

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**35th Day**

**Friday, April 30, 1976.**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTIONS**

**Nurses' Strike — Shutdown of Hospitals in Regina**

**Mr. E. C. Malone** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. If you will just bear with me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I have to make a little bit of a preamble.

According to a news report that I heard this morning the Regina and District Medical Society met last night and came to the conclusion that if the nurses' strike continued for much longer it would become necessary to shut down the hospitals in the city of Regina, which the Minister is well aware, serves not only Regina but southern Saskatchewan. This is potentially, I think the Minister would agree, a critical type of situation if it did arise and would be very detrimental to the health care in at least the southern part of Saskatchewan.

In view of this, Mr. Minister, my question to you is: are you now prepared to reassess the situation and advise the Saskatchewan Hospital Association that you are prepared to advance them further money to allow the nurses to obtain the 2 per cent increase that they are seeking, which I think, we all agree is a legitimate increase for them when you consider other settlements that have been made in other labor areas that are controlled by the Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W. A. Robbins** (Minister of Health): — The negotiation process occurs between the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and the SUN Organization which represents the nurses. We are very hopeful, of course, that they will get back to the negotiating table immediately. We realize that the situation is difficult. We are hopeful that that process will materialize very shortly.

**Mr. Malone:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I think we can all appreciate the reluctance of any government to interface in the collective bargaining process, but may I point out to the Minister and ask him whether he would not agree that the situation that is arising now is somewhat unusual and somewhat unique, because the result of what is happening is that conceivably we could have all of the hospitals except three in Saskatchewan shut down. Those three being in Saskatoon.

Is the Government at this stage prepared to intervene, and I say it would not be improper for them to intervene, to get the nurses back to work and let them get a salary that is decent and allow them to perform their functions that they want to perform?

**Mr. Robbins:** — My understanding is that the difference is not so much money but the percentage differential between pay scales between nurses and certified nursing aides. As I said before I am very hopeful that they will get back to the negotiation table.

**Mr. C. P. MacDonald** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister tell me I also heard a news reporter of the city of Saskatoon, is it not a fact that emergency or situations for serious operations, even not quite as serious, now must be flown out of the province to other provinces to Alberta and Manitoba. Is this a fact in the city of Regina? Could the Minister also indicate what is the situation generally across the province, if this nurses' strike continues, what will be the situation; will people who have serious illnesses be forced to leave the province?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Dr. Baergen, the head of the Saskatchewan Medical Association has said that emergency cases are being looked after. We have made some contingency plans in terms of air ambulance to take patients out of the province if necessary. This is related basically to the children in the neonatal unit at the University Hospital in Saskatoon.

### **Two Separate Cuts of Hospital Services**

**Mr. E. F. A. Merchant** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. Though some figures are questioned about, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will bear with me.

Would the Minister of Health agree that there were cuts in February followed by cuts announced in this House which were forwarded to the Hospital Administrators on the 5th of April, and that the accumulative cuts in the funds to hospitals — for instance, if the City Hospital in Saskatoon amounted to 11.7 per cent, the University Hospital in Saskatoon 9 per cent, other hospitals 8 or 9 per cent around the province — is it a fact Mr. Minister that there were two separate cuts of hospital expenses? One in February which was pre-budget and the uniform 5 per cent cut, which was announced through the hospitals by a letter which you forwarded on the 5th of April.

**Mr. Robbins:** — The 5 per cent cut relates to patient days. The average for Saskatchewan is 1,916 patient days per 1,000; the average for Canada is 1,516 per 1,000.

If you had a 5 per cent reduction on patient days in the Province of Saskatchewan we would still be some 320 patient days per 1,000 population above the Canadian average.

There have been no further cuts announced. The negotiations are carried out through the Saskatchewan Hospital Plan with the various hospital administrations.

**Mr. Merchant:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact that in February the Government told the City Hospital, as an example,

to cut 40,000 hours and 20 employees which amounted to a 6.7 per cent cut, which was then followed in April with a further 5 per cent cut? Is it a fact that in dealing with that specific hospital — and as I say I have figures for other hospitals — that the accumulative effect of the February cut and the April cut, which is to take effect on the 1st of July was 11.7 per cent in staff for that hospital and 70,000 hours from the City Hospital, a quarter of a million hours accumulatively for the University Hospital, for instance?

**Mr. Robbins:** — As I attempted, Mr. Speaker, to tell the Member before, the Budget was drawn on the basis of some restraints in terms of health costs. The Member keeps talking about cuts, the amount of money allocated through SHSP to the hospitals of this province is \$27 million higher than it was one year ago. That is a peculiar cut. The fact of the matter is we must get some restraints in terms of health care cost spending. This is something that is not peculiar to this province, it is prevalent across the country. And it is evident. I attended a health conference recently in Ottawa and it is clearly evident that every province has the same difficulty.

**Mr. Merchant:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact, Mr. Minister that in the city of Saskatoon alone there is a cut of 360,000 hours of patient care, in the city of Saskatoon alone, for this year?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Next question.

### Comparison of Patient Days

**Mr. R. L. Collver** (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, with reference to the answers that he provided to the previous question, is the Minister not aware that in the Province of Saskatchewan there is a considerably higher ratio relationship of senior citizens to overall population than there are in other areas in Canada and that, therefore, a comparison of the patient days in Saskatchewan, in hospitals, is not really equivalent to patient days in other areas of Canada?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Yes, I am aware that the proportion of people in Saskatchewan over age 65 is larger than in other provinces. It is very little greater than in Manitoba, for example, and yet the number of patient days in the city Winnipeg is 18 per cent below that in Regina and Saskatoon.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, again in the field of health and hospitals. Would the Minister not agree that Saskatchewan is somewhat of a unique position in that sort of two categories of hospitals — the ones in the city and the ones in the country and that when you make an across-the-board cut, that the hospitals in the city suffer to a degree much harsher and to a much greater extent than the hospitals that are located in the country?

**Mr. Robbins:** — I suppose to some degree that is true.

**Mr. Malone:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. So when you say that there is an national increase in the budget, but that increase would

be spread around the whole province. And what you really need, would you not agree, is to have a more selective way of increasing the budget so that those hospitals in Regina and Saskatoon which do the bulk of the serious work, would be treated differently than those hospitals in the country, which are used in many cases as, perhaps, old folks homes and secondly, as a referral system to the hospitals in the cities?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the differences are taken into consideration and when the SHSP people talk to the different administrations of hospitals they do take that into consideration.

### **Two Separate Cuts of Hospital Services**

**Mr. Merchant:** — A question to the Minister of Health. Did you, Mr. Minister, on the 5th of April, direct to the chairman and chief executive officers of all hospitals in this province a letter which included these words:

The Government has decided that there will be a general reduction of 5 per cent in the approved number of patient days for all hospitals effective July 1, 1976. SHSP will be able to advise you on how this decision will affect your loss in terms of approved patient days associated and staffing and expenditure levels in approximately three to four weeks.

And of that, Mr. Minister, is it correct to say that you have not as yet advised the hospitals of the staffing cuts which will follow from this letter and that the staffing cuts of which we all had notice in February and March are different from the staffing cuts referred to in this letter of April 5, and 5 per cent staff cut for July 1?

**Mr. Robbins:** — SHSP officials will be discussing and are in the process of discussing with all the various hospital administrations the staffing problems related to that particular approach, that's true. In some instances it could mean some additional lay-offs and that's regrettable we realize that. But again I point out to the Members of this House that when we have a health budget that goes up by \$46 million over the preceding year there must be some way of getting some reasoned control on the escalating costs. I repeat again that this is just not something that is occurring in this province, much more severe restrictions are being applied in Ontario where they have a Conservative Government in Alberta and in British Columbia.

Incidentally, yesterday when I was asked a question, Mr. Speaker, I believe by the Member for Wascana, with respect to whether or not health premium charges will be put back into effect, I would like to point out that in every one of those provinces they have very high health premiums, \$228 per family in Ontario, \$225 per family in British Columbia, \$150 per family in Alberta. You don't know when you are well off.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister could you simply tell us whether it is a fact that there were two separate budgeting requirements which amounted to staff cuts, one in February and a further 5 per cent to come into effect on July 1?

And is it not a fact that the cumulative effect is a minimum of 8 per cent in some hospitals, up to 12 per cent in some hospitals, 11.7 for instance in the city?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

### **Three-Year Teacher Training Program**

**Mr. W. H. Stodalka** (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister of Education. I read with interest the other day your change in the teacher training program from a two-year program to a three-year program. Before you embarked on this particular program did you consider the effect that it might have on the supply of teachers in the next two or three years while the program is initially being phased in?

**Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski** (Minister of Education): — Yes, the program in changes of teacher education that we are considering now certainly has considered that. In doing that we have discussed it with all of those people who are involved in education including the trustees, the teachers and the universities in the Colleges of Education. That is one of the reasons why the proposal which we are putting forward, and it is only one of the reasons, has within it a proposal of phasing in the training program over a period of three years.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Are you saying then that you expect the phase in of this particular program will have no effect on the supply of teachers then in the next two or three years?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Oh, there may very well be some effect, not a great effect, the effect will be minimal because it happens to be the case that a large majority of the teachers who are in Teachers' Colleges now are in fact taking three years training, much greater than there were two or three or four years ago. So the effect, although there will be some, we anticipate will be very minimal.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of teachers in Saskatchewan now who have permanent certificates based on one year of training and based on two years of training. Will these permanent certificates be protected or will the people who hold these certificates be expected to go back and get more education and upgrade themselves.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Teachers will always take in summer classes and other classes throughout their careers in order to be able to upgrade themselves. Their positions certainly are going to be protected but I anticipate that many of them will as they would have anyway gone to take further classes to upgrade their classifications.

### **Adult Education Instructions Fired**

**Mr. J. A. Penner** (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Continuing Education that I directed yesterday in your absence to the

Attorney General and he was unable to reply to it. Would you explain to the House why it is that something in the order of 60 instructors at Kelsey, Wascana and Moose Jaw have been fired effective the end of the term?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I think the figure the Member mentions is a little exaggerated. There are certainly some dislocations taking place, one because of transfer of some programs such as the basic skills and training to the Community Colleges. Some of those instructors no doubt will be hired by the Community Colleges. Also within the Technical Institutes there are some courses which are set up for which there is really very little demand for and some changes are also taking place there. So yes, there will be some displacement of employees but in a time of restraint we have to look very carefully at the program offerings and adjust accordingly.

**Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister not agree in fact the reason was not a matter of restraint at all, a matter of instead — and I would like the Minister to comment — a matter instead of transferring from one institution to the Community Colleges?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Partly, yes, but there is some restraint worked into that because the delivery of the programs for Community Colleges will be probably less expensive, we, of course, are quite confident of that. But at the same time it is also an extension of an improvement of the service because through the Community Colleges there will be a far better accessibility throughout the province, in the communities, to everyone in the communities who has a need to take some of those courses.

**Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I think that that is a matter of opinion and I certainly don't necessarily agree. I suspect that what the Minister is doing is empire building in Community Colleges. The Minister hasn't answered my initial question of how many people have been displaced; and (b) has there been a guarantee given to those people that they are automatically then going to be hired by the Community Colleges?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The Community Colleges have indicated and I have spoken to some of them personally to find out what their intentions are and they have indicated that, yes, they are looking for people who are qualified, people who have experience because they are interested in the delivery of quality programs and so certainly they will be looking at the instructors who will be now available in the province and have got that experience.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

### **Highway Fatalities Related to Speeding**

**Mr. R. H. Bailey** (Rosetown-Elrose): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Recently the Minister made a statement to the press related to speed limits and the highway fatalities related to those speed limits in the province. There seems to be some confusion and I am wondering if I can have the Minister repeat the statement he made related to the number of fatalities that

are directly related to excessive speeding in the province. Could he make that statement in this House?

**Hon. E. Kramer** (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult sometimes to reply to press reports but if you are referring to a statement that I have made regarding the incidence of highway accidents in the Province of Saskatchewan, 55 per cent of the accidents occur in urban areas; about 19 per cent on the provincial highway system, the balance on the municipal road system. So, if that was relating to what I was saying about speed limits, with regard to a reduction in speed limits, then it would follow, would only affect 19 per cent of the accidents. I think I made that statement with regard to the use of seat belts. The use of seat belts would embrace every car driver anywhere in Saskatchewan if they use their seat belts — I am trying to answer the question as best I can, Mr. Speaker, I can't take part of what I have said out of context because one is related to the other. If you are going to place priorities on saving lives I am saying that certainly the reduction of speed limits is far less meaningful than the compulsory use or the total use of seat belts by everyone. That includes the cities and that's where the traffic fatalities and the majority of the accidents are occurring. Saskatoon has an ever increasing and the highest rate in Saskatchewan, possibly one of the highest in Canada and they have a 30 mile an hour speed limit, a 10 miles an hour speed limit, some of them 15 in some areas such as school zones.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Highways.

I would like him to answer this question for me. Would the Minister not agree that the statistics in every state in the United States shows a phenomenal reduction in the number of highways fatalities when the speed limit was reduced?

**Mr. Kramer:** — No, I would not. I don't think those statistics will really stand up. Our people are looking at the question very carefully, they are not impressed with the United States figures, they are mainly some apple and orange sort of comparisons. I can give you one example that we have, and that is, British Columbia reduced their speed limit last year with a tremendous amount of publicity. I think it was a good thing for BC to reduce it, because at 55 or 50 mile an hour in BC it is less safe than 65 in Saskatchewan. They had a 17 per cent reduction in their accidents on highways, while Saskatchewan enjoyed a 15 per cent reduction last year without a reduction of speed limits.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The statistics the Minister has given are somewhat different than that given by the Minister in charge of SGIO. I would just like to make one final supplementary. Would the Minister of Highways not agree that between the present time (April 30) and the time the session resumes this fall, that they look at a total safety package for the people of Saskatchewan which may well include a reduction of speed limits?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Certainly we are considering those things. Now as you know in Ontario, they have brought in both the compulsory seat belt legislation and the speed limits. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see us go first with one or the other, because all the sidewalk superintendents and experts will say in Ontario, if they don't like seat belts they'll say it's because you reduced the speed limits that they are saving lives. The fact of the matter is that in Ontario, regardless whether it is speed or seat belts, the doctors are now complaining because they haven't got enough new kidney transplants in order to carry on their work with people who have faulty kidneys . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I think we have enough people here that can give us enough advice on kidney transplants without the Minister of Highways getting into . . .

### **Premier's Vote on Liquor Amendments**

**Mr. Malone:** — I should like to direct a question to the Premier. I understand, Mr. Premier, that it is highly unlikely today that we will have an opportunity to vote on the two liquor Act amendments that are before the House. We are of course aware that you will be leaving us on Sunday to go to China. I am wondering if you would be prepared at this time to let us know what your feelings are about these bills, that is, whether you will be voting in favor of them or against them? As leader of the Government, your opinion will have a very great influence on all Members of the House as to what you are going to do?

**Hon. A. E. Blakeney (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I have been standing by ready to cast my vote on this. I was here on the Tuesday, and here today, we posted a notice in our lounge, indicating that there probably would be a vote today. I was hoping that I would be here the last of the debate, so that I would be able thereby to make up my mind. I think it would be inappropriate in question period to have a roll call because obviously we would want to ask you your position as well.

### **Contingency Plans for Hospitals**

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Minister what contingency plan does the Government have in the event that the three Regina hospitals are forced to close down? As I understand the situation, this will leave only three hospitals open in Saskatchewan, those that are open in Saskatoon. I further understand that the University Hospital in Saskatoon will have great difficulty in continuing its operation if the strike continues for much longer. Do you have any contingency plans and what are they?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, I know we have some contingency plans available with respect to flying patients who require emergency treatment or people who are in a difficult situation, to hospitals in Edmonton and Winnipeg. I can't give you any other information with respect to other contingency plans at the moment, but if there are others available, I will get them for you.



**Mr. Malone:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Health not agree with me then that if this situation should arise — I know it is a hypothetical question, but it is looking more and more like a fact that it will come about — the Government will then have a duty to intervene in the collective bargaining that is going on right now, with a view to getting them settled as quickly as possible, so that we can get back to normal health care in the Province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is a hypothetical question and therefore can't be answered on that basis.

### **Pollution Control for Coal Fired Plant**

**Mr. Larter:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Has the Minister given the Governments of North Dakota and Montana assurances that there will be no ill effects on the environment or pollution from the new projected coal fired generating plant at Coronach?

**Hon. J. R. Messer** (Minister of Saskatchewan Power Corporation): — Both the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Department of the Environment have given to the Government of North Dakota and Montana assurances that there will be no ill effects, I believe that government officials understood and agreed that there should not be, if the controls and conditions of the agreement were met, any ill effects south of the border. Unfortunately that has not been conveyed to the people of North Dakota and Montana. It has been brought to the attention of the government officials, the Governors of both states, by my colleague the Minister of Environment that there appears to be a problem developing because of the poor conveyance of information to the general public south of the border. I hope that since the Minister has informed the Governors of both North Dakota and Montana that they will undertake to see that this information is in fact distributed to the general public who are concerned about the development in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Larter:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To re-affirm what you have stated that reliable sources reported, and my concern is, the reliable source reported as late as April 19 that Daniels County in which Scobey is a county seat are expecting water pollution from the Coronach area, 16 miles north of Scobey. I wonder if you could reassure this House by writing the Governors of these states assuring them that there was indeed no pollution going to be forthcoming from these plants?

**Hon. N. E. Byers** (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that question on behalf of the Government. With respect to Coronach there are four major issues that the Government of Saskatchewan has endeavored to sort out. May I say with respect to water quality, as a result of the group set up to deal with this question, they have recommended and the Governments have accepted and they have implemented a water quality monitoring network that will record any significant change in water quality that may occur in the

future. That all water quality information with respect to this project has been collected since 1973 in Saskatchewan and has been made known to the United States and to the Montana officials. This I think is the key point. Saskatchewan has given a commitment to undertake a number of what is called predictive studies of future water quality and we have also given the commitment of corrective measures that might be taken.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . that's not . . .

**Mr. Byers:** — I am responding to a question and this is a question not only of provincial importance but of federal-provincial importance and of international importance.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Byers:** — I am responding to the Hon. Member's question on a matter that has been fogged and clouded by the Opposition that has required us to make a statement to correct some of this confusion, and I don't think all of it has originated south of the border.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Byers:** — We will undertake these predictive studies with respect to future water quality. Insofar as our negotiations through Canada with the State of Montana, this has been acceptable. May I say to the Hon. Member and to all Members of the House, with respect to the apportionment report by the International Joint Commission, just released, and there will be information meetings on May 5 in Scobey and on May 6 in Coronach, and I would invite some of the Hon. Members to attend those information meetings to get some information on this question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

## **POINT OF ORDER**

### **Minister of Environment Out of Order**

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Before the Orders of the Day, I should like to raise a Point of Order.

I'd like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition takes exception to the out of order response of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Byers) and I would like to know why you did not call him to order?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member makes the assumption that I thought he was out of order. I didn't think the Minister of Environment was out of order. The question he was asked appeared to be the question he was attempting to answer. He had several interruptions during the time that he was giving the answer. The comments he seemed to be making dealt with the issue and I think the record will show that.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **MOTION FOR RETURN**

#### **Return No. 60**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. F. A. Merchant (Regina Wascana) for Return No. 60 showing:

(1) The number of applications that have been made to the Liquor Licensing Commission for a liquor licence of any sort since 1970. (2) The number of applications that have been made with the assistance of lawyers appearing or on record. (3) The names of the law firms of record on behalf of the applicants where known. (4) The result of the various applications where lawyers were on record by specific case. (5) The date of the final disposition of the respective applications.

**Mr. N. E. Byers** (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I want to provide the Hon. Member and Members of the Opposition with information relating to this subject. However, I feel that we should be providing the Hon. Member with more information than he has requested. I appreciate his own personal commitment to mild restraint but I do not think that the additional information we will provide will strain the resources of the province substantially. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment seconded by the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) that:

Order for Return No. 60 be amended by deleting the numerals 1970 in line one thereof and substituting therefor, April 1, 1964.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **Resolution No. 12 — Borrowing Money for the Acquisition of Potash Mines**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. S. J. Cameron (Regina South):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to borrow money for the acquisition of potash mines solely on the security of the mines purchased or expropriated so that in the event financial difficulties are encountered the general revenues of the Province and hence the medical care and hospital plans, education, highways, agricultural and other programs are not exposed to the financial risks incurred in acquiring potash mines.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

## YEAS — 10

Steuart  
Stodalka  
Wiebe  
Malone

MacDonald  
Penner  
Cameron

Clifford  
Anderson  
Merchant

## NAYS — 31

Blakeney  
Pepper  
Thibault  
Bowerman  
Smishek  
Romanow  
Messer  
Snyder  
Byers  
Kramer

Faris  
Kowalchuk  
Robbins  
MacMurchy  
Mostoway  
Larson  
Whelan  
Kaeding  
Dyck  
McNeill

Feschuk  
Rolfes  
Cowley  
Tchorzewski  
Skoberg  
Vickar  
Nelson  
(Yorkton)  
Allen  
Koskie  
Johnson  
Banda

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. R. Katzman that Bill No. 42 — **An Act to amend The Litter Control Act, 1973, (No. 2)** — be now read a second time.

**Hon. N. E. Byers** (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I could support what appears to be the objectives of this Bill, namely resource conservation and litter reduction. However, I do not agree that the proposed amendment would provide an effective means of conserving resources. Furthermore our surveys show that liquor and wine bottles are not a particularly serious source of litter. Well, the surveys show that they are mainly disposed of, mainly through the municipal garbage collection system. Now the effect of the amendment would be to require the Department of Environment to approve all liquor containers before use. It would also become possible, but, not mandatory to establish refund rates and other terms and conditions for the return of such containers to vendors. Now most liquor and wine sold in Saskatchewan is bottled outside of the province. And a program to return liquor and wine bottles to distilleries and wineries for refilling would only work if implemented nationally and if such bottles are standardized.

Unlike beer which comes in a standard bottle, liquor and wine are bottled in containers of a variety of sizes and shapes. And in order to be refilled the bottles would have to be returned to the company from which they had originated. The bottles would have to be sorted and packaged and transported to a large number of destinations, both inside and outside of the country. A returnable system for present types of liquor and wine bottles would be very costly.

Now the cost of paying refunds, sorting and packaging bottles, transporting the bottles back for a refilling would exceed the cost of using new bottles by as much as 50 per cent

or more. When the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) introduced this Bill I asked my officials to contact several distilleries and wineries across the country to request their views on the proposed amendment to The Litter Control Act.

The distilleries and wineries contacted viewed with disfavor a program to require the re-use of liquor and wine bottles. And some of the reasons were:

1. The cost of returning the bottles would require large increases in the price of such products.
2. Better quality bottles than the type now used would be required, and would cost more.
3. Bottle cleaning apparatus would have to be installed and would be very expensive, adding to the price of the product.
4. The distilleries feel that since their products are more expensive than beer, then consumers expect a new unscratched container.

I'm just reporting to the House the results of that survey which indicated the feeling of that industry. It would be more practical to retain the present system.

Now several points should be considered with regard to reducing litter. First, the number of liquor and wine bottles sold is rather small compared to beer and soft drinks — 14 million as compared to 290 million in 1975. Liquor and wine is usually consumed in people's homes, although according to the comments of the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that practice may be not all that common in some parts of the province, and has not been a serious source of litter.

Surveys by the Department of the Environment indicate that such containers constitute only about 2 per cent of the litter along the roads in the urban areas. Now, the re-use of present beer bottles for their original use is impractical. Our department would suggest rather than returning such bottles to distilleries and wineries it would be more fruitful to investigate other means of re-cycling them along with other glass containers such as fruit containers. As I have indicated in earlier debates in the House, during this session, the Government is attaching a very high priority to such investigations at the present time. And while I am prepared to become involved in national or international initiatives toward standardization of spirit bottles and the evolution toward a national system of returnable and refillable spirit bottles, I cannot support the Bill at this time. I cannot support the Bill at this time because liquor and wine bottles are not a major litter problem and because the system the Bill proposes would only change the route by which the present bottles get back to the municipal garbage dumps.

**Mr. R. Katzman** (Rosthern): — I am disappointed to hear that the Government will not be supporting this motion. I guess they are not concerned with the glass in the ditches and their employees who are getting injured quite regularly with the glass as they cut it.

I think the Minister missed one key point. You said two per cent of the litter in the ditches of this type. If they were returnable, as you suggest they be and you were going to

take them in, I think that if you check with the glass plant in Moose Jaw they would be interested in having the used glass. Second of all, there are many people cut and many people injured with this. But, as usual your concern is not for the individual and just yourself. On that note I'm disappointed, but, I'll let it go.

Motion negatived.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Pepper that Bill No. 36 — **An Act to amend The Liquor Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. J. L. Skoberg** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, as I said last Friday, I will be opposing Bill No. 36 and believe there are realistic reasons why this Bill should not be supported at this time.

Again, I repeat, as I did last Friday, that I hope the Liberal caucus are sincere in their desire for a free vote and have not made a caucus decision as is suggested in their newsletter, reading:

The Liberal Members are urging the Government of Saskatchewan to raise the legal drinking age to 19 years from 18 years.

There is no question our caucus is divided on this issue as has been evident in the speeches in this Legislature, and I should like to suggest that some type of questioning on this Bill will also be evident in the Liberal and Conservative caucuses.

When a vote on this Bill is taken, we will all know whether a free vote has been allowed, by the three parties represented in the Saskatchewan Legislature.

I respect the views of those who have put forth their arguments in support of this Bill. I feel they have established their sincerity by their contribution to the debate. However, I believe they are living in an area of idealism and not realism.

On my trip with the CPA in 1971 to Central and East Africa, we had the opportunity of having an audience with President Banda of Malawi. The question of apartheid was discussed with President Banda and he used an example which I consider could be used as an analogy in the issue before us at this time. President Banda said: "It is quite true that realism and idealism can ride on the same train, but they cannot ride in the same compartment."

While his reference was to apartheid policies, the same could be said for the Bill before us at this time. Ideally, we would like to believe the passage of this Bill will come to grips with a situation concerning the consumption of alcohol by 18-year olds. Realism, however, takes over and it should be evident it is not the 18-year olds that should be expected to take the responsibility for an ailment that is plaguing all age groups in our society. As Dr. Banda said, realism and idealism can ride together, but in this issue before us they cannot ride in the same compartment.

I believe the Members supporting this Bill are not using realism in their attempt to resolve, by legislation, that which

they know if not the answer. Yes, we can talk about and pass regulations governing the age of majority for those entitled to be permitted in licensed premises, but do we in the same sense of responsibility exempt these same 18-year olds from all other 'age of majority' regulations and laws we do now have on our Statutes at this time in our history. In one breath we say 18-year olds are not old enough to accept responsibility in the field of alcoholic consumption, while we well know it is not the magical age of 18 years which determines such consumption, but rather the fast moving society we are now living in.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan was only tabled in January of 1973. Certainly an Interim Report was tabled because of the unanimity of the Committee on certain recommendations concerning the age of majority with debate taking place at the 1972 spring session. The Interim Report said a number of things which I think all Members of the House should review. It said:

The Committee is of the opinion that the youth of Saskatchewan have assumed legal and social responsibilities and privileges and, therefore, recommends that the age of majority should be lowered to eighteen years of age.

I am saying here and now, the youth of Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, that have attained the age of 18 years have assumed legal and social responsibilities and privileges just as much as the youth of 1972-73.

I believe this Legislature is doing an injustice to the findings of that 1972 Committee Report and to the 18-year olds that will have a double standard placed upon them if this Bill is passed before us at this time.

I suggest that there are those in our society who are not prepared to accept their rightful responsibility in correcting and acting positively in our schools if abuses are evident in the consumption of alcohol during class hours. I do not believe their responsibility should be passed on to legislatures within such a short trial period that is evident in this case. In fact, has anyone received official written representation from school board or the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation? Has any Member of this Legislature received written official representation from the RCMP, City Police Commission, or Police chiefs, from police associations, from hotel operators or from any of those groups, organizations or individuals that made up the 23 briefs presented to the Committee recommending 18-year old continuity in age of majority responsibility in alcoholic consumption?

Mr. Speaker, in that regard, when I read the speeches that were delivered in this House in March 1972, I noted the then Hon. Member for Milestone made the point before this House that there were 23 briefs submitted from the various police chiefs, made the point that including the RCMP, the city police, hotel operators of the briefs and submissions to the Alcoholic Commission was the fact that it indicated young people in Saskatchewan have reacted to the increased responsibility at a younger age in a very positive manner. Mr. Speaker, in reference to that, I agree with that type of representation by the bodies mentioned by the Hon. Member for Milestone at that time, we in this House should once again ask those same

organizations, we should ask the RCM Police, the city police commissions and those who are directly responsible vested with the authority of enforcing such regulations to appear at least before some committee in order that we will have their opinion and not be hastened into a decision by some type of urgency at this time.

I suggest to this Legislature we are being very irresponsible in proposing this Bill without at least giving the public and those to be affected by any passage of this legislation an opportunity to make representation to a committee such as was done only a few short years ago. I only say we are not being responsible in attempting to change present legislation until a fair time has elapsed to see if other means of supervision, awareness and enforcement cannot be brought about. No one can possibly suggest three to four years has been a sufficient trial period to prove 18-year olds are not acting responsibly and accepting their responsibility in the majority of cases.

It appears to me we are over-reacting to a problem in order to suggest to some people that the Legislature is prepared to pass legislation even though such action will not bring about any noticeable cure. I do not believe any real effort has gone into the recommendations of the Committee when it called for identification cards with pictures and proper controls and enforcement of the laws regarding minors.

I would support a resolution calling for the establishment of a Committee to review the entire liquor laws in the province as it affects all age of majority citizens. However, that is not what is before us at this time.

Therefore, I will not support this Bill which would again place 18-year olds in a double standard position without an opportunity of having their day in court on a charge which affects them for which they cannot defend themselves if this Bill 36 were to pass.

I urge the Members of this Assembly to recognize the rights of these people we are about to adjudicate on and not be hastily drawn into a position of judging the action of the small minority over the responsible majority.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some letters received and I will refer to one that I received just recently from a young group of people. They suggest:

We believe that raising the legal drinking age suggests that certain MLAs do not believe that 18-year olds are responsible, yet if 18-year olds are believed responsible enough to elect a government and fight or defend their country, then they are responsible to drink.

Another letter received from a lady in Moose Jaw and my reply to her:

I find it difficult to believe that increasing the drinking age to 19 years will even begin to solve any problems in this entire area. My concern is that our entire age of majority legislation includes and designates 18-year olds as coming under Federal and Provincial Acts.



My reply was:

For us as legislators to use a double standard in this instance of age of majority in drinking and ignore those other areas does not seem to be fair to me. I believe we cannot pass on our responsibility as parents to those vested with legislative authority, as laws have to be enforced and such enforcement is not possible without the assistance of parents and those engaged in the providing of alcoholic beverages to those entering their premises.

I sincerely am concerned with alcoholic problems in the society, including older than 21-year olds. Somehow it appears to me we are using the 18-year olds as scapegoats in pretending some serious social problems are not the real cause of a fast living society.

Mr. Speaker, as you have gathered from my remarks, I will be opposing this Bill. I had hoped it would come to a vote today. It seemed to me there was a fair representation in the House, and I would at this time urge all Members of the House to support the opposition to this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. E. L. Cowley** (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, the issue which we have been listening to with some debate today and over the past few days, is one which is a sensitive issue in this province at this time. I considered my position in speaking on this Bill and I think from my personal point of view, that one could have found a reason to avoid the debate all together. However, I felt it was my obligation as an elected Member to make my views known and try to explain the rationale behind them. I may say I do it knowing full well that, at least in my constituency, it would be more popular and I suspect politically safer, to avoid the topic or take a position opposite to the one that I hold.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You've got such a majority you can afford to dice around a bit!

**Mr. Cowley:** — Well, we will see next time around.

Speaking on this Bill, I want first of all to identify the issue, Mr. Speaker. The issue isn't whether alcohol is the problem. I think with both young and old individuals it is. The issue isn't whether we should encourage people to drink. I think whether young or old we should not. The issue isn't whether alcohol should be banned, otherwise we would have a Bill before us introducing prohibition. The issue is, very simply, at what age should individuals have legal access to alcohol? To me, this question is tied directly to the question of what the age of majority should be.

Surely the question of when an individual should have legal access to alcohol is tied to the question of when we, as a society, judge that an individual is mature enough to accept the rights and the responsibilities of citizenship. In all matters today we judge that age to be 18, with the exception of driving, which is 16. In this province at the age of 18 one is legally entitled to marry of his own will. There are a great number of social problems I would suggest which stem from

bad marriages and many statistics would suggest that early marriages cause many of those problems, social problems, as alcohol. However, the age of majority for marriage remains 18, under the present legislation.

In this province, at the age of 18, you are entitled to enter into legal and binding contracts. You are, at that age, responsible for debts. There are, Mr. Speaker, some who would suggest that this too is an area in which maturity is very important.

Also in this province a citizen is entitled to take full part in the electoral process at both the national and the provincial level, and I would think that surely all Members of this Assembly would view that as a serious responsibility to place in the hands of an individual. Surely if we recognize that an individual at the age of 18 is capable of being Premier of this province, or Prime Minister of this country, we are saying that we believe he is a mature member of this society.

At age 18 a young Canadian can join the armed forces of this nation, learn the trade of war, among other skills. At age 18 this province will allow a young person to obtain a chauffeur's licence entitling him or her to handle a vehicle weighing many tons, at high speeds for remuneration. At 18 this province and this nation considers a citizen fully responsible for his actions subject to the full weight of law should he or she undertake criminal activities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the position being taken by those supporting this Bill is in my view inconsistent. If we say a person at 18 is old enough to vote, to marry, to sign legal contracts, to go into debt, to be fully responsible for criminal activities he or she may undertake, to join the armed forces, then surely we must, to be consistent, argue that that person is old enough to make decisions dealing with alcohol, or at least be consistent and raise the age of majority in all cases to 19.

I don't claim that the defeat of this Bill in any way answers the problems associated with alcohol. It doesn't. Unfortunately there is no magic arbitrary age at which maturity strikes human beings. There are people at 17 that are mature enough to treat alcohol and other responsibilities seriously and there are many who at 40 are still not emotionally capable of dealing with those things properly.

The argument I hear most often by those promoting this legislation, is that there are a significant number of young people in high schools old enough to drink legally. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that while the numbers were fewer, that was true also when the age was 19 or 21. I can recall the first class I taught in Assiniboia. I just turned 21 years of age and I had one student in my class who was older than I was.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — That was one year ago!

**Mr. Cowley:** — I wish it was! So I don't think that raising the age totally eliminates that particular problem.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a problem with students coming to school having spent some time drinking at some location there are two directions one should look, at

the enforcement in the school system of rules and regulations and at the home.

It seems to me that we continually try to pass off what we see as problems to someone else rather than looking at the source and the way in which the problem could be most effectively dealt with. In this case, generally I believe, in the home.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are statistics which at least on the surface indicate that lowering the drinking age may be resulting in higher incidence of alcoholism and a higher traffic accident rate. These statistics, Mr. Speaker, are subject to interpretation. Some people might also argue that because the age is 18 it is easier for 17 and 16-year olds to drink. I don't agree that that is necessarily true. Perhaps there is some slight physical change that makes it easier to tell an 18-year old from a 19-year old, than a 17-year old from an 18-year old, but if that's true I haven't personally noticed.

I think that the argument here is not where the age level should be but concerns how the age level (whatever it is) is enforced. It seems to me that if we were to concentrate our efforts on enforcing the existing law more stringently we could solve this problem in a more consistent manner than by raising the age limit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe statistics can be provided to show that raising the driving age from 16 to 18 would significantly reduce traffic accidents. Raising the driving age to 21 would certainly improve the statistics even further. This doesn't deal with the issue before us but it does, I believe, show how similar conclusions can be drawn in other areas from statistics. If one simply followed the statistical analysis, then if one's objective was to reduce traffic accidents, or reduce alcohol consumption, one would raise the age limits to 100.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, that is not the issue. The issue is: what is an appropriate age of majority? I would like to try and sum up my position. One, I find it inconsistent to grant the full rights of citizenship to people at the age of 18, but to then decide they are not mature enough to purchase and consume alcohol. And two, I have not seen evidence which convinces me that this Bill is anything more than the response to public opinion. I don't foresee that the problems we face are going to disappear because we hike the age 12 months.

Alcohol, Mr. Speaker, is a serious problem. I don't profess to know exactly where the age of majority should be. It may be 17, 18, 19 or 23½, but until I can see evidence that the serious problems we face with respect to alcohol abuse can be solved by a simple adjustment in the legal age, I will not support a Bill of this nature, which doesn't deal with the whole question of the age of majority.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. H. H. Rolfes** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes to speak on Bill No. 36. Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations

in speaking to this Bill.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No nerve!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — No, not nerve, I think in 1971 and 1972 when we discussed the whole issue of alcohol at that time, the Committee convinced us that we should include 18-year olds as legally able to purchase and consume alcohol. I think those people who tell us that times have not changed or the conditions are the same as they were in 1971 or 1972 are simply not being realistic.

The problem in 1971-72, the number one social problem I believe was not alcohol, but other drugs. It has shifted today from those other hard drugs and soft drugs to alcohol. And in large measure, Mr. Speaker, we as legislators, not just in Saskatchewan, but in Canada and in the United States and across the world, have to bear a great deal of responsibility for the deterioration of the alcohol situation. I would be much happier, Mr. Speaker, if other amendments to The Liquor Act had been brought in, other than the one that changes the legal age from 18 to 19.

I don't think that this amendment will do all that much to solve the problem of alcohol. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I know that in some small way it may do something in solving the alcohol problem for those people who are 18 and under. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I will with some reluctance, and with some reservations support the Bill that is before us.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think there are many other things that legislators could do and the public could do to help us solve the problem of alcohol. I include the public here, Mr. Speaker, because in this particular instance I think the public wants to put the full responsibility on us, putting pressure on us to do certain things which will not cure the problem, but will increase the problem. Of course, I am referring to the public who want us to constantly increase the number of outlets, where people can obtain alcohol; they want us to increase the number of hours that these outlets are open and thus make it easier for people to consume and purchase alcohol. Yet, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, they are putting pressure on us to change legislation so that we can do, in some small way, do something about the number one social problem before us and that is alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I checked with the Director of the Separate School Board in Saskatoon to see how many 18-year olds there were in the two high schools in Saskatoon. He told me that during the last year of high school, Grade Twelve, some 45 per cent of the Grade Twelves will be 18 years old. And because these 18 year olds socialize with other children who are younger, in high school, and therefore helped or assist these people in the consuming of alcohol, I think raising the age to 19 will in that area at least help solve the problem.

But what are other things that we could do that would have a much greater consequence than simply raising the legal age from 18 to 19.

**Mr. Allen:** — Prohibition.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Yes, prohibition may help but that is not being realistic and no one is going to suggest that. But, Mr. Speaker,

let me say that I think that that we could, in our school systems, start at a much, much earlier age to have an educational program on the evil effects of alcohol.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that each and every one of us must bluntly tell our constituents and the parents in those constituencies that they have a responsibility and they can't simply shirk their responsibility by putting it onto us. I think parents have a responsibility to see to it that they understand and know what their children are up to in their homes when the parents are away and in other homes at parties that their children attend. And if there is alcohol consumed at those parties then I think that parents have a responsibility to simply say, no, you cannot attend.

I met with a doctor in Saskatoon the other day who was very concerned about this problem and he told me a very sad story. He said that in Saskatoon last year a seven year old was found unconscious in the Grovenor parking lot. She was rushed to the hospital, no one knew what was wrong. However, it was found that she had consumed too much alcohol. When they brought her back to consciousness she was asked . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — She?

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Yes, she. They asked her where she had consumed the alcohol. She told them that she had been at a party. When the police went to the house they found a number of eight, nine, ten and eleven year olds, who had all the liquor they wanted, with the full knowledge of the parents. Their parents were gone to another party.

Mr. Speaker, we can't legislate against those things. That is why I come down very hard on parental responsibility. But, we as legislators, could have brought in other amendments. Why don't we issue ID cards with pictures on them so that owners of liquor outlets can put the full responsibility on people who enter those outlets? Then there would be no mistake as to who is old enough or who isn't old enough. But when this was brought before the Legislature by some of us in 1971 and 1972 we were accused of taking away personal liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I will support such an amendment to The Liquor Act or such action on the part of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, those people who are in support of raising the drinking age from 18 to 19 must resist the pressure of their constituents and, therefore, not pressure the Government to increasing the number of outlets that are available. I don't think on the one hand you can say, we will raise the drinking age from 18 to 19 and then on the other hand pressure the Government to increase the number of outlets, to make liquor more easily accessible.

I don't think that it is fair for people then to pressure governments again to increase the number of hours that outlets are open. You cannot take one side in this legislation and behind the scenes put pressure on the governments to do the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I think would really cut down on the abuse of alcohol, or the high use of alcohol, would be if we raised the price of alcohol. The price of alcohol has simply not kept pace with the money that is available to

young people. Spending \$20 \$30 or \$40 on an evening's entertainment for young people today seems to be the going thing. I think a much greater benefit would have been if somebody in this House had recommended to the Government that the price of alcohol be increased 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment that we could bring in, or things that we could be doing, is to have stricter enforcement of the present laws and not just turn a blind eye to some of the things that are happening. I think the fines, for example, that people have to pay today for breaking liquor laws, for entering a premise or for being caught with liquor in a place other than a home, have simply not kept pace. Again, what is a \$50 fine to a young person today who makes a couple hundred a week, especially when the young people get together and they all share the \$50 fine?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Never in my day.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — In our day a \$50 fine meant a lot, but today I simply don't think the fines have kept pace with the money that is available.

I don't think that the amendments that are before us are going to solve the alcohol problem. I recognize that, but I do know that school activities in the last few years have been interfered with because of the abuse of alcohol. It is because of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the amendments that are before us. But I want to say, again, I do that with the full realization that the young people will not be happy with these amendments. I do that fully realizing that there are many people in my constituency who will not agree with my stand. I do that, Mr. Speaker, fully realizing that there should have been other amendments, other actions that this Legislature could have taken that would have come to grips with the problem a lot more than raising the drinking age from 18 to 19.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. J. Wiebe** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, could I beg leave of the Assembly to interrupt the debate for one moment to introduce some guests.

I am very pleased to see in the Speaker's Gallery this morning, approximately 30 students from the public school at Wymark. We didn't know whether they would have an opportunity to witness part of the proceedings of the Legislature today because at the time that they had made arrangements we were not sitting in the morning. I believe that they are more fortunate than many students in that the debate which you are witnessing this morning, is a debate on whether the legal drinking age in the province should be raised from 18 to 19 and the vote that will be conducted on this debate is going to be a free vote which will allow each and every Member the opportunity to vote as he wishes, which is something that does not happen too often in the Legislative Chambers.

I might point out that they have an extremely busy day. They are accompanied today as well by Mrs. Barniuk, Mrs. Toews and also their principal, Mr. Ray Finlay. I look forward to meeting with them later this afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate continues on Bill No. 36.

**Mr. D. G. Stuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in this debate and place my position on the records in regard to the introduction of this Bill on this proposed change to raise the legal age of drinking from 18 to 19.

I want to echo the words of the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) who just sat down about this being an interesting debate and an open vote. I think that it is an indication, or should be an indication to government that we should have more open votes. I have always believed that this idea that the Government, even on government bills and government motions, stands or falls on the vote of the Legislative Assembly a foregone conclusion and as a result pretty dull. It also shakes, I think, the confidence of the people who elect us as individuals in our ability to make decisions as individuals. I hope that the Government would look at the idea of more open votes. I think they engender good debate and I don't think the Government should be defeated or stand and fall on every minor bill that comes in, or every minor resolution that happens to originate from the Government. I know this is the tradition. As I say this is something that I would like the Government to think about.

I think that all of us recognize that raising the drinking age by one year is not going to solve the problem of the abuse of alcohol. I suggest that if we could come back here two or three hundred years from now or longer, people would still be trying to find ways to solve the abuse of alcohol. In fact I think it is time governments recognize and politicians recognize that there are very few problems that face society that they can actually solve and in our efforts sometimes to solve them and our dedication to appear to the public as people who can solve problems we end up involving government in lives of people to too great an extent. We should be honest and recognize that we can do very little to solve most problems. All that we can do is create an atmosphere to allow people, to encourage people, to be in a better position to solve most problems. All that we can do is create an atmosphere to allow people, to encourage people, to be in a better position to solve their own problems. That is what we are doing here, I suggest, if we raise the drinking age from 18 to 19. We lowered it, we lowered it when we were the Government to 19 and the present Government lowered it to 18. I think that we made a mistake. I think that we should be honest enough to admit that we made a mistake. I think that this is just one more factor in the growing abuse of alcohol and I don't think there is anyone who cannot and should not, and is not, concerned about the growing abuse of alcohol.

I was rather amazed to hear the Minister of Highways say that the accidents are down. I don't think they are down, if I recall one of the other Ministers suggesting, I think it was Mr. Whelan, suggesting that they are up and I think that they are up. If they are down in Saskatchewan it is some kind of a miracle. I just don't believe that they are down. I know from statistics that more and more accidents, especially in the bad accidents, that alcohol is involved. Now this isn't a phenomenon of young people. There is no question that some people say 18, 19 or 20-year olds are able to handle alcohol in a more mature way than some people who are 50 and 60, but there is a tendency, there is no question as statistics show that the abuse of alcohol in the younger age group is more

prevalent than it is in the older age group. We all know, whether we admit it or not, that every time we lower the age, the legal age, the effective age of obtaining alcohol goes down further one or two years. We know that there is a bright point in there somewhere. The 18-year olds tend, tend, to associate with 17 and 16-year olds where the 19-year olds tend to associate with the 19, 20 and 21-year olds.

So one of the unhappy results of lowering the drinking age to 18 has been that the encouragement of people who are 16 and 17, even 15, become more involved with alcohol than they have been in the past. We can say, okay, let's get tougher and let's make more people adhere to the law; let's take that course of action and certainly I don't disagree with that and it can be done and maybe it should be done. However, there aren't enough policemen, there aren't enough law enforcement officers and we haven't the money to hire enough law enforcement officers to police this whole thing. I think that by raising the age we are going to, effectively, take a step — maybe a small step, but a step — in combating the growing use of alcohol, especially at the younger age.

A great deal has been made, and I have made the same speech over and over again, you know if they are old enough to fight at 18, they are old enough to drink at 18. Well, maybe we should be looking at the other half of that equation. Are they old enough to fight at 18? I sometimes think that if we made the fighting age 45, if we could convince the Federal Government and all other federal governments to raise the fighting age to 45, since most politicians and generals are over 45 who declare wars, maybe we would do away with wars in one fell swoop and that would be a good thing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I think that we should immediately put into this picture that which says that we would excuse any of us fighting fools who did so well in the last war, or all people under five foot five and a half who got arthritis, should be immediately excused. But outside those little restrictions I think that would be a refreshing change.

But seriously the question of majority at 18, maybe we should look at that. There is no doubt in my mind that as our young people stay in school longer, that the education process takes longer, and it does take longer. It used to be otherwise. The average age of leaving school has risen sharply as more people attend university and post-secondary education. This is a good thing. But I feel that the maturity tends to rise with the length of time they stay in school. When young people were forced out into the labor market out to work, when they were 16 and 17 many years ago, that they tended to mature pretty fast. When they are able to stay in school and this is a good thing and I'm all for it, until they are 18 and 19 and 20 and in their 20s, now that since they are dependent, a great many of them, on their parents and a great many of them are dependent on support from either their parents or government or someone else, that their actual maturity is slower today, in many respects than it was 30 or 40 years ago.

So I don't think we need to apologize for saying we're going to raise this to 19. We tried it as an experiment. I say I don't think it worked and I think that we should have the courage to say, okay, let's try this.



I agree that in the final analysis it is the home, the parent. We can only do so much as legislators. We can only do so much as a government or you as a government, we as MLAs.

A tremendous amount of the problems we face today in the schools, in abuse of alcohol, in a great many areas starts in the home. There is no question. There is a tendency and there has been for a long time, too great a tendency to say, pass along to go to the teacher, go to the school board, go to the city council, go to the Legislature, or go to the Government of Canada and say, you pass a law to solve our problems. Pretty soon we have to get back, I think, to a little more responsibility in the family. We're doing this not just for the young people, we're doing it with old people. The day we disciplined our own children is disappearing in too many families and we expect the schools to do it and that's a mistake. The day we looked after our own elderly people in our own homes is fast passing and that's a mistake. And all you have to do, and this is off the subject, I realize, Mr. Speaker, but all you have to do is walk through any of our old folks' homes, our senior citizens' homes and really talk to those people. They'll tell you what they think of these institutions. They do their best. The people have got a wonderful attitude who run them and thank God we've got them. But those people want to be back in somebody's home.

There is a tendency in society today for the family to shrug off their responsibility and hand it over to governments and I think as governments we should be starting to hand some of it back and have the courage to say, look we can't solve your problems. All we can do is create a climate to help you solve your own problems.

I'm supporting this Bill. I hope it passes. Having said that I recognize that it's just one small step, but I think it's a step that we can take and we should take. When we talk about, as a former speaker did, about other people putting pressure on us to have longer hours and more outlets, I think that they are not necessarily connected to begin with and I think on the other hand they are two different sets of people. We should look clearly at that and I recognize governments get all kinds of opposing pressures, especially in regard to the consumption and the sale of alcohol. So I'm sympathetic, you do get pressures to sell beer in grocery stores and sell wine in grocery stores and have sidewalk cafes and one of the reasons that's advanced always is that, if we have more open alcohol and it's more readily available, we'll become as a nation or as a people more mature in regard to drinking. I used to point to France, well, I don't think this is such a good example. I was over there for quite a while and most people I saw were hammered by about 10:00 o'clock in the morning. Mind you I admit I didn't see very many of them and I was just travelling around the country. But I know what statistics show that there is a greater problem of alcoholism in France than there is in Canada and we're fast approaching, I know that we'll soon be in the same league.

I don't think we need to look at any other country, we just need to look at what's happening to ourselves and I was convinced at one time, but I'm totally unconvinced now, that easier hours, more outlets, solve the problem. I think the opposite is true, that more hours, easier availability tends to increase the abuse of alcohol. So I'm going to support this and I hope that it passes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. H. Lange** (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise against the motion to raise the drinking age from 18 to 19. My basic reason for doing so and for speaking is because I think that the motion is discriminating against 18-year olds in our society. Why do we think about alcoholism as it relates to 18-year olds, rather than the rest of society? But the discussion so far has related only to young people, the 18 and 19-year old age group.

Now, a major argument for that which again I can appreciate, is that there are problems with school students, and curriculum activities in school related to alcoholism or consumption of alcohol. At the same time we must recognize that there might be another reason for young people appearing in bars, rather than recreational activities at school or in a particular role that they are supposed to be playing in school. That reason might be that there is no environment to attract those students to or to keep them in a school system, as opposed to going to a drinking establishment.

We must recognize that the young people do not make the muscle cars that the older generation sells to them and which create the accidents that make the statistics with young people. We must recognize that the young people do not make the movies or the television shows which deal very openly with alcohol as a desirable social custom. That young people do not sell those movies, nor make money from the television programs which depict that kind of thing. This is all sold by the older generation. More importantly, young people do not distil the alcohol nor do they build the premises upon which alcohol is consumed in our society. Most important young people did not create nor design school systems which they must attend from very early ages; they did not create the social structures in which they are forced to develop. That was all done by an older generation.

Where for instance in our school system do we discuss the sensible use of alcohol? Do we have an Aware Program or an analogy to the Aware Program in our school system? No we don't. We don't have any education which teaches young people what alcohol is, where it comes from, what it can do, what its potential is, what its positive effects can be, what its negative effects can be. Why don't we talk about increasing the amount of education in the school system about the responsible use of alcohol to young people. Young people are intelligent enough to make up their own minds about the responsible use of alcohol.

We have a number of superintendents in this Legislative Chamber who are supporting this Bill. If the superintendents want to do something about alcoholism why don't they put pressure on the school system to increase the amount of alcohol education that could be provided for in the school system?

When for instance in our society do we see lack of alcohol at functions that are held by the older generation? When do the school superintendents ever have a function at which there is not a bar at a social hour? When do teachers ever have a social function where there is not a bar? Or when do businessmen, the SARM, the SUMA or the SFA, the SSTA or any other organization we have in our society, fail to have a bar? Even church conventions now very often are held and include bars.

Or, bringing it closer to this Legislature, when have we ever, at the formal opening of the Legislative Assembly have we not had a bar? Even last year when there was a liquor strike on, we did manage to get a bottle of wine on each table for the opening of the Legislature didn't we? Yet we suggest as legislators that we can do something about alcoholism in the school or the problems that are associated with the school, simply by legislating the drinking age from 18 to 19. I would suggest to the Members of the Legislature that this is a specious tactic, that is a hypocritical thing for us to do.

What can we expect of young people except that they are going to emulate the social mores and traditions and customs with which society has presented them? If we present them with social mores and customs which suggest the alcoholism is a form of recreation that it is desirable for people to drink in virtually every situation that society has to present to them, then what can we expect, except that young people will emulate that example. They will emulate it whether they are 18, 15, 10 or 6, because the influences on them come not only from the social mores and customs but are amplified by the exposure that young people have to media and movies.

Legislation is not an answer. We perhaps do not have an answer for alcoholism or for the use of alcohol in our society, but legislation is definitely not an answer. The very fact that it has been legislated up and down and up and down again, that prohibition has been brought in and chucked out, indicates that legislation will not solve the problem of alcoholism as it relates to society in general or to young people in particular.

In fact, legislation is a retrograde step. Legislation will not stop young people from drinking, it will not stop young people from obtaining alcohol either in or out of licensed premises or in and out of schools. If they want alcohol, they will get alcohol one way or another regardless of what the legislated age limit will be.

It is more important for us as legislators to recognize that the use of alcohol is simply a phenomenon in our society, a phenomenon that is growing, for various reasons, but it is not growing because young people are forcing it to grow. It is growing because of the social mores and customs which are thrust upon young people in society.

I would urge Members of the Legislature to recognize the ability and the intelligence of young people to be able to decide for themselves how and when and where they will use alcohol. They have the same faculty, the same intelligence, the same wherewithall, the same ability to research and the same ability to experience as anyone else does in society. It is simply not fair for us to suggest to those young people who are 18 years of age that they cannot decide for themselves how to responsibly use alcohol. They are perfectly capable of deciding for themselves how they will make rational use of alcohol. It is far better for us to concentrate as legislators upon how we are going to create a better environment in which those young people can live and in which they can decide for themselves how they are going to cope with the problems of society, not the least of which of course is alcohol.

I don't think it is fair for us to suggest that by legislating the drinking age we will legislate morality.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. L. W. Birkbeck** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that unavoidably a number of our Members can't be in the House today, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Birkbeck that Bill No. 39 — **An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972**, be now read a second time.

**Mr. L. W. Birkbeck** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I proposed an amendment to this Natural Products Marketing Act and I should like to say with the sincerity that the Member for Weyburn introduced his amendments to The Liquor Act.

The purpose of the Act, I do not agree with, I do not feel that the people in agriculture agree with the purpose of this Act. I would just say that if you are not going to support the amendment, that it will indicate to me that the Members of this Government are in favor of controls, regulations, and licensing of people involved in agriculture in every respect and I simply support them.

Motion negatived.

## SECOND READINGS

**Mr. E. F. A. Merchant** (Regina Wascana) moved second reading of Bill No. 56 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I can be relatively brief in describing the intentions of these amendments. There are a number of amendments, but really there are only two principles involved. I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that I have chosen to proceed with this which will be brief rather than the previous matter which would be lengthy and I think might well evoke a lengthy response from the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, as I said there are two principles involved in the amendments to the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act and as Members may well know, the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act is one of the pieces of legislation which lays down the areas of discrimination which is prescribed by our law. I hope that the Government believes that even if the Government believes that one of the two changes is not appropriate, that the Government might allow one of the two amendments that are proposed to be passed by this House.

Many people in the public, Mr. Speaker, don't understand that it is quite legal to discriminate against individuals provided the reason for your discrimination is not one of those reasons particularly barred in our Bill of Rights legislation. An employer can for instance, advertise that they won't hire someone to work in his restaurant because he has blond hair or because he has blue eyes or he wouldn't hire someone to work in his restaurant in the case of the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, because he's beneath five foot five and a half inches. He could say that he wouldn't hire someone who is bald, or perhaps he could say he wouldn't hire someone that he knew had

voted NDP. These forms of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, are quite legal. The restaurateur would be quite entitled to advertise that he would not hire for instance someone who was bald or blue-eyed and he would not be discriminating in a way that is prescribed by our law.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there was a case in Moosomin in the window of his restaurant as I recall it, read something along the lines as follows:

Help Wanted — Deadbeats, jailbirds and NDPers need not apply.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Merchant:** — The NDPs are upset, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Did you make that up?

**Mr. Merchant:** — No, I didn't make it up. The NDPs are upset in the area, all two of the NDP in Moosomin, found that there was nothing that they could do because though that was clearly discriminatory against NDPers that was not a form of discrimination that was prescribed by law.

The Bill of Rights then, Mr. Speaker, doesn't stop discrimination, it just stops certain kinds of discrimination, and the first change proposes to make one further addition to those kinds of discrimination as are prescribed. These amendments would now include marital status in the new definition of discrimination. The amendment simply says that you may not discriminate because of marital status. Men are never discriminated against because of marital status, this change is a change to help women, both married and single. In housing single women are sometimes deprived of housing because they are single and have had illegitimate children. They are sometimes deprived of housing because they are divorced. They are frequently treated differently by financial institutions and because of their marital status women are frequently discriminated against in other ways.

In Regina Wascana, the constituency that I am fortunate enough to represent, we are particularly concerned about a limited dividend CMAC assisted project by the name of Gladmer Developments, where I believe they discriminate against women who badly need housing because they are separated families and they discriminate against them and don't give them housing. That sort of discrimination exists throughout the province in pockets and areas from time to time. It is not in that particular instance the fault of the Gladmer staff, it is the fault I believe of a particular man in Calgary who in my view doesn't view his role as one of really helping the poor in need.

Mr. Speaker, in other areas some married women face discrimination because they are married and not single and when they seek employment in jobs they sometimes find that management prefers female employees who are single, prefers the availability of female employees as an inducement to obtaining customers, some bars for instance. Some bars for instance actively discriminate against the employment of married women because they prefer to have single women as waitresses. Not many months ago we saw an example from Montreal which indicated that Expo was

was in certain of its hiring practices discriminating against married women as hostesses, they preferred to have single women in those positions. Airlines, for instance, prefer to hire single stewardesses and the examples are many.

So, Mr. Speaker, in that way, in marital status, the discrimination runs in two ways against married women on the one hand in some cases and against single women on the other.

With a simple change to our legislation this Assembly could help a great number of people who are discriminated against in an improper way and I hope the Government will consider the change and I hope the amendment might be passed in the next couple of weeks or however long it takes to wind up the House.

The second area, Mr. Speaker, has a new area of discrimination. A Bill of Rights legislation doesn't say, as I mentioned before, that it is improper to discriminate, period. The Act simply says it is improper to discriminate in certain specific ways. It is, for instance, against the Bill of Rights to discriminate against housing. It is against the Bill of Rights to discriminate in hiring practices. But it is not against the Bill of Rights to discriminate in all ways. The second change adds another area where discrimination is prescribed, namely that it would be improper to refuse credit because of discrimination. I expect, Mr. Speaker, that there may be problems getting credit because of color or race but frankly my principal reason in moving this amendment is again to help women. It is in the area of women being refused credit that discrimination is most rampant.

Firstly, it is more difficult for a single woman to get credit than it is for a single man. Secondly, it is almost impossible for a married woman to get credit or a credit rating separate from her husband. She can't get a credit card except with her husband, she can't borrow money except with her husband and with his co-signing the note. And even if she works where she might ordinarily as a single woman to be able to obtain credit she finds that it is difficult to get separate credit, to get a credit rating and these two amendments working in concert would cure that problem. It is a problem which in some jurisdictions incidentally is cured by fair credit disclosure in some areas and in our law there is no protection. Indeed married women frequently when they have separated from their husbands find it virtually impossible, particularly if their husband has been a deadbeat, to establish a separate credit rating.

This second change is designed to help women in dealing with the credit agencies, credit is extremely important in today's society and is something about which we should be concerned and it is, amongst other things, designed to help women who have just separated from their husbands to be able to obtain a separate credit rating so that they will be able to use credit properly in a meaningful way to establish their new life.

Two simple changes, Mr. Speaker, which I hope the Government may consider and which I hope the Government might permit to be passed before we prorogue this Legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Merchant:** — I move with those few words Bill No. 56.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Hon. R. Romanow.

## **RULING**

### **Bill No. 53 — An Act to Amend the Mental Health Act (No. 2)**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I might dispense with a ruling which I have now which I probably should have earlier when we immediately came upon Second Readings. This will probably facilitate the business of the House. This has to do with Bill No. 53 which is the first item under Second Reading, that section of the Blues that we have just completed.

I have perused Bill No. 53 — An Act to Amend The Mental Health Act (No. 2) which is standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) and I wish to make the following ruling.

I refer all Hon. Members to Rule 30 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, 1970 which is as follows:

Any vote, resolution, address or bill introduced in the Assembly for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever, or to impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people, or to release or compound any sum of money due to the Crown, or to grant any property of the Crown, or to authorize any loan or any charge upon the credit of the Province, shall be recommended to the Assembly by Message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor before it is considered by the Assembly.

The consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon but shall be adjourned until such further day as the Assembly shall think fit to appoint.

The question that faces me is whether this Bill does involve the expenditure of money.

I refer all Hon. Members to Section 5 and 11 of the Bill. These sections establish a new appeal procedure which did not exist heretofore. These sections provide an option for appeal and while the appeal is not mandatory, the Attorney General's Department could still become involved in an appeal proceeding.

I refer all Hon. Members to a Ruling of Chair on March 24, 1966 (Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, pp. 192-194) which states that "A contingent liability is not an absolute liability existing in the present, but one which may become an absolute liability upon the happening of a future event." The Ruling at that time was dealing with a Bill which involved appeal procedures. The Ruling further states that "where an appeal lies, a defence is implied. The Bill therefore creates a contingent liability to the Province for any costs in connection with the defence."

The Bill before us thus creates appeal procedures, which would involve a defence by the Attorney General's Department and therefore a liability upon the Province.

An increase in the jurisdiction of the courts is not regarded as creating a charge upon the public purse. (Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, Seventeenth Edition, p. 792). It must be remembered though that the Bill before us is not only extending the jurisdiction of the courts, which is in order, but it also creates a contingent liability upon the Province by imposing new costs re defence of appeals.

I want to quote further from the Ruling of the Chair of March 24, 1966 as follows:

It is my firm belief that those charged and entrusted by the people with the work of raising the provincial revenues must be the sole arbiters of the institution of new or additional expenditures and that the privilege of initiating legislation which will be a new or increased charge upon the people must therefore be the absolute prerogative of the Government.

I believe this principle to be fundamental to the preservation of self government. It does not limit the right of Members to place their views before the House and the public and to test the opinion of the Legislature, for though they may not introduce a Bill involving money which would, if passed, be an act of the Legislature binding on the Government they are not prevented from moving a properly worded Resolution or Recommendation in general terms seeking the consideration of the House and of the people. Resolutions of this nature are permissible because, if adopted, they have no operative effect and no grant is made or burden imposed upon the people.

I rule that Bill No. 53 will, if passed, involve an additional expenditure from the public purse and is therefore out of order.

**Mr. E. C. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I get myself in the position of having Members in effect challenging the ruling.

**Mr. Malone:** — No, I am not going to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the Member wishes to raise a Point of Order, I may accept that.

**Mr. Malone:** — Okay, a Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the Bill but in listening to your remarks it seems that you have stretched the principle, if I may use those words, a long way to keep this Bill from being heard. I wonder if I could ask you, I'm not present in the House all the time and I have never heard any Member on either side of the House take exception to this Bill as being an improper Bill, and I am asking you if anybody brought this to your attention and asked you to make a ruling on it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — There is an obligation on the Speaker to identify bills which are brought forward, if they are brought to his attention by Members as to whether they require money recommendations. There is also an obligation on the Speaker to identify bills



which he thinks may in fact create expenditures which are not brought forward by Members of the Treasury Bench.

**Mr. Malone:** — On the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, may I just say that I am not going to challenge your ruling, maybe other Members will want to, but it is hard to conceive of any bill that somehow, somewhere along the way isn't going to involve some public expenditure. I don't care whether it is the Bill of Rights that my colleague just talked about, that conceivably could cause the Government expenditure by the very fact of printing a new bill, it's a government expenditure. I am not familiar with the Bill that has been tabled by the Member for Regina Wascana but the recollection I do have of it is that certainly there is no reference at all to any moneys being expended. You take the appeal procedure as an example whereby moneys could be expended but I suggest to you that that is stretching the point very, very much. Any bill that could be tabled here as a Private Member's Bill is going to involve perhaps indirectly the spending of money. I go to the Bill that was introduced by the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) about the accredited public accountants of Saskatchewan; now that is going to involve some expenditure on behalf of the Government just to print the Bill, to change the law, to do various things there. That certainly isn't out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If I may comment in conclusion upon this matter that it is the responsibility of the Chair to define the absolute prerogative of the Government with regard to the expenditure of the revenues of the province. As a result of that, this decision is based on what I believe to be solid precedents which have occurred prior to this time over a number of years. The citations are there in the ruling and I think if the Members follow this through they will see the logic of the citations and the end result, that is, the ruling to disallow the Bill.

**Mr. Merchant:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I too, with the Member, don't propose at this point to challenge your ruling. I am not sure that it would do very much good and neither do I propose to take 67 minutes and deliver my speech in the course of my Point of Order. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest that a tangent fraught with peril in which to move in this way, that clearly any bill involves some response by the Government. Indeed, the changed appeal procedures which were proposed in the Bill and the speech which I would have been presenting replaced a different appeal procedure with a new appeal procedure.

Let me, for instance, Mr. Speaker, moving in an abstract way because you've made your ruling about this Bill and that's the end, but I am more concerned about the future. In an abstract way let us suppose that we move that there be a further appeal from the district court to the court of appeal over an impaired driving charge. That, Mr. Speaker may not know, but I'm sure the Attorney General does, if you are convicted of impaired driving, a summary conviction, it ends at the district court and you can't appeal to the court of appeal in ordinary circumstances. If we then move that there be a further appeal, really committing the litigants to that expense, I take it from what Mr. Speaker has said, that that would not be allowed because it would involve having a prosecutor show up. Almost

anything that would happen, within your logic, one could say that because this Bill deals with the way that a magistrate has power under Section 18 of The Mental Health Act, this Bill deals with Queen's Bench judges and reviews, that any additional time involvement by any public servant including the judiciary, would then mean that if you have done that you can't move the Bill. I say only, Mr. Speaker, that if this Bill is dead in its current form, perhaps I'll re-examine, but I think as I said in opening, it's an alleyway fraught with problems. And that a restrictive view of what the Private Members might move would very much restrict the ability of Private Members to present positions to this House. We've discussed this in this manner before, on another Bill of mine which Mr. Speaker found to be an improper bill because in that case as well it was your feeling that it committed the Government to expense. I only say that it's a matter where Mr. Speaker should be very cautious and I'm sure you are aware of that caution.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that we should close this matter off because we are getting into discussing the merits of the decision that I made rather than Points of Order in regard to it. I believe that I outlined in the ruling that there could be some expansion of duties in some areas that wouldn't be acknowledged as being a charge on the Government. Printing of Bills is another area that can't be called money, because that is a function of this Legislative Assembly, therefore, the monies are available for that. So it was not ruled on that basis. I might say in conclusion the centre point of the ruling is that any infringement upon the Executive Council's prerogative to spend the revenues of the Province is fraught with difficulties as regards the whole principle of responsible government, and on that basis the decision was made.

## SECOND READINGS

**Hon. W. A. Robbins** (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 51 — **An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with amendments to The Mental Health Act and some the provisions of this Bill are concerned with persons who may not be competent to manage their estates. For the most part the other amendments are intended to bring in the provisions of the Act in line with current needs relating to the administration of the psychiatric services program within the province.

Section 21 of the Act now authorizes a person to be examined to determine if he is mentally competent to manage his own estate. If it is found that he is not competent to manage his estate, the administrator of estates will take over the administration. The examination to determine competence may only be made when the person has been admitted as an in-patient to a psychiatric facility. This has created problems in individual cases where the person in question was not mentally competent and it was advisable for the administrator of estates to administer the estate where the person was not an in-patient in a psychiatric facility and there was no need for him to be admitted.

An amendment will provide that a person may be examined by a physician for this purpose whether or not he is a patient in

a psychiatric facility. Where a person is found to be incompetent to manage his estate and his estate is then administered by the administrator of estates, he may then again be examined by a physician to determine whether he is or is not competent to manage that estate.

The physician is required to be a physician registered with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of this province. This requirement creates difficulty where the person may have established residence in another province. An amendment will provide where the examination takes place outside of the province the physician will be required to be registered and in good standing only in the province in which the examination takes place.

The Act now provides for visiting, to annually visit each institution and psychiatric centre and report thereon to the Minister of Health. This committee has not functioned since 1967. Since that time its function has been assumed to a considerable extent by inspectors for the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation. It is proposed that provision for the visiting committee be repealed and that a new provision will authorize the Minister of Health to appoint consultants and committees and authorize them to conduct special inquiries and make recommendations to him.

Several provisions are concerned with psychiatric wards in the Munro Wing in Regina. The psychiatric ward in the Regina General Hospital that has been known as the Munro Wing has been moved from the building adjacent to the General Hospital to part of the former DVA Wing in the main hospital building. Because of the change of location it is considered advisable that this ward should no longer be known as the Munro Wing and an amendment to delete this requirement from the Act is proposed. That's a rather small technicality, Mr. Speaker.

Section 4 (4) of the Act presently seems to imply that the Department of Health will be operating these psychiatric wards pursuant to agreements with those hospitals in which the wards are located. In actual fact the agreements now provide and have provided for many years that these wards will be operated by the hospitals with the department providing professional personnel to the wards. This provision of the Act is being revised to that it could remove the implication that these wards are actually being operated by the Department of Health.

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

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, the Bill basically does four things; basically that psychiatric wards in hospitals so named and that's not very controversial; says the Minister may enter into agreements with hospital boards with respect to psychiatric treatment facilities and that's certainly not very controversial.

It certainly says that the Minister may appoint consultants and committees to inquire and make recommendations with respect to psychiatric care in the province. And I have some reservations about that.

Firstly, the old system which dealt with visiting committees was a shallow provision. It was compulsory that there be committees which would conduct investigations from time to time. The new provision 57 (1) is a made provision. It's permissive rather than compelling.

Secondly, in dealing with 57 (a) unlike the old Act now allows — well for the provision generally of psychiatric services within the province or any matter related thereto seems to imply that the visiting committees (well the visiting committees which are now are held in limbo under the old Act) — that the new consultants and committees would be able to impose themselves on private psychiatrists, that they would be able to go into a private psychiatric office and do an investigation. We don't think that that's right. We don't think that in psychiatric care that the Government should be able to send people in, in a compulsory way any more than they should be able to send people in a compulsory way to a heart specialist's or a dentist's office or whatever in the health field — that mental health shouldn't be dealt with differently from the ordinary health provision services. So I hope that in Committee the Minister may clarify the situation which is created by 57 (a) which we find objectionable and in a way somewhat frightening.

Fourthly the Act allows that patients may be examined as out-patients in Saskatchewan and other jurisdictions by licensed physicians with respect to a patient's competence to manage his or her estate. That's an amendment which will now becomes (7A). I certainly agree with that and that was in a series of proposals which I made, or was proposing to make in this House. Members may not be aware of the way the law now operates, it's very curious. For instance, if your mother or relative is in an old people's homes and it can be decided that that person should have his or her estate handled by someone appointed (that is if you don't proceed under The Lunacy Act, Chapter 3, 46 as I recall) instead of proceeding under The Mental Health Act you have to have that patient actually taken from the old people's home and taken into a psychiatric institution to have the examination done. That's silly, it's been silly for a long time. The profession for a long time has been suggesting to the Government that it's silly and changes should be made.

So, Mr. Speaker, as far as these specific amendments are concerned those are my thoughts at least. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm disappointed and surprised that the Government would take the time to do a review of The Mental Health Act, take the time of the House for proposals and changes to The Mental Health Act, and not review and consider some of the very serious areas where I at least believe where The Mental Health Act is deficient. The Mental Health Act is legislation which flows out of a faith in government psychiatric services, flows out of a faith in practitioners who work in the public service. Perhaps too much of a faith and I'm not in any way attempting to cast aspersions about the competence of the people employed in psychiatric services. But, The Mental Health Act as it now exists and these amendments particularly 57 (a), seem to imply that it's an intention not only to continue the dominance of psychiatric services over the private provision of mental health services but almost extend it. The Mental Health Act gives dominance to government psychiatrists which I don't think is appropriate or proper; gives a dominance to an almost militaristic system of a pecking order within the psychiatric institution. So that if the Act as it now reads gives great power and great control to the head of the psychiatric institution who is always a man in the government service.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, as the Act now exists, if a person is voluntarily admitted, if a person voluntarily agrees to go into a mental health institution it's easier, Mr. Speaker,

to hold them against their will if they then decide to leave than it is for someone who is taken in under signed compulsion. Easier to hold the volunteer than it is to hold the person who is taken in under compulsion.

Curious anomalies exist in The Mental Health Act as it now exists. And I find it curious that the Government, more curious still, that the Government would take the time to amend The Mental Health Act and that such a cursory and artificial set of changes would be brought before the House, as these amendments embody. That if a review were underway of The Mental Health Act I should have expected that government officials would have looked at some of the underlying principles of the Act to a greater extent than they have.

Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that some clarification of 57 (a) and hopefully a House amendment may be in order and some corrections made, I would expect that the Liberal caucus would give their support to these amendments to The Mental Health Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Robbins** (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 57 — **An Act to amend The Union Hospital Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill amends The Union Hospital Act. Although the Bill is quite a long Bill, it's a bit technical in places, I think I can give you the meat of the contents of the Bill fairly quickly.

The Bill deals primarily with union hospital board memberships, with the remuneration paid to union hospital board members and the procedure for taking polls in Union Hospital Districts.

There are presently 116 Union Hospital Districts in the province. The Hospital Board of each district consists of representatives from municipalities, local improvement districts and parts of municipalities and local improvement districts, included within the hospital district. Each area with the total taxable assessment not exceeding \$1 million is entitled to one member. With an assessment of more than \$1 million not exceeding \$2 million, is entitled to two members and with an assessment of more than \$2 million to three members. A special provision provides for cities to have an additional number of members on the Board. Because each municipal unit or area no matter how small is entitled to one member, the membership of the hospital boards in the larger districts have become quite unwieldy, in fact, we have one hospital district in the province that has 49 members.

For example, one union hospital board presently has 49 hospital board members while twelve hospital boards have more than 20 members. These become rather unwieldy in terms of getting business done. Both the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities have agreed that hospital boards of this size are unnecessarily large.

An amendment will provide that ordinarily a municipal unit or area will be entitled to one member only if its taxable assessment is more than \$500,000 but less than \$3 million.

It will be entitled to two members if its taxable assessment is more than \$3 million. Provision is made for small municipal units having a combined assessment of more than \$500,000 to have representation on the Hospital Board as a group. It would also be provided that where hospitals located in a village or town having a taxable assessment of \$500,000 or less, that village or town will be entitled to appoint one member to the Hospital Board. Provision is still made for cities included in hospital districts that have additional membership but the total number of representatives is not to exceed five.

The minimum number of union hospital board members is presently three. Provision is made in these amendments so that the minimum number will be increased to five.

The Urban and Rural Associations as well as the Saskatchewan Hospital Association has been consulted with respect to the proposed changes relating to board membership and some of these provisions are being proposed as a result of recommendations made by those associations during the consultation process. As a result of the proposed changes the total number of union hospital board members in the province will be reduced from approximately 1,300 to approximately 800. The Hospital Boards of the larger districts will continue to have a relatively large membership. But the board membership of the medium sized districts will be reduced to a workable number and those small districts that now have a board membership of three will have their membership increased to five.

The Act presently places a limit of \$8 as payment to a board or committee member for attending a meeting and ten cents a mile for travelling to and from meetings. These limitations have become unrealistic and are being removed from the Act. Both the Municipal Association and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association have recommended that these restrictions be removed in order that each union hospital board be in a position to fix its own rates for hospital boards committee members' remuneration. Polls are now held under this Act for the purpose of confirming the establishment of the new Union Hospital District and for voting upon debenture bylaws. A voters' list for the entire district is to be prepared by the returning officer after he receives the voters' list from each municipal unit in the district. It has become quite impractical for this procedure to be carried out in recent years since under current municipal legislation some municipalities no longer have a voters' list. The voting procedures therefore being revised so that the persons presenting themselves for voting will complete and sign a registration form, indicating that he or she is qualified to vote. The Act now provides that equipment costs in excess of \$500 is not to be acquired by the Union Hospital Board without the approval of the Minister. This section is being deleted.

If it is necessary for the acquisition of equipment by union hospital boards to be regulated this can be done under the regulations of The Hospital Standards Act.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be given second reading.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G. H. Penner** (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, if I could just very briefly respond.

I have to agree with the Minister that what the Bill seems to do for me at least is to tidy things up and streamline the procedure. The fact that SUMA and SARM and the Hospital Association have been involved in making recommendations appear to be in the area where changes and need to be made. Unwieldy numbers on boards certainly do not work and if that can be streamlined I think that makes good sense.

The Liberal caucus, Mr. Speaker, intends to support the amendments.

**Mr. R. H. Bailey** (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Minister in his attempts to make the boards more realistic. I would like to say to the Minister, and particularly for the Hospital Boards in rural Saskatchewan that there is a general concern among the people, not the Boards themselves, there seems to be a feeling among the people when something of a controversial nature arises at the hospital that the Hospital Boards themselves are somewhat an identity unto themselves and there is a real difficulty with people within a hospital region in being able to get some information from their Board.

It seems that in the area of local government it is the Hospital Boards that present a real problem to the people. The inability to find out what's going on, the inability to find out a decision of the Board. And it seems to me that I should like the Minister to consider a study of even going further, and I agree with the representation, according to the population and so on. I agree with the streamlining of the Boards, but I think that in rural Saskatchewan, in particular, it becomes imperative that the people who have representation on the Boards, that the representation is not just back to the rural municipality, it is not just back to the town council, or the village council, but rather the representation on the Hospital Board itself should be considered as the general representations of the people and not just to the other local government boards. That's a problem, Mr. Minister. We will be supporting this, but I just wanted to draw your attention to the problem that the people feel that they do not have an accessibility to the Boards and it confounds people in dealing with the Hospital Boards.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 o'clock until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce two groups of students in the Speaker's Gallery. One group, on behalf of the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) who is not in the House at this time. I want to introduce a fine group of Grade Eight students, 36 of them, from the Bruno School and led here by their teachers Mrs. Warick and Mr. J. Moeff and their bus driver Mr. Herman.

Now from Crystal Springs and Dixon Lake School there is a group of Grades Nine, Eleven and Twelve who made the trip here every second or third year to Regina. They are led here by their teachers Mrs. Marjorie Clayton and Mr. David Piot. Their bus driver is Mr. Herbert LaRoche.

I am sure that they are enjoying their trip here to the city. They have visited different parts of the city and today I am sure is going to be an educational day and I am sure that the Members of the Legislature will be on their very best behaviour because I want to tell you that these students go back home and tell all about you.

So it gives me great pleasure to receive the students on behalf of the Assembly. I also want to wish them a very safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO GUESTS**

**Mr. R. Katzman** (Rosthern): — I should like to welcome a special friend who is out in the audience, in the Speaker's Gallery, who came with the Bruno students, Mr. Gerald Delawski who is the fellow who will put my crop in if we don't get out of here.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J. G. Lane** (Qu'Appelle): — Before asking leave of the Assembly, I'd like to introduce a group and their teacher from Lumsden. They are accompanied by Ken Langford.

I don't know, with the Estimates, if I can inform the guests, the Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs will follow this afternoon, which happens to be my particular responsibility. I don't know whether we are going to get a chance to meet after or not. I certainly hope we do.

I would like to welcome them all to the Assembly and wish them an interesting day and a safe trip back to Lumsden.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **SECOND READINGS**

**Hon. W. E. Smishek** (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 74 — **An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the major changes in this Bill were announced during the Budget Speech. I refer to the increase in the rate of gasoline tax from 12 cents to 15 cents per gallon and the increase in the tax on the diesel fuel from 16 cents per gallon to 21 cents per gallon. Even with this increase as the Hon. Members will know, Saskatchewan has the second lowest gasoline tax in Canada.

The other significant feature in this Bill is in the exemption from tax for fuel used in snowmobiles, motor boats and water vessels in connection with commercial fishing activities. This measure will be of benefit to all commercial fishermen and will be a particular benefit to the commercial operators in the northern area.

The amendment also recognizes that commercial fishing activities in Saskatchewan has changed in the past few years to



April 30, 1976

include the extensive use of snowmobiles when the fishing is on in the wintertime.

The remaining amendments are primarily administrative. Firstly the aviation fuel is defined to ensure that individuals who have access to aviation fuel do not evade tax on gasoline by using aviation fuel in motor vehicles. Aviation fuel is currently taxed at four cents per gallon compared to 15 cents per gallon on gasoline.

Secondly, the Act will be amended to permit the issuance of third party demands similar to the provisions in the E & H tax and the income tax and virtually all other acts and statutes.

Thirdly, the amendment to Section 56 of The Fuel Petroleum Products Act will more accurately reflect the current administrative practices in registering motor vehicles. At present the only permanent record of vehicle ownership is the application for a certificate of registration for renewal thereof.

This minor technical amendment simply reflects the licensing procedures.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 74.

**Mr. C. P. MacDonald** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words. I think I expressed my opposition to this Bill during the Budget Debate and the vote in the Budget itself, but there are two or three things that I want to say.

First of all I don't believe 1976-77 is the year to increase taxes, particularly on fuel. There are two groups of people who are going to be severely hurt and one is the farmer who instead of getting a 7-cent rebate now gets a 4-cent rebate. I want the Minister to tell me whether or not the \$200 maximum is still in effect or has that been reduced on the rebate for farmers on their farm fuel. And the second group that is going to be hurt are the truckers.

I find this particularly onerous in this year, when the Minister gave to me during Financial Estimates, the Energy and Resource Development Fund's statistics. And today the Government of Saskatchewan has \$278,135,000 estimated balance at the end of 1975-76, sitting in the Energy Fund. The total disbursements last year were \$49 million out of which \$35 million was used in the consolidated fund for government programs that the Minister decided that they were essential for. By the end of this coming year there will be between \$400 million to \$500 million in this fund.

This comes as a direct revenue from gas and oil in the Province of Saskatchewan. And yet at this time you charge our farmers an additional 3 cents; truckers an additional 5 cents and charge every taxed user in the Province of Saskatchewan, and, once again it is an additional tax burden. I just find it very difficult to understand why you would increase the fuel tax when the Government has apparently a massive lush fund called the Energy Fund which they are using when they want, for the purpose they want, even putting \$35 million last year in the consolidated fund to use for government programs as they saw fit. They are taking another \$4 million or \$5 million out of this,

or \$10 million whatever the revenue is from this increase in fuel tax, from the Energy Fund that would not have been required.

I don't know what the purpose of the Minister is for saving this, keeping it there and using it only in bits and pieces and here we are going to have between \$400-\$500 million at the end of the year. Maybe they have desires to buy potash mines; maybe they have desires to do other things with that money, but that is the taxpayers' money of the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't think the priority should be potash over and above tax increases in this year of restraint. That is the one point that I want to make. I certainly object to the tax and I am going to vote against it. I think that 1976-77 is the wrong year for increased taxes. I think fuel tax, particularly, with \$400 to \$500 million sitting in that Energy Fund at the end of this year is a bad tax increase and to put the onus on the truckers who are having a very difficult time in Saskatchewan right now.

If I remember correctly the truckers' rates have not been increased for something like a year and the farmers whose costs of operation is continuing to skyrocket their net income this year will be substantially down from what it was one year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Smishek** (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 73 — **An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with two major items that were announced in this year's Budget, the introduction of a provincial income surtax and changes in the Saskatchewan Royalty Tax rebate.

The Income Surtax is designed to supplement the federal surtax which we think is inadequate because it affects only those persons whose taxable income exceeds \$30,000.

The provincial surtax is an integral part of our participation in the National Anti-inflation Program. We think that high income earners should play a greater part in the right against inflation. The surtax is being imposed for the 1976 taxation year. No decision will be made regarding the continuation of the surtax until we have reviewed the status of the National Anti-inflation Program and our role in that program.

As I recall, Mr. Speaker, during the Budget Address the Opposition Members did indicate general agreement with the principle, but did raise the question of whether this particular surtax is to be applied on an indefinite basis or for a specified period. As I have indicated it is for a specific period, subject to review of the effectiveness of the Anti-inflation Program.

The provincial surtax will be calculated at 10 per cent of the provincial income tax in excess of \$1,500 before taking into account the \$100 across-the-board tax reduction, which was introduced one year ago.

I would remind Hon. Members that this progressive \$100 across-the-board tax cut will be repeated in 1976 and will

represent a saving of \$32 million Saskatchewan taxpayers. This surtax will affect taxpayers whose 1976 taxable income exceeds \$16,200. For a taxpayer claiming a spouse and two children, total income would have to exceed \$21,200 before the surtax would apply. We estimate that only the top 7 per cent of income earners in Saskatchewan will pay the surtax in 1976 yielding approximately \$4 million to the Treasury.

Some Members of the Opposition have claimed that the level of taxation in Saskatchewan is too high. Now, from time to time, Opposition Members and others, compare Saskatchewan taxes with those in other provinces. Ontario is often held out as an example. Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the facts. Let's look at the two taxpayers.

One earning \$10,000 and one earning \$30,000, each claiming a spouse and two children and see how this tax level compares between Saskatchewan and Ontario. I say, Ontario, because that province has the wealthiest personal tax base per capita in Canada.

In Ontario the income tax rate is 30½ per cent. Their sales tax is 7 per cent and there are income tax credits administered through the income tax system. In addition, each family in Ontario this year is subject to \$384 annual medical care premiums. Earning \$10,000 the taxpayer in Ontario would have \$8,634 left after taxes. The person earning \$30,000 a year would have \$20,810 remaining after accounting for federal and provincial income taxes, the tax credits, the sales tax and the medical care premiums.

In Saskatchewan our income tax rate is 40 per cent of basic federal tax, plus the 10 per cent surtax on high income earners, less the \$100 tax credit. Instead of the property tax credit we have the Property Improvement Grant and in Saskatchewan there are no medical care premiums, as everybody knows.

The calculation shows that the \$10,000 income earner would have \$9,100 left in Saskatchewan after taxes. That is \$466 more disposable income than his counterpart in Ontario. Even, Mr. Speaker, at the \$30,000 level the Saskatchewan resident would have \$64 more left after taxes than the Ontario resident.

The results of this comparison are remarkable when you consider that the level of government services provided in Saskatchewan, with one balanced Budget after another, and the relative richness of Ontario tax base in comparison to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan royalty tax rebate was introduced last year in response to the November 18, 1974 Federal Budget, which disallowed the deduction of Crown royalties and similar taxes as a business expenditure in the calculation of corporate taxable income.

The Government of Saskatchewan strongly opposed this action. We announced that all royalties would continue to be deductible in the Province's corporate tax system.

Section 5 of this Bill will reinforce the original intent of the Saskatchewan royalty tax rebate. That is the full deductibility of Crown royalties and taxes for provincial corporate income tax purposes. The amendments to the Saskatchewan

royalty tax rebate are highly technical in nature, as probably the Hon. Members have noticed in the draft of the Bill.

I do not intend to elaborate on them at this time since they are, as I say, very technical. They can be more effectively examined, I believe, during the clause by clause consideration of this Bill in Committee of the Whole. However, they are also designed to ensure that Saskatchewan royalty tax rebate continues to permit the full deductibility of Crown royalties in the province's corporate income tax system.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I move second reading of the Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments again. Once again I express my opposition and I don't know why the Minister said I would agree with this particular proposal because I have no intention of voting for it. I want to give a couple of concerns that I have about the principle of the surtax.

It is a departure from the normal taxation formula used in the provinces of Canada. Saskatchewan will be the lone province in Canada with a surtax. I also say that even though the surtax may not be very high this year, it is the foot in the door. Yesterday, or last week, the Premier of Manitoba, I think, really expressed the philosophy of the NDP when he said that he was going to put a maximum or a limit on incomes in the Province of Manitoba.

**An Hon. Member:** — He didn't say that!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Yes he did, he said it would be two and a half times and that would be a limit. I suggest that this surtax is the first step in that direction. We will be the first province in Canada to charge a surtax. Once you initiate a tax, it is very difficult to withdraw that tax. It is also one of the very easy things for a government then to come in and start increasing the tax. If this is the principle of a surtax, and this is just a foot in the door, and in years ahead people earning \$30,000 are going to be subject to a different level of taxation than in any other province in Canada. And if there is any province in Canada that needs professional people, needs skilled tradesmen, it is the Province of Saskatchewan. And this certainly then will be the last place that they will come to reside if they have an option, no question about that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Minister did a comparison with Ontario. I sure like the way he uses his figures. He brings in those taxes that he wants, like the sales tax of 7 per cent. Why don't you take the total tax burden?

For example, the Province of Saskatchewan five years ago, of every dollar of revenue they got, they got 25 cents from the corporation. Now for every dollar of revenue they only get 15 cents from the corporations. The rest comes from individuals, the rest comes from personal income tax on individuals. It is a fact!

April 30, 1976

All that I am saying is that from 4 to 1 it is now 6 to 1, and it is the individuals in Saskatchewan who are paying the taxes.

I should also like to point out, Mr. Minister that it is not the big companies that provide the real sources of revenue from the Income Tax Act in Canada and in the Province of Saskatchewan; it is people in that middle income bracket and today \$30,000 is probably worth what was considered middle income \$15,000 or \$20,000 a few years ago. And these are the people who are really paying the heavy tax load in the Province of Saskatchewan and in the Dominion of Canada. By adding this, you are placing an additional burden on those people and those are the people, really, who support the Province of Saskatchewan and its programs and its other steps.

I say that this surtax will never be removed. It is part of the NDP philosophy, to nail the rich. It will have an impact on incentive and initiatives in the Province of Saskatchewan. It will have an impact upon the attraction of professional and skilled tradesmen to the Province of Saskatchewan in the future.

I say that if the Minister was sincere in saying that this was a step in the anti-inflation program he would have put a limit within the Bill and then next year he could have come back and re-introduced the Bill.

**An Hon. Member:** — It is there.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Yes, it is there, but you didn't tell us what you are going to do next year.

All that I am saying is that I think that this is the foot in the door. I think that it is a very regrettable step.

As the Minister indicated the other parts are very, very technical. I don't understand them and the Minister said he didn't either. I got his tax expert and from what I understand I will have some questions on the technical aspects in Committee of the Whole.

But, once again, I want to say the year 1976-77 is the wrong year to raise the taxes and really the person who is going to pay the biggest share of the surtax is the Saskatchewan farmer, again. He is the man who is just getting off the ground and for the first time he is starting to make a good living. He is one of the few people who will be in that particular area and I suggest that Saskatchewan farmers are the ones who are going to be nailed. I will oppose this measure as well.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Smishek** (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 72 — **An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.**

He said: This Bill to amend The Education and Health Tax Act is really companion legislation to the Bill to amend The

Fuel Petroleum Products Act. Because we are providing certain exemptions for tax under The Fuel Petroleum Act, it is necessary to have a corresponding exemption in The Education and Health Tax Act. Otherwise the fuel products would automatically be subject to the E and H tax.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that it was necessary to introduce this second Bill to accomplish this, however, a House amendment to Bill 49 was not possible since these specific sections were not dealt with in Bill 49. The sole purpose of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that those fuel products which are exempt under The Fuel Petroleum Products Act do not become taxable under the E and H tax. I trust that the Hon. Members opposite will support this Bill. I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:32 o'clock p.m.