,000 if that was the sum, Mr. Deputy Premier, from 30,000 auto workers, but 300 to 400 donors, ranging in amounts up to \$75,000. Quoting again from the Report:

On occasion, Liberal supporters have been known to donate services rather than funds. In 1958, for example, one owner of a television station produced Hon. L. B. Pearson's video tapes and a Liberal sympathizer in the radio business helped with radio broadcasts in a certain area. During campaigns many other individuals donate services of various kinds whose value in the aggregate is substantial. Such donations, however, in no way match the importance of the money contributions.

The report goes on to say, and in the interest of time, I shall shorten this up.

That information from fund raisers active in the 1965 campaign indicates that the world of business in the party's finances is at least as strong as it ever was. One fund raiser said that hardly any money came into the national fund from individuals. Members of Parliament, senators, and nothing at all from trade unions, although individual candidates received funds from all these sources. These donations received from businesses tended again to be substantial.

Now we see why the Deputy Premier is so virulent in his attacks on trade unions, because the trade unions of this country, recognizing their best interests, do not donate to the Liberal Party of this country. That is the reason why. Except, as it

has been pointed out, certain unions that I may say are not in the best odor with respect to either the union centres of the United States or Canada, but who are very friendly to the Liberal Party.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we need a good discussion on this Bill. We could have avoided the type of discussion that the Deputy Premier has brought in here tonight. I think that we want election legislation that will provide the most democratic background for the exercise of voting with respect to Saskatchewan citizens. Surely that is what we need, surely that is our obligation to bring about in this House. But at the same time, for the benefit of those who talk about the dragging in what they think is extraneous material, the Act cannot be separated from the ridings in which the Act will operate.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that by reason of the gerrymandering by this Liberal Government a situation exists in the province which is akin to that which existed before the Reform Bills of England in the 19th century were finally achieved.

The Deputy Premier talks about Moose Jaw. He says that what the CCF did in Moose Jaw, was "blatant gerrymandering." Well, this is very, very hard to understand. Moose Jaw has had a pretty static population; there have been 20,000 voters in that constituency for the past decade or more. I want to remind the Members on the other side of the House that under their legislation of long before 1944, the city of Regina with a population of 47,000 elected two Members, city-wide. That wasn't apparently regarded then as a wrong thing by the Liberal Party. But under a CCF Government it was regarded as very wrong for 35,000 people to have two Members elected at large in that city area.

I want to tell the Deputy Premier if he doesn't know it, because I know, and I feel that this is the sentiment of the people of the city of Moose Jaw, that they believe that the division of the city into two constituencies is artificial, and they believe it makes a division that they do not want. There has never been the slightest suggestion so far as I know unless it comes from the secret confines of the Moose Jaw Liberal Party, that there should be a splitting of that city within two constituencies.

I am prepared to admit that there may be some rationale for such a division, but there is no rationale whatsoever for a situation where 13,600 votes in my constituency (Moose Jaw South) are needed to elect one member when there are only 6,200 votes in Moose Jaw North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DAVIES: — It is absolutely impossible for anybody to justify that kind of a situation. And you should look at the boundaries, running down Caribou Street, running up 9th Avenue, then taking a little jog in Caribou to enclose some of the voters that were favorable to my friend in Moose Jaw North in the 1967 election, taking them out of Moose Jaw North and tucking them neatly back into Moose Jaw South. The situation is, that if that city were divided into two constituencies on a fair basis, it running the line down Fairford Street, and down Manitoba Street, wherever an equal division is accomplished, the situation would then be that we should have about 10,000 votes in Moose Jaw North and

March 15, 1971

about 10,000 votes in Moose Jaw South. The election results would then be that the Liberal Party would not stand a Chinaman's chance of electing a Liberal candidate. That is the reason for what has taken place. When I hear the Deputy Premier talk about "sanctimonious utterances" I just wonder how he can do this without blushing.

I referred to the fact that in my opinion the most blatant gerrymandering has taken place under the Liberals and to that which existed before the Reform Bills were passed in England in the 19th century. As you know there were several of them. Let's not forget what the fight over all these years has been about. Let's first of all remember the rotten boroughs, where a few hundred people elected a Member of Parliament, where in another 100 or 200 times that number were needed to get a Member. The cry then, with the Chartist agitation that served the Reform Bills, was "representation by population." That has become a sort of sacred tradition, and well it should be. But the action of the present Government, as I say, has undone the great reform of the past and it has plunged us again into a system where representation by population has been bludgeoned in an effort to perpetuate the reign of the Liberal Party in this province.

Mr. Speaker, The Election Act should contain a section which guarantees that ridings are formed in such a way that never again can there be the subversion of democracy that has been accomplished in the Liberal gerrymandering in Saskatchewan.

As you know, and I don't want to repeat all that has been said in this connection, the New Democratic Party has called for an independent body or agency that would impartially draw the boundaries in the whole of Saskatchewan, so that we should have the fairest and most equitable relationship that could exist with respect to voters. This is what we have asked for. When my friend the Deputy Premier accuses us of insincerity in this regard, I want to tell him that we had given them the opportunity of joining with us when the Special Committee on this Bill met and when the New Democratic Party Members on this Committee advanced these propositions.

In the same way, I also want to say by way of digression, that we have asked by resolution in this House, that political party expenditures be reported and be examined in the same fashion. There is no vote in our eyes on this particular question. We have asked for an independent body or agency. The Liberal Party has ignored completely the request that has been made in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the worst and most irresponsible action in this Province's history has resulted from the violation of democracy that has been revealed in the last Liberal constituency re-division. The only way, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province can recover their lost rights in this particular respect and can restore equal rights for voters is to vote out this Liberal Government that has so barefacedly engineered last year's regrettable action, and the one in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, an Independent Boundaries Commission has become more than desirable, it has now become a burning necessity. A situation now exists where one-party rule. Liberal Party rule can be imposed on the people of this province who may want to vote it out. As I look at my own city of Moose Jaw, as I have already said, the results of Liberal action in mis-shaping

boundaries is just nothing short of terrifying in the eventual result. I say the situation is shocking in the extreme. I want to repeat, that The Election Act should contain a section which specifically forbids any glaring inequalities that will abridge the principle of representation by population anywhere in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other references that I want to speak about this evening. First of all, with respect to the status of election officials. What I have to say here I think will be agreed to by most people, including Liberals, or New Democrats, or Conservatives, or what you will. I think it is high time that we have a neutral set of election officials. I think that the party that decides upon this course and implements it, will gain a great deal of credit. I do not believe that this will be forthcoming from the Liberals. I promise you that with a New Democratic Party Government in this province, this will be achieved. I want to tell the Minister of Labour that when this party promises something that there is some reason for it because we implement our promises. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Assembly should appoint or should endorse the appointment of a Chief Election Officer. We should take elections out of the control of the Cabinet, I don't care whether it is a Liberal Cabinet or a New Democratic Party Cabinet, we should remove that control from them.

MR. McPHERSON: — Why didn't you do it?

MR. DAVIES: — We made a great many reforms, Sir, in our time. We did not attend to all of them. I think one of the reasons why we intend to do it after the next election, when there is a New Democratic Government is because we have seen the extent, the horrible excesses that can result through the Liberal Party example. I should like also to go on to say this, Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. McPHERSON: — What was the Bill?

MR. DAVIES: — That the field would be created for the unbiased handling of elections. It would be possible to build election machinery on an impartial system based on the civil service. It is no use my friends talking about, "Why didn't you do it?" We didn't do everything during our term of office. But we had raised this question within the lifetime of the last two legislative terms.

We have given you people the opportunity of joining with us and you have flatly rejected every one of the propositions we have proposed. You have gone on to compound the felony as it were, by introducing this terrible gerrymandering in so many constituencies.

This kind of an approval would give us what? First of all, it would help, I suggest, to accomplish that which I don't believe we have now, and perhaps we have not had for some time, and that is to expand the confidence of the public in the democratic system. It would increase respect among ordinary people for our parliamentary system. It would place, once and for all, the party system above narrow party policies. I am not here trying to suggest, by any means, that any party in this province is pure. I am saying that it is a road which this Government that is now in power has the power to do something about, not in the

future, but at this moment. But it refuses to do anything.

Now, for another point. What about the question that concerns me very much, because it concerns people with whom I work, because it involves a situation that I have had much to do with during the last 35 years? That is, the whole business of the equal rights of citizens to run in election campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, I contend, and I think perhaps you will agree with me, that all citizens of our province, providing they have the general capacities to vote, the right to vote, should be guaranteed the actual right to run in an election campaign. I am suggesting that at this moment, those rights don't, in reality, exist. It is true that they exist on paper, but let me tell you that any worker, any employee, especially an employee who is not in an organized trade union, will tell you that they don't, even in some cases, dare to run. They wouldn't even as much as dare to tell their employer that they are a supporter of the New Democratic Party.

But coming to the business of running, that would be the last thing that they would try to do if they wanted to keep their job. I say that there are many workers, many people in this province who fear to run. My friends say "nonsense," but it is because they are completely removed from the reality of the moment. They don't know a dashed thing about what goes on in the shops and the factories in the firms in this province. You can live in your insulated environment, my friends, but you should come down and talk to the people who work for a living. That is the trouble with the Liberal Party. They have no one on that side of the House who can tell them anything about the real problems of workmen in industry. So, this may be nonsense to the people on your right, Mr. Speaker. But I want to tell them that these are very real problems. It is not only, Mr. Speaker, the question of being fired, but there is a subtle intimidation. For example, people who are not organized won't get promoted if they don't belong to the right party or if the boss doesn't like their political entanglements. In any case, I am saying that there is nothing whatsoever guaranteed to either the organized employee or the unorganized employee in respect of these particular rights.

I suggest to the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) that this is really the nub of the problem, the protection of these rights. I am suggesting that it should be in this Act and that it is not stated, these rights are not guaranteed.

Anybody who works for wages or salary can tell you that there are so many devious ways by which all kinds of discrimination can be exercised. There are so many ways in which the employer can do things. Because he doesn't like not your religion, nor your politics perhaps, but the way you might part your hair. This is a kind of an authoritarian situation that exists unfortunately; this is what I think our Act should give protection against. The response of the Members opposite shows how far away they are from the reality of this situation. I can tell one or two of the Members over there, whom I believe have been in the teaching profession that the rights for teachers did not always exist in this province and it was left to the former leader of the Federal party, Mr. M. J. Coldwell, to establish that right in the city of Regina years ago when he was discharged by the Board of Education because he chose to run as an alderman in the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DAVIES: — Let's not forget that these things have taken place. Let's not forget that some people had to fight to establish the right of teachers to run for office.

MR. MCPHERSON: — Bill, he was a good teacher;

MR. DAVIES: — My friend says he was a good teacher. If my friend was an employer and if he was on the Board of Education and he said Mr. Coldwell was a bad teacher, that would give him reason to prevent that person from running. That's the nub of the problem.

Now, what are the other points? Well, many workers would simply be denied time off, would lose service rights. Everybody knows what can happen. If you are elected and do come into a position where you have to serve the people, at whatever level, there is your pension, your holiday rates, your promotion — all the things that are written into your stated or verbal terms of employment. I say that workers are not guaranteed these rights under our Election Act.

I say again in response to what some of the Members on the other side have intimated in the last five minutes or so, that we did give the employees of the Crown the right to run for office. We did give them guarantees. We never terrorized them. We gave to Liberals who were in the Civil Service the right to run. I say that these rights were taken away; that these rights were abridged and violated. And the first action in this respect was the firing of one Baskin after the accession to power of this Liberal Government, because he chose to exercise his rights of supporting a political candidate.

MR. MacDONALD: — He wouldn't accept a transfer . . .

MR. DAVIES: — I know, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister of Welfare, that that was the finding that was made finally by whom? A Liberal Chairman of a board of arbitration that again was set up with bias and callous forethought in mind. No question about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out again that there are only 25 per cent of the workers in this province who are organized; that is who are so-called non-agricultural wage and salary earners. If there are difficulties for trade unionists to run, either at the municipal or the provincial level, as in the present case I want to tell you that the difficulties are almost insuperable with respect to other employees who are not organized. Now, I am not talking, of course, about employees who happen to desire to become Liberal candidates or have been persuaded to become candidates and their employers are Liberals. There, I suggest there would be no difficulty. I am talking about where this situation doesn't apply. I am suggesting that because there are a good many of the big employers who happen to support the old line parties, and in particular, the Liberal Party, that this right needs all the more to be stated. Because, what has happened in the past has convinced me — and I have heard of a fair number of examples — that we need to attend to this particular remedy.

First of all, I suggest that these difficulties exist where one presumes to run for office. Secondly, I suggest that there are great difficulties when a person is elected and I have said that I think he should be assured of his rights in that regard. I say that serving one's country in the Legislature — and I earnestly believe that a person does serve one's country when he serves in the Legislature — should be viewed in such a way that his rights of employment are guaranteed, as well as his tenure, and his leave of absence guaranteed against discrimination in terms of what can happen to him when he returns to employment. These should all be guaranteed by law. I say that he should be able to return to his employment without having lost anything especially because he has served his province, and as I say, served his country.

I say that these rights should be entrenched within our Provincial Election Act. Further, that these rights should be extended and they should follow down into every aspect of elections at the local level. All these proposals that I make here today would protect the citizen in his rights. This would immeasurably expand and enlarge, the representative quality of the Legislature. At the moment this really isn't so because many persons are effectively denied the genuine, the actual, right to run or to be elected and to function as a Member thereafter.

I say that if it means something in a democracy — and of course this is our whole theory and our whole premise — we need a cross-section of the whole community in a body such as this Legislature. We may not have, and in some measure I think we have not, achieved the position where we have a true cross-section of the community in this Legislature. So, I say that by writing into The Election Act the kind of terms that I think are necessary, I believe that we should be substantially enlarging the representativeness of the Legislature, substantially enlarging the whole scope and operation and meaning of the democratic system.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to say just a word or two with respect to advance polling. I am going back a few years to the time of the absentee balloting. I agree with many Members in this House, who claim that absentee balloting was not an ideal solution. What the system sought to achieve, I think, was good in the objective and that was, as everybody knows, that regardless of where you were, on Election Day you could vote. You would not lose your vote because you were required or had to be in some other constituency. We know that there were a good many difficulties in the election of 1964. Not only difficulties but I think more than that, Mr. Speaker, a good many annoyances. But I don't think annoyances should preclude the operation of the thing itself.

It was decided — and decided by the incoming Liberal Government — to do away with the absentee ballot. I want to suggest this — that the absentee ballot had many flaws and was therefore repealed as a principle in the legislation. But I want also to say that the fact is we have not solved the very real problem of thousands of voters who are away from their polling stations, their constituencies, during the election day and are unable to vote. I say that where any number of people are prevented for any number of reasons from voting, that it is a problem that we should give some attention to. I can see that the absentee balloting system was awkward and that it was not effective in the context in which it operated. I do not think, however, that we should leave the matter simply because there were difficulties.

I feel we have to find other ways and means to solve that problem because I think the disenfranchisement of people is a problem that we have to face in any election legislation.

As I understand it, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), the number of days in The Election Act for advance polling is the same as in the old Act. I once again say that that is no solution. The fact that there are four days for advance polling is not enough to suit our present situation. We're living in a modern period. We've got truck drivers, construction workers, travellers. We have things like vacation periods. We've got compassionate leave and visits, funerals and the like, all the ambit that goes into this kind of thing. So that, regardless of why people are away from their constituencies other than in those four days that are provided in the Act before us, or the Bill before us, it just doesn't solve the problem. Because thousands of people will be away from the constituency during such periods.

Let's take the business of a vacation. Why should we say to a workman that because his vacation occurs on Election Day and he has made plans to be away from the province substantially ahead of any Election Day announcement by the Government, that his right to vote should be removed and abridged simply because we have the present inadequate number of days for advanced polling in the Bill.]

I know that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) is not sympathetic to this proposition.

MR. CAMERON: — Now, Bill, how could you get it down . . . on your ballot.

MR. DAVIES: — You know, this is the epitome, you see, of the understanding of the Minister of Mineral Resources. He doesn't talk about the Member being in Vancouver, being in Alberta, he has to be in New York. Well, I have news for him that there won't be one worker out of 100 . . .

MR. CAMERON: — Hear, hear!

MR. DAVIES: — There won't be one worker, Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources, out of 100 who will ever be able to take his vacation down in New York and you should know it.

HON. J. C. McISAAC: (Minister of Education) — No, just the union bosses . . .

MR. DAVIES: — Well, now the Minister of Education has added his little intellectual blast about the union bosses. There is here such an absolute absence of understanding or feeling for the ordinary employee that I wonder why the workers of this province in their totality have not caught on. It is not only that we have legislation — Liberal anti-labor legislation — but we've got a complete lack of understanding. You people are not only of the 19th century, you have hardly emerged into the 19th century. I say again that whether people support the Liberal Party or whether they vote Liberal, Conservative or New Democrat, they have an entire right to vote. They will not have the right to vote by the inadequate advance polling that we have provided in this legislation. I say this should not be. And if the absentee

March 15, 1971

ballot procedure is not good enough we should look for some other procedure. At least, we should increase, Mr. Attorney General, I suggest, the number of advance polling days. That would do something towards rectifying the present unsatisfactory situation.

Now, how about the right of access to electors, Mr. Speaker. I think that this is a basic matter, another matter that I have thought about a great deal for a long time. It should be written into our Act that every candidate of a political party should have access to the voters in a constituency. I do not believe that he should be locked out of some apartment building because of the adverse political sympathies of some landlord. I say that no one should have the right to deny or to abridge that right. The Act should ensure that all tenants have the right to meet and have the right to speak to their respective candidates for office. I say that's an important matter. We can't have voters hemmed into little citadels on the responsibility not of themselves but of the people who own the buildings in which they live. That is a simple right. It was asked for by my colleagues on this side of the House in the minority report and it has been ignored in the legislation before us.

May I advance, Mr. Speaker, another recommendation that I think should be in the Bill. "The time off for election" clause has not, to my knowledge, been changed in the last 35 or 40 years. It would be an excellent thing if we were to make Election Day a holiday. I think it should be a holiday, first of all, to ensure equal voting rights. I believe that our concentration on Election Day should after all be to see that everyone who can and who wants to vote can vote in the easiest possible way. I think that because the Act does not provide that in this Bill before us it should be so stated and carried out.

I know my friend, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), will probably say, "Well, they already get three clear hours off to vote." I say that this does not provide equal rights. Let's take, for example, a worker coming out of IPSCO. He gets off work only at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, even though his hours of quitting might be 5 o'clock, because of the three clear hour provision. But does he have three clear hours? I suggest that if he emerges from work at IPSCO his first consideration and right is to have a bath. Suppose he wants to take his wife to vote with him — and this is the usual practice — the wives usually wait for the husband. He must go home, he has the business of dressing, of getting his people and his family who want to vote into the car, all of this, mind you, around supper time when a voter who, for instance, is a steel worker has put all of his day's time into hard work and wants to eat. So, he's precluded from exercising the right to eat at that point since he probably will not be able to get to vote until well after 6 o'clock p.m. — not allowing him very much time in which to vote.

I do not say that the opportunity of voting within slimmer limits is not there. But I say the same opportunities of voting as other sections of the population do not exist. And what about the shift worker, the man who works from 12 o'clock to 8 o'clock in the morning? If he's lucky he gets to bed around 9 o'clock or 9:30 o'clock in the morning and would like to get some sleep until 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock in the afternoon. I am just saying that there is a very great temptation for a person to say, "Well, I've had it, I'm tired, the shift last night was a pretty hard one," and not go and vote because of the other determinants in

the whole business of the shift worker's life. I say that it is not fair.

MR. LEITH: — Sheep herders;

MR. DAVIES: — If the Member for Elrose wants to bring up other examples, I have no objection. The field is free; he can enter this debate if he wants and if there is any other section that he knows about that has equal problems, I'd be glad to hear about them.

I repeat, that in these examples people don't have equal rights with respect to voting on Election Day. They do not have the clear period of from 9 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock at night. Their rights to vote are rigidly circumscribed within the hours of, say, 4 o'clock to 7 o'clock, and I am saying that the creation of Election Day as a holiday would permit the easier exercise of the right to vote.

But you see it is not only, Mr. Speaker, the right to vote, there is also the right to exercise your own rights as a citizen to help to participate politically on Election Day. (Let's say he is working at the polls in the exercise of some function for his political party, the party of his choice.) If these rights were more general among the employed population, we should have a much better exercise of Election Day activity, because we should have more people to do that required work on Election Day I say, quite seriously, that in my opinion the manning of the polls the carriage of workers to the polls, the innumerable apparatus ' of a political party is an important thing in our whole system I say that the more people who can so participate, the better it is for the democratic system.

I should like to see us so legislate that this kind of thing would be taken care of. Too, we should increase the number of people who vote. We know what happens — 70 or 80 per cent' of the people vote during a provincial election campaign. Unquestionably there are fairly large numbers of people who don't vote who should vote. Now, I'm not trying to make excuses for these people, I'm just saying that the more difficult you make it for people to vote, the less interest there is for those who have very little stimulus to vote to go to the polls.

As a matter of fact, if my friend, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) wants to refer to the civic elections of last December, I shall agree with my friend from Regina North East because that is precisely what happened.

Your Government, Mr. Minister of Welfare, changed the voting day from the first Wednesday in November to the first Wednesday in December. And in 1970 it was rotten weather. In my city, as well as in the city of Regina, therefore hundreds of older people who did not go to the polls because of that type of weather. Out of your own mouth you prove my point, that the more difficult you make it to vote, the less exercise of it there is in democracy. You see, everybody doesn't have an automobile — everybody doesn't even have an automobile that runs properly. I know that in my constituency where we have about 11 per cent of the population over 65 years of age, that this is a real problem. What the Minister of Welfare has said really illustrates the point that I am making.

Now I say that at the moment, some sections of our population can spend the whole Election Day helping candidates. For the most part these are well-to-do people. It is unfair that this privilege should not be extended to others. I say that the creation of Election Day as a holiday would extend all of the things that I have suggested and benefit the fabric of our democracy. I say to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) it is all very well to say that the time allowed for voting is sufficient at the present. The fact is that it is restricted to only a few of the total voting and not extended to wage and salary earners. The fact is that the whole period that is allowed for voting is, in fact, not a genuine thing. For employees there are only a few hours to vote on Election Day, that is, when they are actually permitted to vote.

Now, just a word, Mr. Speaker, about the question of Election Day expenses and there's been some talk about that this evening. I am glad to answer some of the remarks of my friend, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart).

Now, we feel with the NDP minority on the Election Committee, who asked that all sources of income for political parties in elections should be revealed as a mandatory obligation. We say the source of funds — that is, who is making the donation — should be revealed to everyone, revealed to the general public. We said that the public has a right to know who supports the candidates and to what extent. We say that this knowledge is vital knowledge in many ways in our democratic practice. I point out to the Members that we asked for this and that the Government Members on the Committee refused it. That is why this proposition is not in the Bill before us. I say that it is not a question of what happened two years ago, five years ago, ten years ago, it is what happens before us in this Bill at this time. On that ground, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is the Government that stands before the bar of public approval.

There is also of course the question — I don't want to dwell long on this matter — of the public treasury and the use to some extent of the public treasury in so arranging matters that all candidates, no matter how much money they have in their political treasuries would have some kind of an equivalent opportunity of approaching people in an election campaign.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I think this Bill is not satisfactory, why I think this Bill is noticeably deficient. I see no reason why the Attorney General could not make the important revisions that have been suggested by myself or by many other Members on this side of the House. I see no reason why the Attorney General and his colleagues could not make these important revisions unless it is for one thing, to continue the kind of regrettable situation that has already been noted in the notorious gerrymandering of the Liberal Party of this Province.

I shall not be supporting this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. N.E. BYERS: (Kelvington) — Mr. Speaker, when I came to this House this morning, I didn't realize and little did I believe that the Government would push through this Legislature today the second reading of an extensive election Bill. I find it rather amazing that the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan has got in such a hurry. You

know, the people out in my riding for over a year had no one to represent them in this Legislature. I find it ironical that we now find such tremendous bursts of speed to get an election Act through the Legislature within a few hours. One would almost think that the Government wanted to get this Act passed to call a by-election in Melfort-Tisdale to sample the water and public opinion for this new Bill.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we should consider carefully a piece of legislation as important as The Election Act. It is not a Bill that the Government would necessarily bring back again next year. But it is a piece of legislation that we are going to use and the people of Saskatchewan are going to use to elect their government to determine their whole social, economic and political welfare for four or five years. It is a piece of legislation on which we should spend several days in this House. We debate whether we should have 10 cent deductions on hogs or what the size of grants to hog barns ought to be. But when it comes to deciding the whole framework of our democratic structure then we seem to be very, very pressed for time. As an MLA I find that regrettable.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't had time to peruse this particular legislation as thoroughly as I had wanted to. I don't expect my remarks to be that penetrating or that profound. I have a few comments to make about a few sections of the Act. I'm glad the Attorney General is here. There are a couple of points I want to raise with him. I don't know whether the terms I shall speak about are in the legislation or not. If they are and if they have been corrected, as I suggested they be corrected, then I should certainly be delighted.

First, with respect to the absentee ballot, I think it is regrettable that there hasn't been some provision to allow people who are away from home on Election Day to exercise their right to vote. I think perhaps of the young man, let us say, from the constituency of Arm River, who may be an ardent Liberal, a Liberal by conviction. He may be working up in my constituency next June or October on the paving crew that is going to pave the highway which the Minister of Highways says will be paved through bad weather or if the contractor wants to get on with the job, that young man may be denied the right to get back to Arm River to vote for the Member for Arm River (Mr. McIvor.) I think it is a regrettable situation that we don't have provision for this sort of situation.

The absentee ballot, Mr. Speaker, did have its shortcomings. But I think the intent of the absentee ballot was fair and good and it was sound. It was a Bill which provided that those who are amongst our transient laborers particularly, who go out to work on highway gangs, construction jobs, and who can't come back on voting day to the place in which they were ordinarily resident could vote away from home and have their ballots sent back for counting later. That was a piece of legislation which gave every eligible voter within the province a chance to vote on Election Day. I do not believe that when the legislation was passed that it was the intention of this Legislature that the absentee ballots be used to give and to get the wrong or incorrect outcome of an election in any given constituency. I know that the Government doesn't look favorably upon the absentee ballot or the transferable ballot because to them it seems that an election is something like a ball game. You have the game on a given day and by 8 o'clock you have to know what the score is. This type of thinking doesn't take into

March 15, 1971

consideration that the selection of a government for a four-or-five year period is so important that we could well await the outcome for another week or ten days.

I want to draw to the attention of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) a section of the old Act with respect to the advance poll as it applies to university students. You are aware, Sir, that the old Election Act said that students at university had the option of voting either in their home ridings or in the polls, Sir, in which they were a resident while attending university. The situation is now that a number of students, because the absentee ballot is no longer in effect, tend to come home on the weekend prior to an election and vote in the advance poll. I discussed this matter with a lawyer very knowledgeable in election matters — not one who is a Member of this House I might say — and it seemed to us that students who followed the practice of voting in the advance poll in their home ridings prior to Election Day were really not complying with the law, Mr. Speaker, in that the people who vote at an advance poll must vote at the advance poll in which they are ordinarily resident. Now I am simply drawing this matter to your attention, Mr. Attorney General. I certainly do not think that the legislation of this Province should be written so that university students may be breaking the law unaware of what the legal situation is. As you are fully aware in the case of close elections, if one has to look around for ineligible voters, these people are easy prey. These are people very likely who have voted for their first time and candidates are often reluctant to have these people appear before the bar at controverted election proceedings. I should be more than willing to discuss the question further with you because I should personally like to see that particular situation clarified.

I want to say a word or two about the provision for a re-count. I am rather disappointed, first of all, that the basis under which a recount can be held or applied for is so narrow. You are aware of what the Act says in that respect. Section 123, proceedings preliminary to a recount or additions:

Where after the addition by the returning officer of the number of votes given for each candidate, the majority of the votes cast in favor of the candidate declared to be elected is less than the total number of all unopened ballots, rejected ballots and ballots objected to,

and so on, really forms the basis for a recount. I think that there may be other circumstances which necessitate a recount. Might I say that, if we are asked to judge on this particular legislation, I think it would have been courteous of the Government if they intended to bring in some amendments to the Controverted Elections Act to let the Members of this Assembly have had both Acts so that we could have compared that particular provision. Because I think it is only when you can see the Controverted Elections Act besides the basis on which you can apply for recount, that we can really tell whether the legislation for the provisions of a recount are adequate. I don't know what you would do about this particular problem but I know that the old basis for the application of a recount had many, many pitfalls. That I am willing to admit.

I am wondering what happens in this procedure, where a candidate applies for a recount. He fills out Form 36, I think it is, making application to the returning officer for a recount. He, in turn, sends it forward to the judge. For example, if I,

candidate B, should apply for a recount, and the returning officer in completing Form 36 makes an error, would the District Court judge have the right to deny a recount on the basis of some error made by the returning officer?

MR. HEALD: — The answer is. No.

MR. BYERS: — The answer is. No, all right, because the candidate still has the right to apply some 10 days later. All right that is fine. I don't know whether this is necessary but I want to draw it to your attention, I am wondering what would happen along the line if someone should err, and then no recount is held and perhaps there should have been a recount held. Then a higher court judge in the appeal court rules that a recount should have been conducted due to an error by someone at a lower level. I certainly think you know the legislation I am referring to. I am referring you here to the judgment of Judge Bence in the case of the Kelvington appeal who so ruled that in his opinion the district court judge had committed an error but there was no legislation whereby the Queen's Bench Court could . . .

MR. HEALD: — Perhaps I could interrupt. There is a provision in the new Bill for an appeal in those circumstances to a Queen's Bench Judge, appealing a decision of a district court.

MR. BYERS: — Thank you, Mr. Attorney General. One other question I want to bring to your attention and I believe it is an addition to Section 29 with respect to residence in the new Act. Yes, I believe this is an addition, the term "ordinarily residing." Now this question of residence is a problem in a number of constituencies. It is certainly a problem in rural areas where you have a family that live in town and they have a farm or they have a home in the city and they have a farm in another rural constituency. I should like to get some definition from you when we go into the third reading on the meaning of "ordinarily residing" for this is going to cause more confusion as to where people are legal residents for voting purposes or not. I think we should have some explanation on that particular one.

On the form of the ballot, Mr. Speaker. You know, I can remember Liberals prior to 1964 going around weeping and moaning and saying it is just terrible that the voters have to go into the voting booths and that they must vote with the pencil provided by the election officials. If we could just let them mark their ballots with a ball point pen how they would be liberated. Something like that the story went. Now we find that we must require the voter to put his 'X' or his check within a very narrow square. Now what happens if the mark goes over the line into the white, what's going to happen? Take any rural constituency where you have 40 DROs, 40 polls, every one of them may put a different interpretation on what is an eligible vote or what is an ineligible vote. You are going to have as many interpretations as there are DROs in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think this is a very dangerous move. I don't think there is any necessity for it. I have seen DROs who allowed to be counted as a marked ballot a check marked to the left of the name. Other DROs did not. I don't know why the Government wants to be so firm about having this tidy little square in which the voter, perhaps with deficient eyesight, is required to put his mark within a one-inch square.

That seems to be a bit too precise, I should think.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed that there was no provision here to reinstate the transferable ballot or the absentee ballot. The absentee ballot ought to be a means whereby every single eligible voter in this province has a chance to express his will and how he wants to vote. I don't think it was the intention of this Legislature to use the transferable or absentee ballot as a means to confuse or to alter the outcome of an election. We accept the principle of the absentee ballot for hospital patients. I am glad this still remains in the Act. I have hunted the Act, Mr. Speaker, and I raised this question with the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) privately today, I hope we can get an answer and I hope that the provision is removed from the Act whereby once a hospital patient has made his declaration in hospital that he is of age, that he is a citizen, that he meets the residence requirement, that no one should be able to deny his right to have that hospital patient's ballot count. I hope that we have passed the days of the terrible situation we went through in Kelvington. I want just to remind Members of two or three instances whereby a gentleman who came to this country from Poland in 1928, took a job upon the section, obtained his naturalization papers in 1936 and in 1967 had his ballot challenged by a Liberal scrutineer. His vote was not counted. Or I think of the lady who was 75 or 80 years of age who was a pioneer citizen of the district, who was the superintendent of the Sunday School, a very fine and highly respected lady who had never lived anywhere else and yet had residence questioned. And the list goes on. I certainly hope that that provision of the Act is removed because I think that if a person signs a declaration before election officials, DROs who have taken the oath to subscribe to the oath, that no other person should be able to say: "You've made a false declaration." If there are people who have made a false declaration there should be other provisions in Controverted Elections Act so this should not be allowed to take place at the final count.'

Well, there are other questions, naturally. Mr. Speaker, I really think it is regrettable that the Government has not seen fit to incorporate provisions in this Election Act for an independent boundaries commission. You know the whole struggle of developing political democracy for people spans back 150 years at least. Yes, more than that, but it was only 150 years ago I say to the Hon. Mr. McPherson from Regina South West that man started to get out of the woods. You know as well as I that until 1832 it was only the landed aristocrats, the owners of land, who had the right to represent anyone in the British parliament. From that time on we laid aside the old pocket borough where a Member of Parliament was elected by one or a handful of people. We laid aside the rotten boroughs whereby an advertisement was placed in the newspapers for a Member of Parliament and the seat was sold to the highest bidder, Parliament in those days was a forum for only the rich and the able and the well born. There were large areas in England where the people had no representatives in Parliament at all. Finally it was, the new captains of industry as Thomas Carlyle called them, the new Capitalist class who emerged in England in the 19th century who slugged it out with the landed aristocrats to gain a voice in Parliament. Through the 19th century we extended the vote to renters of land. Then we gave the vote to lowly farm workers and the men of the mining towns and then we introduced The Corrupt Election Practices Act, Mr. Speaker, so that some of the notorious vote-getting methods would be

considered illegal and those people who resorted to them when caught could be punished and even unseated. I say, Mr. Speaker, that these changes came not without a struggle and it was our forefathers who have been part of that struggle. You know, I get a little annoyed and I am sure people out in the country do too when we raise in this House the question of an independent boundary commission to draw the boundaries according to the long-time Liberal formula of representation by population. Government Members point across here and say, why didn't you fellows do it. Well, I wasn't here then. We were the trail blazers for many years in other fields of human endeavor. Might I say that when our party left office that the idea of an independent boundary commission was just coming into vogue in this country. The idea was just starting and I see the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) smiling, but it has only been in the very recent years that three or four provinces and the Federal Government have adopted the idea of an independent commission to draw the electoral boundaries. And might I say that the Federal Government followed this particular method, and might I say to the Members, Mr. Speaker, that for the Federal Government to draw electoral boundaries on as a fair a formulae as they were able to devise required a good deal more skill and knowledge than this Government would have to apply in drawing fair boundaries within this particular province. There are many traditions, and restrictions, which the Federal formulae had to consider such as situations whereby there must be an equal number or more Members of Parliament than there are senators. This Government isn't troubled with restrictions such as that. I also recognize in drawing the boundaries in an area as vast as Canada that there is in this country a common interest between those people who live in our rural areas and those people who live in our urban areas. I know Liberals don't generally like the philosophy because it shatters their old divide-and-rule philosophy pitting urban voters against farm voters. This is why I am sure that this concept is not appreciated by our Provincial Liberals.

Well, I just want to say to some of the Government Members that I have for some years been a school teacher in this province in the fields of the social sciences like the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) when he was out in the classrooms. I have over the years endeavored to inculcate in young people an appreciation and love and admiration and respect for the whole British Parliamentary system, British parliamentary justice as we know it in this country, and I am going to continue to do that. But when I must pick up some figures and say, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), your riding, Lumsden, 7,250; Member for Arm River (Mr. McIvor), 6,200, according to the last voters' list, a total of 13,450 voters in those two ridings and find that that is almost equal to the number in Kinistino, 13,000, then we see that the principle of representation by population is not even being applied. Once could take Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) of 5,000 and Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) of 7,000 for a total of 12,000 against Swift Current (Mr. Wood) of 13,081. Here is a better one, Hanley, the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie), was on this Committee, 5,879; Mr. Barrie, the Member for Pelly, 6,282; Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), 6,000. Add all of those up, Hanley, Pelly, Milestone, all represented in this House by three Liberal Members, and you have fewer voters than you have in the constituency of Regina Centre. Was it Gladstone who said of the great Reform Bill of the year, 1867, "Was a leap in the dark." Well, I think that if Liberals don't show more interest in an independent boundary commission, that the voters will leave them in the dark because I don't think, if I measure

March 15, 1971

the sentiments of our younger generation today, or the older generation either, who have put so much into this country, that they will long tolerate this type of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few more things about the Bill. I apologize for my remarks not being as well organized as I should like them to be but I shall in years to come compare what I have said with what the Members opposite have said in this debate. I will not support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Like the Members opposite I didn't intend to participate in this debate. However, I am glad that I have the opportunity because if we have ever heard a lot of wailing and sobbing today it is from Members opposite. Well, you are going to hear the truth which is something you wouldn't understand even if it was put on a platter in front of you.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What are we going to hear?

MR. GUY: — Well it won't be the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), not likely, because he has been pretty busy this evening. I see he's got a tag on his shoulder showing that he has been out enjoying himself while the other Members of this House have been attending to their responsibilities.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Jealousy will get you nowhere .

MR. GUY: — Well, you know, I am really amazed at some of the speeches made this afternoon in an attempt to gain some political advantage and no other reason than straight politics. 'First of all I want to refer to some of the remarks of the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), who's probably gone now to attend the party that the rest of us cannot attend because we are attending to our responsibilities.

But he referred to courtesy and he wasn't the only Member who raised this question of courtesy. He said that they had a man in the sickbed who wouldn't be able to participate in this debate. Well, I am sure that Members on this side of the House are just as anxious to see the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Romanow) return as they are. We enjoy his comments. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this has happened before when Members have unfortunately been taken ill and if every time that someone is ill we have to hold up the work of the House, I should suggest that we would never get anything done.

As you know, you can never tell when you're going to be back. I think it was last Thursday that the Members opposite said, "Well, if we can keep the debate going, the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale will be back on Monday." So Monday came and unfortunately he was not back. We could not be sure today if we adjourned the debate that the Member would be here on Wednesday. We thought our Whip (Mr. Larochelle) was going to be back in about three days after he took ill and unfortunately he has not been able to return. And he would like to participate in this debate.

Your Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) will have an opportunity when the Bill is in committee to make whatever speech he has prepared and if he's not here then, he'll have an opportunity on third reading to make his speech. So this suggestion that we are prohibiting any Member from that side of the House from speaking is not true. In fact, I think that we have been very generous to you today to let you have the full day to make your comments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — It's my regret, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite have not taken more advantage of it and made better speeches. You know almost every Member opposite got into the question of gerrymandering. It has nothing to do with the Bill in front of the House but that doesn't matter. They never tend to worry about whether they are talking about what's in the legislation or not. But I was surprised yesterday when I turned on my television set to find that the former dean of the House, J. H. Brockelbank, was making some statements about redistribution, gerrymandering and the moderator or the fellow from the radio station said, "Well now, Mr. Brockelbank, did you or did you not carry out some gerrymandering when you were the government?" And he smiled — and I'll say this for "Brock" he was as honest yesterday as he was when he was here in this House — he kind of grinned a little bit and he said, "Well, you know, I guess all governments carry out a little gerrymandering. But we only did a little, we only did a little gerrymandering, you know." And he said, "Those fellows across the way did a lot of gerrymandering in the last year." But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that either you gerrymander or you didn't gerrymander and when a former Minister from that side of the House admitted in front of the public of Saskatchewan yesterday that the NDP gerrymandered, well then there is not one thing that Members opposite should be saying about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — If you've got any integrity at all, you'll forget about it because you're the worst perpetrators of gerrymandering, and if anybody learned about gerrymandering it was from you fellows.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — You know, the Members opposite, particularly the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) said we should have a neutral set of officials for elections. Yes, he said, we must have a neutral set. In 20 years, in five elections, did they have a neutral set of officials? I'll tell the world they never had any neutral set. In fact one of the Members today admitted that he was one of the returning officers for three terms before he became a candidate for the NDP.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Two:

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Oh, only two terms. And then he said, "You know we never played politics with election officials." No, they never played politics.

March 15, 1971

MR. STEUART: — Who was that?

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — That was the Member for Regina South, he said we never played politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — But I should remind you that they had five election campaigns to carry out what today they say should be done. Manitoba has the same opportunity today and what are they doing? Not a thing. There is no legislation for independent electoral commissions or anything else in front of the Manitoba House. They have an entirely different story when they are in the Opposition than they do when they are in the government.

We've had Members opposite talking about going back to the reform bills of 1832 and saying, "Oh, this Act that is in front of us today is even worse than it was then." But I notice that the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who spoke didn't say anything about the voters having five votes. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's just as wrong to have one person having five votes as it is for people not having any vote. They say you should have one vote and then they turn around and say but under circumstances in the cities when we know we can win five seats, then we think you should have five votes. How did you tell the people in Lumsden that they're only entitled to one vote but the people in Regina are entitled to five votes? The same is true in Saskatoon. How can you tell the people in Morse they were only entitled to one vote but the people in the city of Moose Jaw were entitled to two votes? And then you say that we're going back to the Dark Ages. If any party was in the Dark Ages when it came to electoral reform it had to be our friends opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — But then we came to some of the best statements of all and that was dealing with campaign funds. Again the sanctimony that dripped from the mouths of our friends opposite was something to behold. They said, "You know, this should be covered in the legislation. It should be limited." We shouldn't be allowed to collect funds from unions. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Ah, they can't take it. They can't take it, that's the trouble.

In fact the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) made one of the statements that will go down in history I suppose for being so far from the facts when he said, "You know, we got no or very little labor union support "and . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear:

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — . . . he said, "I can tell you categorically, we never got any funds. The NDP have never had any funds from outside

the country. All generated from within our own little sanctum." Well, I want to read the same book that he was reading from, *The Political Party Financing in Canada*. I should like to turn first of all to page 56. It tells you all about the finances of the CCF-NDP, and I'll tell you this is pretty interesting reading here.

Soon after the NDP founding convention the party's financial relationship with the trade union movement was formalized.

But, oh, he said we didn't have much to do with the trade union movement. No, Sir.

The Federal office has ceased to depend on quotas raised from the provincial party. Since 1961 regular trade union contributions have been received in the form of affiliation fees raised by . . .

And get this.

. . . a fixed checkoff of five cents per month.

Not a voluntary one. A fixed one. Where every member of the trade union movement, whether he's a Liberal, Conservative, a Creditiste, a Social Credit, or anything else, has to contribute to the ND Party, there is no choice.

. . . a fixed checkoff of five cents per month from the wages of workers belonging to trade unions. Such affiliation fees now provide . . .

Listen to this.

. . . approximately 40 per cent of the Party's regular income. The former reliance on individual membership dues has lessened. The sums realized from this source being only slightly higher than the special gifts of more affluent members raised through the sustaining membership. The availability of assured resources on a regular and a continuing basis has permitted the preparation of realistic and sound budgets for organizational purposes. With these revenues ongoing expenditures at an annual rate of more than \$200,000 are being made.

Well, that's one of the myths that the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) was trying to spread in this House. They never got any money from trade unions, and if it was, it was voluntary and on a very, very small scale.

Then we go over here to page 59 and it says:

At the Federal level trade union support was no less forthcoming. Practically all the sums spent by the Federal office in the 1962-63 campaigns came from labor sources. In 1965 approximately \$150,000 or 72 per cent of the expenditures of the Federal Party was covered by trade unions, notably, the United Steel Workers of America and the United Packing Houses of America.

Now here is a man who had another myth, that the NDP never took any money from unions outside of Canada. Any money we got which was very small, came from within unions within the country. But here the NDP gets it from the United Steel Workers and

United Packing Houses, \$150,000, 72 per cent of the total expenditures of the Federal Party. You can go on and on with that sort of statement from in here. But the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) made one of the best statements of all when he said, "Trade unions do not like to donate to the Liberal Party." Well I have news for the Member for Moose Jaw South — there is some question as to whether they like to donate to the NDP. I just happened to pick up the paper tonight and I see this in the Leader-Post. "Unions deny funds to NDP." The Free Press published the text of a letter from 18 Winnipeg union officials to the Manitoba New Democratic Party declining financial contributions to the campaign for two April 5th by-elections. But the Member for Moose Jaw South says, "We never contact unions for any campaign resources. Oh no, we don't have anything to do with the unions." The newspaper says 16 of the 18 signatures are of officials speaking for their locals with memberships of from 8,000 to 10,000. The letter acknowledging a request from party president, Lawrence Ball says:

The signatories feel our compliance with this request is not justified by what appears to us to be the government's policy or lack of policies and attitudes toward organized labor.

That was in Manitoba;

\
You know, you hear Members on that side of the House saying "We are the champions of the labor movement." But how different they talk when they are in Opposition than they act when they are the government. The unions in Manitoba know what happened when the NDP got into the government there and as a result they are denying them funds for their by-elections. I should submit Mr. Speaker, that if it should ever happen, and I know it won't that those gentlemen over there come back to this bench it would not be more than 15 months before the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, which is in bed with them now, would be out of bed and running down the street.

So, Mr. Speaker, just to complete the reasons why the unions in Manitoba fail to donate funds to the NDP. The union people declared:

That Government policies remained slanted to frustrate the worthwhile objectives and activities of organized labor. We cannot encourage the membership of our respective organizations to participate in the request contained in your letter in a fashion consistent with their past performances.

This is the key, the past performance. It is obvious they made great donations to the NDP when they were still in opposition in Manitoba, but today they have cut off the source of funds. I submit that this will be the end of the NDP in Manitoba because without union funds they will never get elected.

So, Mr. Speaker, in view of these myths from the Member of Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), and some of those other speakers over there, which I have exploded, it is obvious that I will support the motion and not the attitude of the Members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. H. WOUFF: (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the Hon. Minister who has just taken his seat that, after all, we are proud of our support both financially and vote wise from the unions of this country, and we don't have to go to thugs like Harold Banks as the Liberal Party did to get their support.

MR. STEUART: — What thugs do you go to?

MR. WOUFF: — You know all about it, you had your fingers in it;

The Deputy Premier talked this afternoon about the Opposition having something to hide. Well now, Mr. Speaker, probably the Deputy Premier knows more about hiding things than anybody else. The kind of ungentlemanly exhibition by the Government and the Deputy Premier this afternoon, only proves that it is the Government that really has something to hide. For some reason, the Government wanted to force this Bill, this legislation through the House with the minimum of debate and in the minimum time. Either they feared, and I believe they did, my hon. colleague from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), or could it be that they have a rendezvous with a certain date just around the corner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOUFF: — I should like to take a glance at Saskatchewan's great gerrymander as it affects my constituency. This Government took 500 people in an area west of a natural boundary such as the North Saskatchewan River, or on the south bank if you like to put it that way, people who for the last 50 years, supporters of different political parties who were centred in the city of Lloydminster for all their organizational work, people who lived a bare 25 miles at the furthest from the city. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government has taken that area which runs within six miles of a city like Lloydminster, and tied it to the constituency of Turtleford whose East boundary is within two miles of Shell Lake.

I am telling the gentlemen opposite, including the Premier, that it is not just the NDP who are objecting to this kind of gerrymandering. Some of the Liberals in that area wrote letters to the Premier objecting to this kind of nonsense. When they got letters back from the Premier they were just mad enough to show them to some of our people. Mr. Speaker, the reasons the Premier gave in his letters for making the boundary changes were identical with the reasons that the NDP had already given the people as to why the change had been made. Only now we have it from the Premier's own pen and out of his own office.

Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes I want to turn to the Bill, and I do want to say this before I start, that if we do not take time to debate this Bill, we are going to face real criticism out on the hustings, I can tell you that. Because there is a lot of dissatisfaction with some revisions included in the Bill, as well as with suggestions excluded from the Bill. I wish to draw the attention of the House to Section 70, subsection (1), giving a candidate's agent, the candidate or the DRO, the right to require that a declaration be signed by a voter, and further, to the many provisions governing the deputy returning officer's right to require a signed declaration.

I would suggest you read the Act. The right of the returning officer to refuse a voter a ballot without signing a declaration is found in Section 72, subsection (1), (a) to (e), which give instructions for the DRO in clear concise terminology. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a voter may come in to a polling booth requesting a ballot, whereupon a candidate's agent or the DRO, for valid or other reasons, requests that the voter sign a declaration, with which the voter may agree. Then, regardless of the voter's right to a ballot or the poll officer's abuse of their position, the ballot goes directly into the ballot box. Once the ballot is in the box there is nothing that can be done at the final count about checking the voter's right to a ballot in the first place. In other words, if he is playing false, he also has the right under the Act as it is to bury the evidence in the ballot box. I have maintained for years, Mr. Speaker, that all declared ballots should go into envelopes so that they can be scrutinized and that they can be reviewed and that it would be a great deterrent on any kind of skulduggery by either voters or poll officers. I suppose somebody is going to say to me, "You have no faith or trust in your fellow men." It isn't a case of faith or trust in my fellow men; it is a case of reducing the possibility of a candidate and the electorate being denied the rightful seat in this Legislature. After all there are just enough unscrupulous people who, in a close election could, as the Act stands, upset an election. There are just enough DROs, there are just enough voters who will take advantage of a weakness in the Act, thereby, in some cases they may change the result of a close election. So, I suggest that these sections of the Act be reviewed and be changed so that all declared ballots, Mr. Speaker, go into an envelope where they can be reviewed on the final count.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOFF: — I think this is only justice. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, when I talk about gerrymandering and the Premier's ability to do it, that the Hon. Minister for Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) knows exactly what I am talking about.

Now, I'm not going to take any further time of the House. I just wanted to draw the attention of the House to what the gerrymander has meant to people within six miles of a centre like Lloydminster. I just wanted to draw your attention to what I believe are shortcomings of the Act in these sections dealing with declared ballots. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear;

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I only want to take a very brief time on this subject. There are two or three points that the Members opposite have been bringing up. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite have been talking to themselves for so long that they have more or less forgotten what the rest of society really thinks they look like.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they like to go back to the good old days when everything was supposed to be right — supposed to be right, I guess it was better for themselves — but it wasn't so good for most of the Liberal Members in 1952 under their redistribution. I took the liberty to go back and in 1944

you will recall they had a sizeable majority of Members. In 1948 they got very scared in the election and in 1951 they decided they should have a redistribution and the net effect of that redistribution was to eliminate two Liberal seats and make about seven more NDP ones safe. Some of the Members who are in this House presently were here at that particular time. The Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) — although he is not here this evening — was a Member as the Minister of Education at that time — his seat was helped out considerably by taking a few votes out of some of the neighboring seats. I think there are one or two other Members — possibly the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), he was here at that time, and his voice was not heard in the records, at least as far as I have heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — He wasn't particularly vocal on that occasion on redistribution Bills. But I guess as age has crept up on the Member for Turtleford he has had a great change of heart. This is most encouraging to see, Mr. Speaker.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, the most flagrant violation of all in gerrymanders proposed — and the reason I am taking the Members up on it, Mr. Speaker, is because they make credible the reason why people think that politicians are so cynical. They make it credible because they have reversed their arguments totally in the last seven years.

]

You know, in 1964, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Saskatoon — I looked up the election results — the Member who got the most votes was Mr. Nicholson — 16,701. The Member who finished sixth was Mr. Estey. He had 15,741; in fact, there were just slightly less than 900 fewer votes than the Member who won. In the city of Saskatoon there were 43,527 votes cast. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the city of Saskatoon elected four NDP Members and one Liberal with slightly less than an average of just over 15,000 votes.

MR. MacDONALD: — If it had in Regina, Mr. Blakeney would not have been here if it had been the same as in Saskatoon.

MR. WEATHERALD: — That's right. So, Mr. Speaker, my point is exactly that with five votes per man, with a slight majority on one party, as they intended — the only thing that fouled them up was a very popular lady Member who ran for the Liberals. With five votes per man, Mr. Speaker, they were elected with a slight majority of under 1,000 votes for five Members. In the constituency of Cannington in that year with over 1,000 votes majority, the Liberal Party elected one Member. You know, Mr. Speaker, they talk about gerrymanders and there couldn't have been a worse one than there was in 'the city of Saskatoon because they figured that they had the overall majority of NDP votes so they gave everybody five votes so that they could elect five NDP Members. Regina City, Mr. Speaker, they didn't think was quite so safe so they hived all the Liberals into South Regina into one big seat which the present Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) won. They put all South Regina which was tough territory for them into one seat, Mr. Speaker. They weren't too optimistic about Regina or they would have let them have five votes there in Regina per man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — If they got five votes, of course, there might not be any NDP Members.

So much for the credibility of a lot of the Members opposite when they talk about fair redistributions. Their credibility is just about as credible as they are on a lot of other subjects.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) was here, because I like the Member but I'm afraid I don't accept a number of his views. He has become so enamored with his own particular lot in life of fighting the trade union cause that he has forgotten any of the rest of us exist. You know he talks about the unfairness of the employers. He says an employer who, he alleges, would probably be a Liberal or a Conservative, that his employees would be scared to run for the NDP. He says this would scare them right off. You know, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to ask that Member just how any Liberal trade unionist who is part of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, what his chances are. His chances are just zero and he knows it but he doesn't mention it. There are a few in that body, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, but with Federation's position taken to defeat the present Government, the chances of them ever surfacing, Mr. Speaker, are absolutely negligible.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where is he now?

MR. WEATHERALD: — That's a good question. Where is he now all right? But the Member from Moose Jaw South is too biased to recognize such things as this. He recognizes only total unfairness by employers. He forgets the total unfairness of such organizations as the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour which he helps control along with the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more unfairness going on in this country and in this province than exists totally on the side of employers.

I want to turn for just a moment to another remark that a number of Members opposite have made on disclosure of all sources of income. I think that there is a necessity for some sources of disclosure, but there is also a very great need, Mr. Speaker, for the retention of a good deal of secrecy in this regard.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Privacy!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Privacy, is a better word, Mr. Speaker, simply because no matter how honest that particular donation may be, no matter how honest that man may be who gives the donation or that organization, once his name becomes public and it has been disclosed that he has given a donation to any political party, if at any time, no matter how honest his actions are, he is suspect by much of the public. This man puts himself into the serious position of jeopardizing his own situation once his donation to any political party, no matter how honest it is, is known. He puts himself in a position of being abused by the public. If he is a road or any type of contractor or type a

lawyer or anyone at all, Mr. Speaker, if he puts himself down as even donating \$25 then the public are very, very apt to say and will say in many cases, that the reason that such and such an act came about was simply because he was a donor to the political party. That would happen just as often with the party opposite as the party in government. It is unfortunate that many people are willing to jump to these conclusions but it certainly is a fact of life. And on that basis alone, I should not want to see any donations disclosed by each individual.

Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to mention two or three things in this discussion. The Members are making a lot of to-do about the Member not being here because he is sick. I think the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) dealt with that quite adequately. If we are going to make separate provisions for every single Member for the reason of not being here, then we are going to have 59 exceptions on most days. There are a lot of reasons, Mr. Speaker, too that are just as reasonable for a Member not being here, so I suppose if we are going to take account of anybody being sick, I suppose we should take account of a lot of other reasons why a Member has to be away.

The Members opposite had a year and one-half to study the Bill. They have about two or three Members here who aren't sick. The Members opposite had about two or three Members on the Committee and they've had an opportunity to study it. I think that many of their accusations that are made on gerrymandering and so forth will be certainly considered by the public of Saskatchewan as being just exactly what they are. Yes, they'll be considered for exactly what they are. A group of people who have had a sudden and fantastic change of heart all of a sudden in the past six years, mostly after they got into the Opposition.

The Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) said . . . Do you know what he said, Mr. Speaker. He said, "Why didn't they do it? Well the reason they didn't do it was because it was a new idea." In 1963 it wasn't a very new idea exactly. "Well," he says, "we would have to have more time to think about it." Well, they've been thinking about it for about 20 years but they haven't quite made up their minds yet. Mostly they haven't got their courage up which is more to the point. So, in any event they weren't able to get their courage up to bring about an independent redistribution and I'm sure they didn't do it because of a lack of funds, Mr. Speaker. They didn't appoint an independent returning officer because of lack of funds. They didn't appoint a lot of the new election machinery or agents and so forth that they speak of now because of lack of funds. They didn't have an independent redistribution because of lack of funds. You know, Mr. Speaker, the only reason they didn't do it was because they were too partisan and it wasn't in their own political interest to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — You know they didn't have the courage to do it because it was going to hurt the NDP if they had an independent redistribution. So, Mr. Speaker, all I say is for the people of Saskatchewan to take a good look at all the talk that we are getting from the Opposition because they didn't act very justly when they last had the chance to do so.

March 15, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about this Bill and I want first of all to make some remarks about some of the petty outbursts that I've heard on the other side of the House. You know we heard a great deal about contributions. When the Provincial Treasurer rose and peeked over his desk and made a lot of noise, I don't really remember anything he said it was a tremendous amount of abuse that poured from him but didn't make much sense. He said something about contributions from the unions. Allow me to read, Mr. Speaker, allow me to read from the Leader-Post:

Hal Banks may name Liberals. Radio correspondent, Ed Murphy who covers the House of Commons Proceedings in Ottawa for CKNW, says he is going to broadcast a tape interview with Harold Banks, former Canadian Seafarers' International Union, now in New York, about November 8. He says the tape mentions Liberal election candidates who accepted campaign funds from SIU sources and also discusses Bank's social association with some Liberal leaders, past and present.

Mr. Speaker interrupted proceedings and

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.