LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
38th Day

Monday, April 14, 1975.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and the Assembly a group of 62 students attending Division III School at Rosetown. They are seated in the east gallery and are accompanied by four of their teachers, Mrs. Wicket, Miss Klassen, Mr. Huck and Mr. Brumwell. I know the Assembly will join with me in extending a welcome to this group, wishing them an enjoyable stay with us this afternoon and a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this House approximately 18 students from the Morse High School. I understand they are Grade Twelve students. They came in earlier this morning. Their trip was cancelled last week because of the severe weather. I am very pleased to see them here today and I look forward to meeting with them at 3:30. I understand they are accompanied as well by their Grade Twelve teacher, Mr. Carl Radbrooke. I might point out to the Legislature that since Mr. Radbrooke has been teaching at Morse he has managed to take a class of students to the Legislature each and every year. I look forward to meeting with them at 3:30.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with Mr. Loken, Member for Rosetown in welcoming the group from Rosetown. I also hope that they have an enjoyable day in the Assembly and a safe journey back to their homes.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, Sir, and to all the Members of the House, 90 I believe, Grade Eight students from St. Mary's School. Their teachers are Mr. Ferner, Mr. Gervais, and Mr. Hicke, I hope I have pronounced those names correctly.

They are in the west gallery and I will be meeting with them about 3:15. St. Mary's School is just off 20th Street. It is one of the oldest and best schools in the City of Saskatoon. I hope that the students have a good and informative visit here and a safe journey back home to Saskatoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

WILL SGIO ESTABLISH ANOTHER RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General. With the establishment of the research centre for SGIO, I believe it was pretty well understood that there would only be one such research centre and it would be located in Regina. And it would not become just another auto body repair shop.

Would the Minister tell us if the Government is planning on opening another research centre in Saskatoon in the premises either now or formerly occupied by Doc Landa's Body Shop?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — No, SGIO to my knowledge has no such plans to open up another experimental research centre at this time anywhere other than the one that is open here in Regina.

Mr. Grant: — I presume the Minister would know if there were such plans since he is so closely tied-in. Would the Minister advise us whether he has seen that specific instructions are given to the Claims Service Centre, that only special repair cases are referred to the Research Centre. As he knows, there are complaints regularly from the auto repair industry that a little bit more than research work is being carried on. I think in Crown corporations' discussions he assured us that it was not the desire of the Government to have this become an auto body repair shop. Have instructions been passed on to the Claims Service Centres?

Mr. Romanow: — I can only repeat what I believe I indicated to Members in Crown corporations when I was asked a similar question. That under normal circumstances the prime function of the Research Centre is to do that, namely research. References by adjusters or other people in SGIO to the Centre are only made when specifically asked by a customer or when in the case of a specialized research project, such as the chromed bumpers, whatever you call them, I think they call it chromatizing the new bumpers. So far as I understand, that is the standard procedure. John Green advises me that that is the position with respect to all SGIO people and I certainly know of nothing that would alter that in the next little while.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure I have a clear understanding on the first question. The Government is not planning to buy Doc Landa's Repair Shop.

Mr. Romanow: — I give you as clear and as full an answer as I can. I know of no move by SGIO, certainly none by the Cabinet, because Cabinet would not be involved in this. It would be an SGIO meeting, and I know of nothing by SGIO to purchase the Doc Landa's Auto Body Shop in Saskatoon. It is conceivable that there may be some informal discussions at an officials level, but I even doubt that because I think I would be advised of it. Standing here I can't see that and I can assure the Member that

there is no plan to purchase Doc Landa's in Saskatoon.

HOUSING DISCRIMINATION

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, if I might address a question to the Attorney General, I have received a number of telegrams which are concerned about the problems of discrimination in housing with respect to the Human Rights Commission. I understand that the Minister is planning to meet with this delegation at 2:45 p.m. Could the Minister advise the House what position he will take at that time in communicating with these groups?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that because I don't know what position they will take. I want to hear them and I will give responses as best I can and in any event the Bill is on the Order Paper for a debate by all Members and at that time I will be tendering the views of myself and the Government.

Mr. Richards: — Clearly the supplementary question, I was trying to ferret out the Minister's intentions without making any specific reference to the Bill in order to stay absolutely within the rules of this House as specified by the Speaker and one will note that in my initial question I made not the slightest mention of any piece of legislation which might be before the House. I think it might be appropriate if the Minister did state and I am certainly asking in my supplementary for his position about a certain piece of legislation which would seriously result in an increased potential for discrimination. I understand that 40 per cent of the housing cases alleging racial discrimination which came before the Commission would be affected by the amendment in the legislation. Could the Minister not have something more definite to state as to whether his Government intends to proceed with this obviously obnoxious piece of legislation?

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously my position and that of the Government is together on this. The Bill is before the Members of the House and at present subject to any representations or any other consideration of the matter. It's my intention to proceed with the legislation as it is before the Members of the House in due course.

SECRET AND CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS SENT TO CROP INSURANCE BOARD

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister is aware that secret and confidential reports are being sent in to the Crop Insurance Board about crop insurance claimants. In view of the concern of confidential files of people, I wonder if the Minister is aware of this. I wonder if he would comment on it.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any secret or confidential reports being sent to the Crop Insurance personnel. I would be happy to have the Member convey to me by whom these reports are being compiled and forwarded to the Crop Insurance

Board. This is the first I have heard of any confidential or secret information.

Mr. Gardner: — I will provide a copy to the Minister. They are from the Crop Insurance Board and they are being sent in by their agents. They are asking such question as this; what is the insured's attitude and understanding of the crop insurance program. Questions such as this that are obviously not related to his claim, but is confidential information. The farmer doesn't get a chance to see this, he doesn't have a chance to sign it but they are being sent in and kept on file regarding the farmer. I have a copy of the report here, the reporting form that is being used. I just wonder if the Minister would check into this and if this is the case, if he would see that this type of thing doesn't go on.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to have the Member table the documents so I can pursue the matter further.

SASKATCHEWAN POLICE COLLEGE

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to address . . .

Mr. Speaker: — We have had three questions, is the House prepared to take another one?

Mr. Malone: . . . another question to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. It is in connection with the Saskatchewan Police College in an article that appeared in this morning's Leader-Post. According to this article, and I am quoting from one of the professors, he indicates that the marks of the students, that is the policemen attending this College are very poor. To quote from the Leader-Post he says:

> In all my university career, I have never had so many with such bad marks.

The article goes further to say that the students are judged on their attitude, deportment and ability to work with others at the College. My question to the Attorney general is: do the students not have to attain a certain academic standard, that is in marks, before they are given the pass from the College?

Mr. Romanow: — I believe that the question the Hon. Member directs my attention to really relates to one class only, and that is as I understand it, a psychology class at the University of Regina. This is really an experimental aspect of the Police College inasmuch as we only introduced it last year for the first time and this year for the second time, in an attempt to get the students some exposure to university attitudes and university classes and of course, to a particularly important subject matter, psychology. It was not felt by the officials and the administrators of the College that they should be in the ordinary class fail situation as it relates to the psychology class. I think that the comments made by the particular professor, while I haven't seen them in detail, may be a bit too harsh, keeping in mind what this was

intended to do. As far as I can see, the students are a very excellent crop of graduates, graduating at the end of this week and will do an excellent job in the field. I hope I have answered the question of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Malone: — By way of supplementary then. I assume the students don't have to attain a certain mark to be passed from the College. May I suggest to the Attorney General it would seem to be rather useless to have them attending the College if there is no intention to mark their efforts while they are there. I realize it is still at the experimental nature, but is it the intention of your Department at a later date to require the students that attend this College to attain a certain mark before they are given a diploma or certificate, whatever they get when they are finished?

Mr. Romanow: — Let me just make this clear. Again the marking relates to the psychology class only. My understanding is that there is a grading. There is a standard that has to be applied with respect to the rest of the Police College training. In the end result as you will appreciate, all the recruits sort of are the ultimate responsibility of the individual local police forces. What happens is that if the recruit does not meet the minimum standards, or the minimum qualifications or the minimum sort of criteria, this is notified, it is notified to the respective police authority and action is taken. So it is not to be assumed that there is no marking and no standard. Yes, indeed there is. There just doesn't happen to be one in this psychology one. And may I say before I close off, that in addition to all the other remarks that I made, I think the other part of the report was that there were some students who were indeed very, very excellent in that psychology course. As I say, I sure wouldn't want to see the Press or anybody jump on remarks which I think are out of context on the overall total program.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. W. Robbins (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 55 — **An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act**.

He said: For the information of Members, I wish at this time to outline some of the features of the Bill to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act. There are four basic amendments in the Bill.

1. The addition of labour service employees under The Public Service Superannuation Act.

2. A new Section 62B will enable a contributor under The Public Service Superannuation Act. to continue to be a contributor where he ceases to be an employee in a hospital operated by the province to become an employee of a Board of Governors appointed to operate that hospital.

In other words it is simply to continue the superannuation coverage for those persons such as the Souris Valley Hospital which would come under this particular item in The Public Service Superannuation Act.

3. The addition of a new Section 62C that will permit an overage employee, a person who is 55 years of age or over of an institution acquired by the province to become a contributor under The Public Service Superannuation Act notwithstanding the fact that he is overage at the time he becomes an employee of the province.

This deals specifically, I believe with the Qu'Appelle Sanatorium as one example that comes to mind.

4. A further Section 64A that will allow a person employed in the Office of the Government Caucus or the Office of the Caucus of the Official Opposition by notice in writing to the Board to elect to contribute and receive benefits under The Public Service Superannuation Act as if he were an employee within the full meaning of this Act.

The Public Service Act authorizes the Chairman of the Public Service Commission to designate any position or class of positions as part of a group to be known as the Labor Service.

The size of the Labor Service staff varies with the season of the year from an estimated high of some 5,000 employees to an estimated low of perhaps 2,000 employees. Most of these employees are found in the Department of Highways and the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. A number of the employees work for 12 months in a year. Some of the employees perform duties similar to, if not identical to, duties performed by other persons in the classified Public Service.

Labor Service employees do not contribute to The Public Service Superannuation Act. However, certain Labor Service employees up to this time have contributed to the Labor Service Employees' Retirement Plan established by a regulation made under regulation making authority provided by Section 8 of The Public Service Act. This Plan is administered by The Public Service Superannuation Board.

Section 9 of the regulations requires every person who becomes an employee on or after February 1, 1971 commencing one year after the date of his appointment to make contributions in respect of wages received by him. The rate of contribution is computed at five per cent of the wages earned.

Regulations provide that every employee who is retired under the provisions of these regulations shall be paid in a lump sum his total contributions with accrued interest, together with an amount equal to the said contributions and interest by the Treasury of the province.

The Labor Service Employees are represented by the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association. At the request of the union, the Government has agreed to bring all the Labor Service employees under The Public Service Superannuation Act. These Labor Service employees will, therefore, no longer be entitled to benefits under the Labor Service Employees' Retirement Plan regulations but on the coming into force of this amendment, will become entitled to the benefits provided under The Public Service Superannuation Act. This of course will then cover all employees in the Public Service.

One of the Sections in this particular Bill which are being changed will permit hospital employees to continue to be contributors under The Public Service Superannuation Act. This

Section is similar to 62A which came into force on April 1, 1968, with respect to the employees of the Wascana Hospital. In both cases, the new employer is required to make a contribution equal to the amount of contribution made by the employee.

This new Section is required at this time to provide for the employees of the Weyburn Hospital who became employees in the Souris Valley Extendicare Hospital as of January 1, 1975.

It is also expected that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will designate the Qu'Appelle Sanatorium to be an institution for the purposes of this section thereby permitting three overage employees to become contributors under The Public Service Superannuation Act effective April 1, 1971, the date they commenced employment with the province.

That, Mr. Speaker, summarizes the amendments to The Public Service Superannuation Act. I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two. We have been waiting for some time for the Minister to move second reading of this Bill to hear his explanation. It appears that these four principles that are involved in this particular piece of legislation is in the best interest of the people who are concerned. However, we should like to take a little more time to go over the Minister's remarks, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. Robbins (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 57 — **An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill, Bill 57 deals with the Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act. Before proceeding to give some detailed information and examination of the Bill I wish to make a few comments, perhaps to better acquaint the Members of the Assembly with the proposals placed before them with respect to these superannuation matters. There are five superannuation acts: The Liquor Board Superannuation Act; Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act; Public Service Superannuation Act; Saskatchewan Power Corporation Superannuation Act and the Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act. In addition there is a sixth superannuation Act, termed the Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

This latter Act has been used as a vehicle for amending each of the five other Acts which are essentially similar. In other words, I think perhaps most of the Members are aware of the fact that the Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act is used as a means of amending the five other Acts because of their similarity. This prevents, of course, the necessity of bringing in amendments to each of the individual Acts before the House.

The Bill being submitted for your consideration today, a Bill to amend the Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act is designed to amend each of the five superannuation Acts previously referred to. Generally speaking those five Acts are similar in content although there are some differences. The differences need not concern us today. Each of the superannuation Acts provide a superannuation allowance upon retirement

through the use of a formula. The formula is years of service to a maximum of 35 years computed at 1/50 or two per cent times the average yearly salary of the employee and that is computed with respect to the six consecutive years of highest salary. In other words it's a formula type pension, a pension allowance, not an earned pension.

In its application to a person who works continuously in the government service, each of the five Acts is simple in its application and really quite easy to understand. The problems in establishing and administering a suitable superannuation plan arise mainly in respect to those persons who may be generally categorized as special cases. Included in the group of special cases are those persons who entered the service of the government during the latter part of their working lifetime.

A large portion of the provisions of each of the five superannuation Acts is devoted to these special cases. These special cases, Mr. Speaker, give rise to many special rules. In many cases the reasons for making the special rules are not readily apparent. Some of the amendments being proposed today are designed to overcome the prejudicial effects upon certain employees of statutory provisions enacted to deal with these special cases. An example of this is the proposed new Section 5B to which I will refer in greater detail in a moment or two. This new Section will enable an employee to pick up continuous periods of one year or more in provincial employment and to have these periods included as continuous with his present employment. A further example of an amendment designed to overcome the prejudicial effects of a previous statutory provision is a proposed new Section 6A. This Section will provide refunds of contributions to certain employees who as a result of exercising an option made available to them have made contributions in excess of those required. Now this gets a bit complicated but I hoe to be able to explain this to the Members perhaps by using a specific example without naming the individual, of course.

A third example is to be found in Section 5 of the Bill which provides for the enactment of a new Section 8B which prohibits the board from failing to grant an allowance or suspend or discontinue an allowance on the grounds that the applicant or the recipient is unworthy of it. Fortunately the power of a superannuation board to fail to grant an allowance or suspend or discontinue an allowance has been exercised only on very rare occasions. To my knowledge this power has not been exercised for many, many years.

I propose to refer to each section of the Bill and to outline the intent of the proposed amendments.

Section 2 of the Bill will add a new section, 5B to the Act. The purpose of this amendment is to permit an employee to include any continuous period of one year or more in provincial employment as part of his service for the purpose of computing an allowance upon reaching retirement. It will be noted that an employee is required to refund any benefit received from his previous employment and also to pay certain sums as interest.

I direct your attention to sub-section 6 of the proposed new section 5B. This sub-section allows any beak in service

to be bridged and provides that prior service and present service may be regarded as continuous for the purposes of the Act. I will cite one or two examples to illustrate this and I think this is very important to the individual concerned. The several benefits provided under the Act are granted on the basis of a required period of continuous service. The proposed amendment will provide significant advantages to a number of employees who have had broken periods of service, in some cases, extending over 30 years. Certain of these employees will now be eligible to retire having completed 35 years continuous service without incurring a reduction in their superannuation allowance because of the fact that they failed to meet a certain requirement for continuous service. For example: one employee worked for a period of 17 years. He left the service of the public service of Saskatchewan for six years and since his return has completed a further 18 years. Because these two periods of service totalling 35 years, cannot be regarded as continuous at the present time, he is unable to retire under the rules which permits early retirement after 35 years service without a reduction in the allowance payable. Further, if he were to retire before attaining the age of 65 and elected deferred superannuation allowance which is now payable at age 60, his allowance would be reduced because he does not have a period of twenty years of continuous service, having the two periods of 17 years and 18 years broken by the six years when he was not in service. The reduction would be in the order of six per cent to that individual. I point out to the Members that he would have 35 years of public service exactly the same as an individual who had started and worked continuously for 35 years.

This amendment will also circumvent the prejudicial results of special provisions that required an employee to pick up prior service within a specific period of time. I will cite an example. One clause requires that within one year of a permanent appointment or within one year of reappointment, or within one year of the coming into force of a particular section an individual may elect to pick up service. There are also special provisions that prohibit an employee from picking up a period of prior employment if his reappointment was more than six years after the last day of the previous employment. In other words what has really happened in terms of the pension Acts is that we have got amendments piled upon amendments until it has become such a hodge-podge, that hardly anyone can really decipher what is involved. We are hopeful that some of these amendments will at least clear out some of that underbrush and give individuals a much better chance really to understand the implications of the Act and therefore, be in a better position to select whether or not they wish to retire, whether it is early retirement or normal retirement.

The proposed amendment will eliminate this hardship by providing that an employee may pick up any continuous period of one year or more in provincial employment at any time prior to the first day of his last month of employment.

That is not as easy as it sounds because if the individual elects only a month before he actually retires he is going to have to pay the contributions that will have been payable down through the period of time he has been employed and he is going to have to pay interest on that amount on a compounding basis annually. However, he will not be prevented from having the probability of doing what he may choose to do at that particular time up to one month prior to his actual retirement.

A new Section 6A is being added to the Act to provide for the refunds of contributions in certain cases. The Section also repeals the statutory provision that granted the option that resulted in the excess contributions.

I might say a word or two about this. There are a number of employees, I am not sure where they are located, I have located a few of them. Some are at Sask Power, some are at Sask Tel, some are in the Public Service. I will just cite one example to illustrate. This individual started to work in pubic service at 18 years of age, he had his 35 years of contributions in when he was 53. He could not be retired as he was under the earliest possible age of retirement. At that time the restriction on the size of the allowance was related to 70 per cent on the basis of a $10,000 a year income or $7,000. Because of this many of these people were given the opportunity to continue to make contributions and some of them elected to do so. I understand there are 16 of them. These individuals began to make excess contributions. In the interim, wage scales rose appreciably and they now find that the contributions that they have made, one instance I am aware of for the last 12 years, are absolutely meaningless to them. They bring them no further results in terms of pensions whatsoever. In other words using the computation of two per cent times 35 years of service computed on the basis of the six best earning years, the individual would have a pension, the one I am thinking of, of $8,400 per annum or $700 per month. The fact remains that that individual would have had that pension irrespective of the fact that from 1962 on, the last 12 years he has made contributions based on his age level to The Public Service Superannuation Act. This sum of money refunded to him, not directly, but into a Registered Retirement Savings Plan of his choice will permit him to get additional pension by reason of the fact that he made those contributions over that period of time.

As a result of substantial increases in salaries in recent years, certain of the employees who exercised the option to continue making contributions now find themselves in the position where they would be entitled to an annual allowance in excess of $7,000 if they retired immediately. These employees have requested a refund of the excess contributions made by them and this statutory amendment is designed to provide these employees with a refund of their excess contributions. It will be noted that the section also provides for a refund to a superannuated employee who has made excess contributions. As previously mentioned, the statutory provision that resulted in these employees having made an excess contribution is being repealed to avoid the possibility of excess contributions being made in future years.

I don’t suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is absolutely perfect by any means. I frankly am of the personal opinion that individuals should be making contributions, no matter how long they work and that the pension should be an earned pension. The Public Service Superannuation Act and these Acts do not operate on that basis, they do not operate on the basis of earned pensions, they operate on the basis of pension allowances.

A new Section 7F is being added to the Act to provide for further supplementary allowances based on years of service of the employee. The further supplementary allowances being provided are:

(a) To a superannuate — $12 for each year of service; and

(b) To a widow — $6 for each year of service of the employee.

In both cases the maximum service to be included is 35 years. The maximum amount payable is 35 times 12 or another $420 per annum or $35 per month. The minimum for 10 years service is $120 or $10 a month.

This is the same formula used last year when the supplementary allowance granted was based on years of service except that the rate of service for a superannuate this year is $12 as against $10 last year, and the rate of supplementary allowance for a widow for each year of service of the employee is $6 as against $5 last year.

As an alternative to granting the allowances based on years of service, we considered indexing to the consumer price index. However, when you look at the actual figures, they become rather horrendous in this respect, over a very short period of time, if you assume two digit inflation. While there is some merit to indexing, I want to point out to Members that on balance we considered the greatest advantage to the largest number of retired public servants would be provided by an allowance based on years of service. We considered that as a good employer we had a responsibility to give first consideration to the needs of those persons who had spent nearly a lifetime in the service of the province and its people. Many of these persons retired several years ago and inflation has eroded their pensions appreciably, the purchasing value of their allowances granted to them have been appreciably reduced. Under the indexing method, the greatest number of dollars would be provided to those retired employees in receipt of the larger allowances. Many of these persons have retired in recent years and their allowances are based on higher salaries paid in recent years. These are not the persons who are being most adversely affected by inflation, and therefore, we did not take that approach.

Under the method of supplementary allowances chosen, the greatest advantage will accrue to those with 35 years of service or more. Many of these persons have been adversely affected by inflation and it was therefore decided to grant the allowance on the basis of years of service rather than to index it to the cost of living.

I have a table which I can quote to Members if they wish information with respect to the supplementary allowances which have been granted since 1965, by the current administration and the previous administration.

It will be seen that in 1965, the allowance granted was $10 annually and $4 annually for widows for each year of service. However, I should point out to the Members of this Assembly that the allowance was restricted to those who commenced pension prior to April 4, 1951 and only those persons who were on allowance at that date, received the additional increment. The average monthly increase was $12 and the annual cost was $74,574. The estimated cost for providing allowances at the rate of $12 for superannuates and $6 for widows is $447,300 per annum. This is some six times the cost of allowances provided in 1965 and more than four times the cost of allowances provided in 1970 when the cost totalled $108,513.

Section 8A of the Act deals with postponement of allowances where monies are owing to the Board. It will be appreciated that under Section 5A being enacted at this time, an employee has the right to pick up prior service and it is probably that the employee may be indebted to the Board at the time of his retirement. It is a requirement therefore, that he settle that indebtedness to the Board prior to being in receipt of an allowance.

We have found some examples already where there are people indebted to the Board but who are currently drawing allowances. This does not seem a reasonable approach. This Section will require any indebtedness to be discharged prior to the commencement of an allowance.

At the present time, a superannuation board can refuse to grant an allowance or suspend or discontinue an allowance on the grounds that the applicant or recipient is unworthy of it. This power has not been exercised in recent years so we see no reason why this clause should be retained. The Government considered that no superannuation board should continue to have this kind of power. The proposal is, therefore, that a superannuation board be prohibited from failing to grant an allowance or suspending or discontinuing an allowance on the grounds that the applicant or recipient is unworthy of it.

Section 8C of the Act deals with an employee who has attained the age of 35 years and who has served at least 10 years continuously. This individual may at his option be granted a deferred superannuation allowance upon separation from the service. The deferred superannuation allowance may be commenced at age 60 if the employee has 15 years service but the allowance is reduced. If the employee has 20 years or more of service, the allowance is not reduced.

Under the wording of the present statutory provision, an employee is required to exercise his option within one year of separation from the service to be granted a deferred yearly superannuation allowance. If he does not exercise the option within one year, he automatically is granted a refund of his contributions. This, Mr. Speaker, really struck us as an anomaly in the Act. We want people to retrain their pension monies for the purpose intended, for pensions and yet we forced these people to take their money out irrespective of the fact that many of them did not want to do so. The proposed amendment encourages the employee to take a deferred superannuation allowance by providing that he will be deemed to have elected a deferred superannuation allowance if he does not request a refund within four months of separation from the service. I wish to point out to the Members of the Assembly that this reversal of the option is not prejudicial to the employee as he may at any time elect to take a refund of his contribution, although I frankly think that we should encourage people not to do so simply because it is imperative that people get pensions for their period of service when they reach pensionable age.

It is considered that the Government as an employer should encourage an employee to take a superannuation allowance wherever available, because it is likely to be to his advantage for him to do so. Further, unless an employee becomes entitled to the superannuation allowance in respect of each period of his employment, whether it is with the Government or elsewhere, he is likely to become a charge on the public purse when he reaches

age 65 and beyond and we have a lot of history to back up that statement.

At the present time an employee who retires from Government service is automatically granted a refund whether he wants it or not. In many instances the board has been requested to defer the payment of a refund but the board up to this time had no power to delay a refund. Further there are a large number of refunds payable each year, last year some 1,800 of them and the board is experiencing considerable difficulty in paying out the allowances in less than two months which is required within the Act. It is expected that the requirement that an employee request a refund may reduce the substantial number of refunds payable each year and thereby assist the board in coping with the process of refunds. It is also hoped that it will encourage employees to leave their contributions on deposit in anticipation of re-employment with the Government or an eventual pension which would cover that period of employment. It will also allow an employee to choose the time of refund for any personal reasons, including any advantage which may accrue to him in relation to income tax in the Income Tax Act.

Section 6 of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is worded in such a way that the Superannuation Act prohibit the payment of an allowance to a widow if the employee or superannuate married after attaining the age of 60.

There are cases where the parties have lived together for a number of years (in one case, exceeding 40 years) but were unable to marry prior to the employee or superannuate attaining his 60th birthday because one or both of the parties was a party of a previously contracted and undissolved marriage. This situation held true prior to the recent amendments to The Divorce Act which permitted divorce for grounds other than adultery of one of the parties. We have a very peculiar situation with respect to an individual who worked for 35 years for the Public Service of Saskatchewan, married after age 60 but in fact lived with his wife after age 60 for 40 years prior to that. He died a year later and she has no pension. This really is irrational in relation to the needs of those people.

It is not possible to give any estimate of the number of case of widows who may become entitled to an allowance as a result of this amendment. But it should be noted that the amendment has a retroactive effect and it is to be expected that several applications for allowances will be received as a result of the amendment. Payment of an allowance in a particular case is to commence on the first day of the month following the day an application is received from that particular party.

That, Mr. Speaker, covers as briefly as I can the rather complex set of rules and regulations related to the five Acts, I move second reading of the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I think as the Minister has explained it is rather complex and after listening to him it is even more complex than when I read the Act, and it is no fault of the Minister, it is just one of those things. I suspect that we will be able to question him more intelligently during the Committee of the Whole, however, there were a few points that

came out. I am sure that many of the amendments that are being presented here are welcome, I gather, to a rather limited number of superannuates in each case who will benefit from it. But certainly in most of these cases I gather that injustices which perhaps have been going on for a great number of years are now being rectified and I think that this is rightfully so. We certainly would not have any opposition or oppose this in any way.

There is one, I think, major section of the Bill and that is the increase in the allowance and I think that here the Minister is open to some criticism because I think we all recognize that in this day and age with inflation at the rate that it is that this is a very minimal type of an increase for the superannuates. I think it worked out to something like $35 per month. When you consider the effects of inflation over the last two or three years and I think particularly when you consider the increased revenues of this Government opposite, that surely they could have had a little more compassion for these superannuates than the $12 a month that is being suggested in this Bill. They have been able to invest large sums of money in companies like Intercon, they have been able to invest large sums of money in going into their own potash companies and oil companies and yet they find it difficult — I suggest it was with some measure of being old Scrooge — that they were even able to get this $12 out of the Minister of Finance. I think this is the weakness of the Bill, the other provisions are housekeeping insofar as they are overcoming injustices that were in the Act perhaps for a great number of years. The one area which is affected a large number of superannuates and where the Minister could have made a major contribution in making their life a little easier he failed to do. The miserly $12 that he is suggesting here in this legislation is not in keeping with the increased costs that these people are forced to look at and it is certainly not in keeping with the fact that the revenues of the Government have increased substantially over the last couple or three years and, therefore, we certainly regret that.

However, I should like to have another look at some of the comments that he made so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 61 — **An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1972**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to move second reading of a Bill to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1972. This Bill comprises mainly housekeeping amendments which provide uniformity with The Urban Municipality Act.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities informed us that many municipalities are experiencing difficulty in obtaining persons to perform services for the municipality, for example, mowing the weeds on a road allowance. The Association asks that we provide legislation to permit councillors of rural municipalities to perform certain services for the municipality without being disqualified as a councillor. This authority was granted to councillors of towns and villages in the 1970 consolidation of The Urban Municipality Act and we believe it is desirable to provide the same authority to rural municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, The Urban Municipality Act calls for disclosure of any conflict of interest by members of a district planning commission. This provision applies to only those members of the commission who are appointed by the urban municipality and we are proposing an amendment in this Bill to require a similar disclosure by the rural members of the commission.

Rural municipalities adopted the practice of establishing polls for their elections in villages and towns located within the outer boundaries of the rural municipality or adjacent thereto. This procedure was a practical interpretation of the Act and did not create any legal problems until this year. This year, Mr. Speaker, the legality of a rural municipality in establishing a polling place outside its boundaries has been raised and we have received an opinion from our legal advisors that the Act does not support this practice. We are proposing amendments to this Bill that will allow a rural municipality to establish polling places either within or without the municipality.

Mr. Speaker, the most contentious area in the assessment of rural lands is the requirement to assess farm buildings where the occupant's chief source of income is from a source other than from the agricultural operation of the land. Frequently many bona fide farmers are forced to accept outside employment to supplement their farm income while they are establishing a viable farm unit or during periods of adverse farming conditions. If the income from such non-agricultural pursuits exceeds the agricultural income of a farmer, the municipal assessor is required to assess the building for taxation purposes. Many municipalities overlook the statutory requirements in this respect because the council feels the condition may be temporary and they do not wish to impose any further hardships on the farmer. However, the non-agricultural income of farmers in some municipalities has exceeded their agricultural income by a considerable degree and the municipalities have assessed the farm residence and all the farm buildings. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of the chief source of income the buildings used solely in connection with the agricultural operation of the land should be exempt from taxation and the amendments proposed in this Bill provides for such exemptions.

We have discussed this matter with the executive of the SARM and received concurrence for this proposal. Also as a measure of concession to bona fide farmers who are acquiring the greater part of their income from non-agricultural pursuits, we are proposing an amendment to this Bill that will provide an exemption of the portion of the assessed value of the residence and other non-agricultural buildings which is equal to the assessed value of all the land owned by the occupant and used by him for agricultural purposes. Mr. Speaker, we believe this proposal will relieve most bona fide farmers from any taxation on their residence and it removes the problem facing many municipalities in attempting to determine when a farmer's chief source of income is from other sources because of the fluctuating farm income. This amendment will be brought into force by proclamation because some municipalities have completed their assessment rolls for 1975 and would not be able to use the provisions for this year.

The executive of the SARM presented a request on behalf of

the rural municipalities to increase the rate of penalty on arrears of taxes. The municipalities contend that an increase is necessary to compare with the rising cost of money. Mr. Speaker, we are proposing permissive legislation to allow the municipalities to increase the rate of penalty from seven per cent to nine per cent.

The SARM has agreed with the principle of each of these proposed amendments, most of which are in response of their requests and I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, we have a few amendments. Again it is further proof that the conflict of interest proposals that were introduced in this House as they apply to local government were poorly thought out, poorly drafted and obviously a lack of rational thought was put into that matter.

I might also take the opportunity of reminding the Government Members and the general public that many of these criticisms were brought to the attention of the House when the Bill was introduced the first time in 1972. Now it seems the Opposition is put in a rather frustrating position in these matters when we bring legitimate criticisms and fair criticisms to this House and of course they are ignored. I think a lot of us are getting a little sick and tired when some obvious situations arise that are not going to work, that legislation in certain circumstances in unworkable and legislation is not, in fact, solving the problem or a principle applied in blanket fashion is going to create some hardship, some unfairness and some unreasonableness. And yet the Government in the last four years has used its 45 to 15 majority and failed to take concrete and reasonable suggestions from the Opposition to heart and the upshot is of course that they are now forced to come back a second time and use up the time of the House, use up the time of the draftsmen, use up the time of the Attorney General's Department, use up the time, in this case of the SARM and SUMA, because of problems that were brought to the Government's attention beforehand. That is not the proper way to draft legislation and I am sure the Minister knows it and I am sure the Minister is now paying the price because of the hassle that has arisen over the last few years as a result of the approach taken by the Government opposite.

We note to the explanation of the amendment to Clause 6 of the Bill, the amendments to Section 309 of The Rural Municipality Act. One of the results, of course, of the proposed amendments is that it will certainly help the gentleman farmer. That is that individual who buys a quarter or a half section of land to try and get some benefits, either taxwise or otherwise, and, of course, he will now benefit under the exemption given to him and we, in the Opposition, certainly oppose that type of legislation. The Bill was to exempt certain provisions for farmers, it was supposed to be to the benefit of farmers whose primary occupation was farming and, of course, it can very easily happen under this proposed amendment that an individual whose main source of income is from non-farming operations will now be entitled to the exemptions. Frankly we oppose that approach on rural land.

Mr. Speaker, we will have more comments to make on this particular Bill and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 65 — **An Act to amend The Controverted Municipal Elections Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker The Controverted Municipal Elections Act provides the authority of procedure by which a person can apply to the courts to have an election voided on certain grounds. The usual grounds for a person seeking to upset an election are those affecting the qualifications of the person who has been elected. In these cases there is no question about the responsibility of the elected person to finance his defence.

However, situations have developed, Mr. Speaker, where the validity of an election has been contested on the grounds that the election itself was not conducted according to law. Under the present Act the defence of any such contest falls on the person who was elected although the cause of the action was not because of any disqualification on his part.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association made us aware of a resolution passed at its recent convention requesting the legislation that would remove or correct this deficiency in the Act and we believe the stand adopted by the Association is valid. The proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, will make the municipality a party to the defence of any contest which is started on grounds that the election was not conducted according to law and it authorizes the judge of the court to order the municipality to reimburse the person elected for the cost of his solicitor, and such other costs as the judge approves. We believe this is good and desirable legislation and I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. G. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, we don't object to the proposed amendment.

Perhaps the Minister can clarify when we get into Committee of the Whole as to the matter of a controverted election brought on several grounds, one of which is, that it was not contrary to law, and that the election is overturned for several reasons, one of which is that it was not according to law, and whether he would get his costs based on the total action or whether just on that aspect that it was not his fault, if he is unsuccessful, and as I say, we do not object to the principle and hope that the Minister will be able to comment on those matters in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D. Cody (Minister of Co-operatives) moved second reading of Bill 62 — **An Act to amend The House Building Assistance Act, 1974**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill 62 has a very small amendment to The House Building Assistance Act, and basically what the amendment does is it allows an individual to take part in a grant in both sections of the Act. There is one section for the building of a new house, another section for alterations to a home. So that in fact what has happened up until now, is if a person took a grant to alter his home and got $100, he then would not qualify for the balance of the $900 should be wish to construct a new home. We decided now to change this

so that if in fact he received at one time a grant for alternations to his home he could now qualify as well for the balance up to $1,000, if he were going to construct a new home. I don't think there is a great deal more that one could say to this very slight amendment, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 62, an amendment to The House Building Assistance Act.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister didn't, of course, touch on the major part as to whether or not the proposed grant is adequate and, of course, we, in the Opposition feel that it is totally inadequate.

The fact that an individual now may obtain up to $1,000 through either one of the aspects of the Act is, I suppose, reasonable. It should have been in the Bill and I think the Minister will admit this. Again, it falls short, however, allowing the eligible applicants, under the Act, to keep up with inflation. Building costs have increased dramatically, building repair costs and labor costs have increased dramatically and the $1,000 allowed right now has become minuscule to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, we agree that a person should be eligible to the total of $1,000 and it shouldn't depend on either aspect, either if it is repair or building. From that point of view we support the legislation in principle.

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say a great deal, but I just wanted to bring to the attention of the House and to the citizens of Saskatchewan that this Act, where the Member may say it has fallen short by only having $1,000, it just happens to be a 100 per cent increase since 1971. When we took office in 1971 the grants for this program were $500, and I think that raising them from $500 to $800 in our first year of office and then from $800 to $1,000 is creditable and certainly I believe that the citizens of Saskatchewan also feel that it is creditable. I feel that with this there can be no complaints by the Members of the Opposition because they only had half the amount of grant involved at the time they were in power versus $1.000 now.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill 63 — **An Act to amend The Election Act, 1971**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I move this Bill I think I will need leave of the House. I wonder if I might ask leave of the House. It's The Election Act. I should like to get the second reading speech off and if you, the Opposition, wants to adjourn it, we could adjourn it.

Mr. Lane: — I should like to be able to comment. We just got that Bill this morning and we've asked the Minister in the past why it was the only Bill, the most important, and I'm sorry we can't give leave. We would like to have a good debate on this matter and we would like to have time to read the written Bill.

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Members opposite. Mr. Speaker, I'll be very quick with the proposed amendment to No. 63.

Section 2 of the Act is amended by providing new definitions of the word 'candidate' to hospital or sanatorium and words 'spoiled ballot'. The present definition of candidate has been expanded by the addition of a sub-clause (iii) which provides that for the purpose of the election expense provisions of the Act a candidate is a person who, prior to the issue of a writ for an election, begins campaigning for his election as a Member of the Assembly. This was an obvious loophole in the legislation which had to be covered.

The definition of hospital, or sanatorium, has been changed to provide that any public or private institution which has more than five beds is a hospital or sanatorium within the meaning of the Act. The definition now includes a facility under The Mental Health Act. This is necessary in order that persons who are voluntarily in an institution for observation and who are not being detained there will have a place at which to vote. At present, persons who are in this category are eligible to be registered as voters and to vote under the Act.

The definition of spoiled ballot is being included in the Act. This expression was not defined and a definition is necessary, and included. Sub-section (iii) of Section 2 of the Bill is replaced in order to update the names of the constituency in respect of which part 2 of the Act applies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the deletion of sub-section (ii) of Section 6 is to eliminate the maximum age of 65 for a person holding office as the Returning Officer. The amendment to sub-section (ii) of Section 65 will bring the closing hours of voting in line with the general voting hours. Section 85 is a consequential change to the Act.

Throughout the Act, 'cancelled ballots' are being changed to be referred to as 'rejected ballots'. This Section is self-explanatory and provides for the voting by mail of persons who are unable, because of physical disability, to attend in person to vote at a polling place or an advanced poll on polling day.

The amendment proposed to Section 90 will bring the closing of voting hours in line with the general voting hours.

The amendment to Section 92 is the subsequential amendment being provided throughout the Act to substitute the word 'rejected' for the word 'cancelled'.

New Section 101(a) is self-explanatory and provides the same procedure for voting by a person who is bedridden in a geriatric centre, as a person who is bedridden in a hospital.

The amendments proposed to Sections 106 and 107 and 130 are consequential changes changing cancelled ballots to rejected ballots, again, being consistent with the amendment throughout.

Clauses (a), (b) and (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 201, presently reads as follows:

> (a) all expenditures made or liabilities incurred during an election for the purpose of promoting or opposing,

directly or indirectly, a particularly recognized political party or the election of a particular candidate or person elected to become a candidate;

(b) all amounts paid or liabilities incurred before an election for literature, posters or other materials or devices of an advertising nature used during an election;

(c) the salary or other remuneration paid, or agreed to be paid to a candidate while he is a candidate, by his business manager or by a recognized political party.

The new clauses will provide that the expenditures or amounts being paid or incurred under clauses (a) and (c) are those which are paid or incurred after the Act comes into force. Whereas, the expenditures and liabilities contemplated by clause (b) will be those expenditures for election materials whenever made or incurred; for materials used after the clause comes into force.

Now, Mr. Speaker, clause (c) of sub-section (ii) of Section 201 of the Act, I think, is self-explanatory. Presenting this clause reads as follows:

(c) the necessary cost of holding a convention in a constituency for the selection of a candidate, including reasonable expenditures of a candidate's nominative convention, the cost of renting halls, the convening of delegates, but not including the cost of any publicity of the convention, and all necessary costs of holding the convention shall not exceed $500.

Present clause (e) of sub-section (ii) of Section 201 of the Act reads as follows:

(e) the transportation costs of any person, other than the candidate, paid out of his own money, where the person has not received or is not entitled to reimbursement for the costs.

Proposed new clauses (e) and (e-A) are self-explanatory, as a result of the amendments necessary there.

The amendment proposed to sub-section (i) of Section 201(b) is consequential upon the new proposed sub-section (i)(a) to this Section of the Act. New sub-section (i)(a) defines when a candidate incurs election expenses for the purpose of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, present sub-section (ii) and (iii) of Section 201(b) are as follows. These are the Sections which deal with the maximum allowable expenditures by candidates. Now, roughly, this works out to about $6,500 per candidate. The proposed amendment is in substitution of sub-sections (ii) and (iii) and it will raise the maximum ceiling for election expense that may be incurred by a candidate to a minimum of $10,000, or $1 per voter, for each voter on the voter's list, for those constituencies which lie south of the dividing line set out in Section 14 of the Act, whichever is the greater. With respect to the constituencies lying north of the dividing line, the maximum amount of $15,000 reimbursement, or the sum obtained when the number of names on the voter's list for that constituency is multiplied by $2, whichever is the greater. In

effect the ceilings for the south are raised to a minimum of $10,000, to the north to a minimum of $15,000.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by sub-section (i) of Section 16 of the Bill is to provide that the return for the candidate's expenses shall be submitted within three months after a candidate has been declared elected, rather than the present two month requirement. This is obviously needed in order to give more time to the candidates to file their returns.

New proposed sub-sections 2(a) and 3(a) are consequential upon Sections 201(e) and 201(g) inclusive. In the case where a person makes a contribution in respect of several candidates who have entered into an agreement under new 201(e), (this is basically the metro in Regina and Saskatoon operation, but not only there, but that's basically what it is designed to deal with), where an agreement has been entered into and that person gives a contribution he may give that contribution to the business manager of one of the candidates who is a party to that agreement. The business manager shall include in the return that he is the business manager for a particular candidate and he also must state in the return the name of the contributor, the amount contributed and the amount allocated by the contributor to each of the candidates for whom the contribution is made. This is the metro contribution — one donation to be divided equally among all the candidates. He must reveal the name, the address, the amount contributed and the amount that is to be paid to each of the candidates in question.

Proposed sub-section (iii)(a) states that where election expenses are paid by the business manager of one of the candidates who have entered into an agreement or arrangement under Section 201(e), the business manager who makes payment of election expenses shall send copies of the receipt he receives in respect of the expense to each of the other business managers of the candidates in respect to whom the payment was made. Copies of those receipts when submitted by the business managers of the other candidates shall be sufficient for the purposes of Section 3 of the sub-section of the Act.

The amendment to Section 201(d) of the Act will provide that when taking into account the election expenses of a candidate for the purposes of calculating reimbursement those election expenses which are being disputed by the candidate or his business manager or expenses for which the payment is refused by the candidate or his business manager will not be considered.

The amendment proposed by the insertion of new clause (b) of sub-section (i) of Section 201(d) is to provide that the Chief Electoral Officer shall forward to the business manager of the candidate or to the designate of the business manager the amount of reimbursement to which the candidate is entitled. This is obviously the case since we are all running on sort of associations or constituency associations, the reimbursement should come back to the business manager, hopefully the representative of that association rather than directly to the candidate.

Proposed new sub-section (iii) of 201(d), I think, is self-explanatory.

Sections 201(e) to 201(h), Mr. Speaker, is self-explanatory but important. These are the provisions which relate to the metro operation. As I have indicated, these sections allow

two or more, but not more than ten candidates to agree in writing to share expenses among themselves for a regional operation. We know that in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina, primarily, but not exclusively, thee is a regional arrangement and a pooling of funds, particularly with respect to the question of television, radio, newspaper advertising and 201(e) to 201(h) recognize the metro concept in the legislation.

Section 202 has been redrawn and I don't believe is of any real major consequence.

There are some amendments with respect to the form which is required to be filed at the time that a recognized political party seeks to become recognized in order to be recognized for expenditures. This is set out in Section 202(b), sub-section (ii) at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I won't elaborate on the various points of the metro. I think these can be outlined in more detail really, clause by clause where the specific questions can be put. I think we can elaborate on it in that regard.

With respect to 202(j), Mr. Speaker, the remaining proposals for amendment to Section 202(j) result as a consequence of a candidate or an official agent from being prohibited from receiving contributions or making payment of election expenses. Sections 202(l) to 202(n) are, again, basically not major in their scope.

The amendments proposed to Sections 26 to 31 of the printed Bill are consequential upon the renaming of the constituencies north of the dividing line as set out in Section 14 of The Constituency Boundaries Commission Act.

Mr. Speaker, those are all very technical notes by way of the second reading. But basically the principles of this Bill, I would describe as being three-fold. The first principle of the Bill is to recognize the mail-in ballot for the physically handicapped person, this will be a first for the Province of Saskatchewan to allow a mailed-in vote for the physically handicapped. Provision here is basically unchanged from Bill 22 which was withdrawn earlier.

The second amendment deals with the ceilings for the recognized political party at the provincial level and the individual candidates in their individual constituencies. The amendments there will allow a provincial party to spend $175,000 rather than $125,000 as is presently set out in the Bill. And for the candidates in the south there will be a minimum of $10,000, while for the candidates in the north there will be a minimum of $15,000 as an allowable ceiling. It is a minimum because the maximum could be higher if there are more voters equalling more than $10,000. So, it's a minimum expenditure of $10,000 and perhaps a little higher.

The third feature of this Bill relates to the establishment and the recognition of the metro concept and will allow for a mechanism without it being too bureaucratic for the operation of metros and I think this can be explained in Committee.

The fourth aspect of the Bill deals with basic, minor housekeeping changes, word changes, consequential changes as a

result of some loopholes in the legislation. It's basically the same as Bill No. 24.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to say very much more. I think that the Members on all sides know each other's positions in respect to The Election Act. I support this Bill and this amendment because it does, I think, seek, albeit with a lot of difficulty and some possible loopholes in it, it does seek to do two very necessary electoral reforms.

1. Put a ceiling on expenditures.

2. To compel revelation of sources of campaign funds for all candidates.

And I think if those two provisions of the Bill are indeed accepted and are indeed workable, we'll have made a pretty good step forward in the area of election reform.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about this Bill and then adjourn debate on it because I think it is rather apparent that from the Attorney General's remarks that you're going to need a squadron of Philadelphia lawyers to try and interpret just what the Bill means. I noticed the Attorney General very carefully read from the prepared statement in introducing the Bill and I suspect that he doesn't know what all the implications of the Bill are. I certainly don't and I don't think probably anybody does.

There are some comments I'd like to make. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has indicated that there is a minimum of $10,000 to be spent in any individual campaign but it's clear from the notes that were handed out with the Bill that this is a maximum of $10,000. I will just read the notes:

> Will provide a maximum of election expenses that may be incurred of $10,000 or one dollar per voter for each voter whichever is the less.

It is my understanding of it so it the maximum that can be spent is $10,000 . . .

Mr. Romanow: — That's wrong. I think $10,000 or one dollar per voter, whichever is the greater but that's all.

Mr. Malone: — All right. The next comment I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to the voting procedure by handicapped people. When this Bill was originally on the Order Paper I think we made our position quite clear that we agreed with this procedure and I don't think we will be changing our position at this time. However, I still would like to make the comment again that I made earlier that there should be some provision in the Bill so that agents or representatives of the candidates in an election are advised as to who are the people that applied for vote by mail so that if there is a challenge of the eligibility of these people to vote, it can be made before the vote is cast. As the Bill presently stands I believe there is no way the vote can be challenged if it should

turn out that the voter is ineligible for one reason, that is not old enough, not a citizen, so on and so forth. This not asking for anything that isn't already there for people who vote at the polls because the agents of each candidate have the right to make the challenge at that time. Now, all we are asking for is that this same right be extended to people who vote by mail and this, I'm sure, would end any possibility of any abuse of this process. However, for reasons known only to the Members opposite, this change was not made.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to address most of my remarks to the other more important provisions of the Bill or more serious provisions, I suppose, as politicians are concerned. I think the amendments as to spending limitations are a classic example of the hypocrisy of the Members opposite. You know, you remember the speeches made by the Attorney General and Members opposite when they first brought this Bill in approximately one year ago. They went on and on about saying how this was certainly enough money to be spent in any election campaign, $125,000 was more than any party needed to get their platform across, that $6,500 would be more than enough to run any provincial, separate campaign. You know, the reason they did that, Mr. Speaker, if they felt that with their millions of dollars they have spent on political propaganda through their various departments, with their paid employees who do nothing but work on political campaigns as they come up through the country, that if they could gag the Opposition just a little more, just a little more, that their position would be secure with the voters if the Liberal party and other parties could not get their messages across. And I think they've had a surprise. They've found out that when they've gone back to their constituencies and when they've gone back to their people they find that they are going to have to do some more advertising, and that they're going to have to spend some more if they're going to get their message across. So the only reason, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments, in my view are put forward to this House, is that the NDP feels that they require more money to run their political campaign, that the NDP feel that it is advisable for them to spend more money and that's the only reason that these amendments are before you. It has nothing to do with what is reasonable, what should be spent on the political campaign, but what they feel should be spent, not what the people of Saskatchewan feel should be spent, not what the other political parties feel should be spent, but what they feel and that's the upshot of it.

Now, I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, about some civil servants or so called civil servants who are on the payroll of the Government to do nothing other than really campaign politically and I think it may be of interest to bring forward to this House the salaries that have been paid to these people. And I'd just like to name a couple of them. There's Mr. Coulter whom we've heard a lot about and I always can remember last year when Mr. Coulter was off campaigning somewhere, I'm not sure whether it was in the Lakeview by-election or Nova Scotia but he's attached to the Premier's office and he plays such a valuable role in assisting the Premier that when the Premier was asked in this House as to what he did, he didn't know. I can well remember the Leader of the Opposition asking the Premier what Mr. Coulter did in his office and the Premier, and you have to give him credit for his honesty, stood up and he said, well, I don't know what he does. I understand he's in

my office so I'll ascertain what he does. He came back a day or so later, the Premier, and said, well I found out what Mr. Coulter does in my office and I think his words were that he opens the mail and he didn't go beyond that. I think he changed it to say, no, he doesn't just open the mail, he handles the mail. I suppose he not only opens it but he closes it at night and sends it out as well. We've had no further details as to what Mr. Coulter does. For this valuable service he was paid, according to the figures that I have, a yearly salary of $17,000, or at least that was his rate in October of 1974. You multiply that by four and that's a substantial amount of money, Mr. Speaker, in fact, it's almost, in fact, it's more than half of what the NDP are going to allow the Liberal party and the other parties in this province to spend on their entire campaign in the next election. That's for one civil servant who does nothing else but campaign where NDP parties are involved in elections. That's one man.

Mr. Burton is another one. Now, Mr. Burton has some other titles, he has special projects which I suspect are writing speeches for the backbenchers of the NDP. Mr. Burton is an ex-MP where he, I am told, did a good job representing his people, but apparently not good enough for the people in the Regina East seat because they defeated him not only once but twice, but he's still on the payroll. We don't know what he does except we know that he, also, campaigns whenever there's an election called in Canada and he's paid $26,000 a year, at least as of October, 1974. Between Mr. Burton and Mr. Coulter, I believe they receive more money from the Government of Saskatchewan which is really from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan than the NDP party has allowed the Opposition party or other political parties to spend on an entire election campaign. When I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP is trying to gag the Opposition, is trying to gag the opposition parties, we suggest to you that that is the case when one considers these figures. We can go through all sorts of other people. I see some familiar names, Mr. Cam Cooper, Mr. Clare Powell. I'm not quite sure what they do but I do know that they're on the Regina Metro Committee of the NDP and one can only speculate as to how much time they spend on that Committee and doing political work and how much time they spend doing work for people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I just raised those two points to you because I think they should be brought out and I think the people of Saskatchewan should be aware of just how much the NDP spends, how much money of the people of Saskatchewan they spend on people who are nothing more than political organizers.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I want to repeat my remarks about the limitation or the disclosure provision on political donations. Once again the NDP, in its wisdom, has decided that any donation over $100 must be disclosed. I'm not against the disclosure rule, I think it is a very good thing, in fact I find myself with some sympathy to the Bill that was brought in by the Member for Saskatoon University as to disclosure by political candidates of their holdings, but I say that the $100 limit is too low. I think that even the Attorney General would agree, that this disclosure provision is an infringement on basic rights, that is, the right to support a political party of your choice in the manner of your choice. $100 in this day and age is not very much. I think that there are many people who would be prepared to donate both to the party

opposite and to this party and to other parties if they found that they didn't have to make their names public. I think they should have the right to make those donations to both parties and to the Conservative party and even to the Member for Saskatoon University but I think that this could easily be solved if the limitation of disclosure was raised to $200 or $250. I don't think there is a politician in the country who would feel himself obliged to a supporter if he received a donation of $200. I don't think that anybody sells himself out if they accept a donation of this amount. Now, once again the NDP, in its wisdom, has decided that $100 is the limit and that's all.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things in this Bill that I'm sure need other scrutiny. I'd like to consider the remarks of the Attorney General. There are a number of other Members on this side who I know want to speak to the Bill at a later date so I would ask leave at this time to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:17 o'clock p.m.