

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**32nd Day**

**Tuesday, April 5, 1977.**

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I should like to take this opportunity to introduce a group of students located in the Speaker's Gallery. They are from the Westmount constituency in Saskatoon, from Westmount Public School. They are Grade Eight students accompanied by Mr. Koray and Mrs. Bowie. I want to join with other Members in welcoming these students to the Legislative Assembly and I hope they have an interesting and informative day and a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN** (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Legislature this afternoon on behalf of Premier Blakeney, a group of students from St. Luke School in the Premier's constituency. They are 26 in number and they are accompanied by their teacher, John Stockmal. I should say to the students that the Premier was disappointed that he couldn't meet with you today but he is out of the province. Perhaps he'll be back at another time and you'll have an opportunity to meet with him then.

I might also say that our colleague, the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Johnson) will be meeting with you a little later outside in the rotunda. So we would like to welcome you today and hope you have a very interesting time here in the Legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.N. WIPF** (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly a group of 70 students in the east gallery. These are Grade Eight students from the Westmore Junior High School in Prince Albert. I'll be meeting with them after for a drink and pictures. I hope that their stay here is educational and informative. I know the Assembly will wish with me that they have a safe trip back home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**CONSTITUTIONAL REVISIONS**

**MR. E.C. MALONE** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General in the absence of the Premier. I have in front of me a press release issued from the Premier's office, either yesterday or today, in connection with the Premier's speech last night in Montreal. I should like to direct the Attorney General to a part of the speech where the Premier

indicates that your government would be prepared to support some constitutional revisions for Canada and that you pledged this province's willingness to support these revisions, so-called. The speech itself was not made public as far as I know or copies were not distributed. My question to the Attorney General now is, what constitutional revisions is the Premier referring to and before making any statement on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, is it your intention to bring these revisions or whatever they are, to this House for debate?

**HON. R. ROMANOW** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, any answer that I give will, of course, have to be conditional upon the Premier's return because I frankly have not had an opportunity to discuss his speech. I would simply point out to the Leader of the Opposition, that as he will know, for some months now since the Prime Minister, about a year or a year and a half ago, suggested that we should consider in Canada the patriation of the Constitution, there has been an ongoing discussion among all the Premiers and from time to time with federal authorities, on the need to have certain revisions and accommodations for the Constitution. Several things come to mind as possible topics for amendment. One deals with the question of communications. I think Members will know the concern that a number of provinces have on communications. Another one is concerning itself with natural resources, confirming provincial powers on natural resources and the rights to taxation. One could go on in the list in this regard.

The former Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, had a shopping list which, of course, was the subject of a Premiers' discussion in Edmonton in August. That was followed with a further meeting in Toronto in October and a package was then submitted to the Prime Minister subsequent to October. And I have no doubt that the Premier was referring to that kind of a package or perhaps even to that package with one or two modifications.

**MR. MALONE:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps then I could be more specific. Recently, of course, the Government of Quebec brought down its White Paper on language rights in that province and I think that most Canadians probably deplore the suggestions in that White paper. My question to the Attorney General is, the White Paper of course is not law but it would appear that in due course it will be law, is it the Government's intention to make any recommendations to Ottawa if that White Paper becomes law, with a view to requesting that Ottawa disallow the legislation or at the very least, have the matter referred to the Supreme Court of Canada on a constitutional referendum?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the Leader of the Opposition any specific answer to that today. We are looking at the White Paper. Frankly, I think it has only arrived today in my office and I haven't had a chance to look at it at all. Furthermore, as the Leader of the Opposition will undoubtedly know, governments do, from time to time, table White Papers but they are not one and the same as the actual legislation that may be introduced. I am certainly concerned from what the press reports seem to be respecting the initial reporting of the White Paper, but I think above that, it would be inappropriate for me and undesirable to say anything specifically in terms of a course of

April 5, 1977.

action. I think we have to really see what Quebec does, if anything, in this regard.

**MR. MALONE:** — Final supplementary. Then can I get an assurance from the Attorney General that once you have had an opportunity of perusing the White Paper that this Government will make its views known to the Government of Quebec, as to whether it is in favor of the contents of that White Paper or if it, as I do, deplores the contents of that White Paper?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, again I can't give the Opposition any assurance that a representation will be made to the Quebec Government. We table in the Saskatchewan Legislature White Papers which affect Saskatchewan people, albeit the White Paper on language policy in Quebec seems to have a wider ramification than simply affecting the people of Quebec but I simply start from the basic proposition that it certainly has been, up to now, not a general policy for one Legislature to comment on White Papers of governments tabled in other Legislatures. It may be that, by virtue of the gravity of the situation facing Canada and the importance of the White Paper, we may need to make an exception in this case. I don't know. I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition that I am in no position today to say one way or the other since we haven't looked officially at the White Paper.

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South): — I was going to direct another supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker, to the acting Premier . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The Member for Morse.

#### **LAMB PROCESSORS CO-OPERATIVE LIMITED**

**MR. J. WIEBE** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last Thursday a meeting of the shareholders of the Lamb Processors Co-operative Limited in Innisfail was held and at which time they were notified that their co-operative had gone into receivership that the Alberta Government had taken over control of all the liabilities and assets of that particular company. The Saskatchewan Government recently purchased \$50,000 worth of shares in that particular co-operative and I was just wondering if the Minister could advise this House who represented the Government of Saskatchewan at that particular shareholders' meeting and what was the Government of Saskatchewan's position in regard to the Alberta takeover?

**HON. E.E. KAEDING** (Minister of Agriculture): — Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know we are only one of the shareholders of that co-operative and as such, we are entitled to one representative from the Government. It appears at the present time that it is uncertain as to what the status of our investment there is. However, we do know that the Government of Alberta intends to continue to operate the Processors Co-op in one way or another, either through a private company or by itself. We are assured that they intend to continue to process lamb and they will require that of any private processor who might go in there. And so we feel that even if we should not be able to regain our investment in terms of the \$50,000, it

would still help to provide for our producers an outlet where they can process their lamb products and so I think that we will not have lost in any case.

**MR. WIEBE:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I was in conversation with the Alberta Government this morning and they have advised me that the value of shares now is zero. I am just wondering what negotiations your Government is undertaking or instrumenting with the Government of Alberta to protect Saskatchewan's investment in this and, as well, protect the sheepgrowers of Saskatchewan? It is my understanding that many of them have only received 25 per cent of the value of the sheep which they have marketed through that particular processing co-operative.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that Saskatchewan producers have not received their full value for the sheep that they have processed through that plant. If that is the case, I should like to investigate it. I say, again, as far as the shares are concerned, it could well be that the value of those shares are zero, but at the same time we have the assurance from the Government of Alberta that the plant will continue to process lamb products and this will be of benefit to Saskatchewan producers. So even if we have lost the value of those shares, the value to the people of Saskatchewan is not lost.

**MR. R.E. NELSON** (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — A final supplementary. The Minister is no doubt aware that the many farmers that have been shipping their lambs to that plant for the last while, in fact the last two months, have just received 25 per cent of the pay for their lambs. What action will the Minister take to see that they are immediately paid the 75 per cent balance owing them?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a question which I should like to examine before I make any reply and I will take that as notice.

#### **JUVENILE CAMPS IN NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN**

**MR. H.W. LANE** (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — I have a question for the Attorney General. The Attorney General has by now no doubt heard the press release given by Mr. Eugene David yesterday in tendering his resignation from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

In the press release he makes very serious allegations of the prevention of laying of charges by the RCMP and, for the lack of a better word, the attempted cover up within the department.

My question is this, are these allegations the subject of the investigation and possibly you will agree that these are the subject of potential criminal charges, are these within the scope of the investigation which you alluded to in the House yesterday?

**HON. R. ROMANOW** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to see the statement by Mr. David to check it, nor have I had an opportunity

April 5, 1977.

to refer it yet to the members of my department staff for further advice. From the judgment that I would make from the newspaper reports, I, of course, cannot subscribe to the suggestion that this is a cover up, as the Hon. Member colorfully describes it.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I believe when a copy of the press release comes to your attention, you will see that Mr. David alleges that the DNS was concerned that this matter be kept quiet and internal, this matter of the wilderness camp. My question then is this, are you aware, Mr. Attorney General, at this time, of any efforts by the DNS to keep this matter from the public as alleged by Mr. David?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I've said this now several times, over and over again and I will repeat again to the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. The answer is a loud and clear no. I've had no information to that effect and neither has the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Furthermore, it is not like the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland misrepresents. The newspaper reports from David's argument was not that the DNS tried to keep the matter quietened down, but he alleged an allegation against one person — one Mr. Worster. Now we don't know what Mr. Worster's side of the story is. It's a recollection of a purported conversation between David and Mr. Worster. I say that the Conservatives, by this continual manipulation of the truth, are playing very irresponsibly on a serious matter.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary question to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). Do you agree with the Attorney General that this is the first time the matter of allegations of a cover up or of suppression of the RCMP laying charges has come to your attention, i.e. with the release of the press statement by Mr. Eugene David yesterday? Is that the first you've heard of this matter?

**HON. G.R. BOWERMAN** (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, the continuing probe by the Conservatives in this matter only indicates their overriding interest in cheap politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — I know who released that information to the Conservative Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake. I know who released that departmental material to him and I know that he made a commitment to that staff person not to reveal it. I know that this cheap political manoeuvre in this Legislature belies the fact that this Member . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I think we're getting into the area of ascribing allegations of one kind or another to different Members. I'll take the Member for Wilkie.

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Would you not agree that the main concern in this matter is the young

people and that this type of a discussion in the House is indeed hurting them and it would be best to have a public inquiry so it would get out of this political hassle?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with the Hon. Member for Wilkie. This matter was handled by a question in the Oral Question Period by the Members of the Conservative Party. If they had at least come to me privately and said that they had this report and asked where I stood on it, then I could have said that they had some concern for the young people. If they'd come privately to the Member for Northern Saskatchewan and asked what he had done on the closing and said if he didn't give it in a day or so they were going to make it public, then I could understand they had some concern for the private kids. But the matter was made a public issue and politicized and has continued to be politicized on a day to day basis by the Conservatives. I couldn't agree more with what you say. We've got to consider the interests of the children. Now I think that that's really where the further deliberations of this matter should lie, not on the business of the Conservatives trying to continue making cheap politics on the lives of obviously difficult personalities.

### **LAMB PROCESSING CO-OPERATIVE LIMITED**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture with respect to the same topic, you were being asked questions earlier on and that's with respect to the investment in the lamb processing plant in Alberta. I'm looking at an Order in Council passed September 2, 1975 in which, I gather, the Department of Co-operatives has no power under its legislation to invest outside of the province, by what authority did you get fleeced or sheared with respect to the \$50,000 that was put up?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member has indicated that that was a decision made by the Department of Co-operatives. I suggest that he should ask the Minister of the Department of Co-operatives.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Well the Minister is a member of the Executive Council. Can the Minister not tell me whether there is authority and where you presumed to have drawn your authority to invest the \$50,000 outside the province? I say you don't have it.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I should indicated that at that time I was not a member of the Executive Council. However, we'll check that and take that as notice.

### **MEETING OF FIRST ENERGY MINISTERS**

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT:** — (Regina Wascana) I wonder if I might direct a question to the Deputy Minister in the absence of the Premier. There is a meeting tomorrow of the First Ministers in Ottawa, the First Energy Ministers. I would be interested in knowing whether the Premier intends to attend as the head of the Energy Secretariat or not.

April 5, 1977.

I see also that the Minister in charge of Mineral Resources is not in his place and I assume that he intends to attend. I wonder why no position has been announced. Would the Government be good enough to indicate what your attitude will be at the meetings of the First Energy Ministers?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I fully understood the Member or whether he, in fact, said this, but my understanding is that the meeting which starts tomorrow is a meeting of Energy Ministers alone and not Premiers or Prime Ministers, provincial Premiers. In that context the Premier, who, as Members will know, has a speaking engagement in Montreal, will be back in the House tomorrow. The position that we are taking at this particular stage in the game is that the question of the oil price is a matter on which we can't enunciate our position at this time, because we want to know what the federal position is going to be, as it will be revealed tomorrow. We want to know what posture the Federal Government thinks the oil producing provinces should take on the price for oil and what implications that has for us in some areas, such as heavy oil and so forth. Accordingly, I think, that I would ask the Member to stand his question until tomorrow. At that time we'll have a better idea as to what the opening approach is of the Federal Government and in order not to perhaps disrupt or impair the positions taken, we should await the first meetings tomorrow.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared not to ask the other questions that interest me in that area but might I ask why have there been consultations between our Energy Minister and the Energy Minister of Alberta? Is it the intention of the Government to present a unified approach, if I may put it that way?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I must tell the House candidly that I did not discuss this in detail with the Minister of Energy before he left but I have checked with the Minister of Finance and to the best of our knowledge there has been no prior consultation with the view to setting up a united front. Accordingly, the next part of your question is also answered; to the best of my knowledge, there is no united front in this regard. It's a question of coming and listening to the submissions. We will be putting forward the best Saskatchewan position that we can but there is no union between the Conservative Government of Alberta and our Government of Saskatchewan in this regard.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — As I have understood the position in the past, it has always been that the Government of Saskatchewan believes that domestic oil should rise to the world levels. Will you be advancing that position or some variance of it, depending on the view of the national Government?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, again I don't want to play a word game but I think it is important. I believe that the position of the Government has been that we should aim towards the world price. And I think maybe the Member thinks the same thing, but there is a difference between aiming towards it and being at the world price, because we recognize that it may not be possible given the rest of Canada's interests, the industrial interests of central Canada. That is something that I think we need not look out for, they can look after themselves. All of these

factors have to be taken into consideration as to the level of the prices. Now as I said, I don't want to get into a word game with the Member. I think it is correct to say that the general position of the Government has been that it is valuable oil, a valuable resource which is rapidly depleting and we must, on behalf of the citizens of Saskatchewan, get the best price that we can for that oil, keeping in mind our commitments as Canadians to other parts of Canada. And that is, I think, the nitty gritty of the deliberations and the discussions and the bargaining that will take place in the next day or so.

## **JUVENILE CAMPS IN NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN**

**MR. H.W. LANE** (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. A few minutes ago the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) indicated to this Assembly that this was the first time either of you had heard about the incident of Mr. David's press release, stating the allegations of a cover up. You did not answer my question. Is this the first you have heard about it? Please answer the question, or do you refuse to answer it?

**HON. G.R. BOWERMAN** (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Member insists or will persist in this line of questioning. The information has been made available to the House many times. The information that we have, that I have, indicates that when the Royal Canadian Mounted Police came to visit with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan officials, on the 1st day of February, that they made an immediate response and went to the camp.

**MR. LANE:** — Cover up.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well the Member says, "Cover up." I only wish to indicate that it is sinful the way that you fellows are proceeding on this issue. You have gotten one of the Members of the staff of Northern Saskatchewan to perjure himself in giving you confidential information in the first place and when you promised not to divulge it, you broke your promise in that respect. You don't even have the decency to sit in the Chamber let alone raise questions.

## **CONSTITUTIONAL REVISIONS**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South): — I would happily defer to the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald), Mr. Speaker, who has been trying desperately to get a question; I rose really to give him a question. I want to ask a question of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), along the same subject matter as Mr. Malone's earlier questions. I note reports that the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) had indicated in Montreal that Canadians may have to get used to a constitutional arrangement which would give one or more provinces special constitutional powers or, in other words, some special status. I would ask of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) what was meant by that reference to special status, which perhaps may be given to one province in Confederation?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't



April 5, 1977.

answer that because frankly I have not seen the text and don't know in what context it was said. But the position of this Government is clear. We believe that all the provinces should be equal provinces in Confederation. What we do have to take into account, and I am not going to use the word special because that is open to misinterpretation, is the peculiar nature of Quebec as a part of Canada; the bilingual policy of Mr. Trudeau is based on that fact. But we have to also acknowledge the fact that there may need to be a loosening or changing of the division of provincial powers in order to clarify some areas, an example being the resource area, in order to give some powers to the provinces which by technology, something that our forefathers 110 years ago could never have foreseen, should be in the hands of the provinces. Now if that involves a kind of a specialty, so be it, but in the context of saying a specialty for one province, I would be surprised if that is what the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) indeed intended or indeed communicated in his speech in Montreal. But I am at a handicap because I haven't seen the remarks. I don't have them in front of me, I am sorry.

**MR. CAMERON:** — By way of supplementary, I presume the Premier, if he was making a major comment, he would have discussed it in the Executive Council first. May I ask you to give us an assurance then, that currently the Government of Saskatchewan is not prepared to see any constitutional reform unless it applies equally to all provinces? Or to express it another way, we would be opposed to giving special powers to a single province or two provinces as opposed to all of them.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly say that that has been the position and I have no reason to assume that there has been a change in that position in Montreal. It was a major speech but one that did not, so far as I can tell, involve any major change in policy of the Government. If it would have, I am sure the Premier would have discussed it as open debate in Cabinet, but I would certainly say, based on what has happened in the past, that that kind of an assurance can be given to the Member for Regina South.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to pursue the line of questioning of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Malone) and the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron). I appreciate that the Attorney General has not got the text of the Premier's speech in Quebec. I have a copy of the press release and it would appear to me to strangely represent the viewpoint of 35 or 40 per cent of NDP supporters in Saskatchewan, and not the majority of the people in Saskatchewan. It talks about economic control, masters of our own house; it strangely reminds me of Bill 42 and the potash take-over. I would like to ask the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) if he can give the assurance to this House that any recommendations to the Federal Government in relation to the revision of the constitution will be publicly debated by resolution in this House, that all Members will have an input, which is traditional in this Assembly and traditional when we come to discuss major revisions to the constitution of Canada, which affects all of Saskatchewan and not just the NDP supporters?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well I think, Mr. Speaker, certainly since the November

15 events in Quebec, I, for one, would be prepared to say that is an option which must be maintained, an option kept open. Prior to November 15 and perhaps even post November 15, I think a government is entitled to take the position that it will make policy statements or announce programs in a whole variety of areas, as it does and then respond to Opposition questions in the Legislature or in Estimates or whatever, or through your resolutions for the policy. One could argue, reasonably, we should maintain that, even with the constitution in deliberations. Certainly we have done that prior to November 15. I have said to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Malone) for some weeks, some months before November 15, we are involved in a constitutional process at the request of the Prime Minister of Canada. Now November 15 may have changed all of that and if the Government doesn't come in with a resolution or something of that nature, then I think it is open to the Members of the Opposition to put a private Members' resolution on the Order Paper or to state some other kind of an emergency date to discuss this, if they think we are going in the wrong direction.

## **STATEMENTS**

### **CROWN CORPORATION REPORTS**

**HON. E. COWLEY** (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a very brief statement. Last day in the Question Period the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) raised the question of whether or not some Crown corporations were filing their reports beyond the period which they were entitled to.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Member for Biggar is transgressing on my area now. The Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) had asked for a ruling on the matter and I intend to present a ruling before the Orders of the Day, if I may. I am not looking for any more guidance at this moment.

## **RULING BY MR. SPEAKER:**

### **CROWN CORPORATION REPORTS**

He said: Yesterday, before the Orders of the Day the Hon. Member for Regina South rose on a Point of Privilege concerning the tabling of annual reports of the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation and the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation within the legal time limits. I deferred my ruling at that time.

I refer all Hon. Members to The Tabling of Documents Act, Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1973, Chapter 3, Section 3, subsection 2, page 578 which states that annual reports are to:

Be forwarded within 90 days after the end of the period in respect of which the document is prepared by the proper officers of the department, board, commission or agent of the Government of Saskatchewan in respect of which the document is prepared to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. A member of the Executive Council or such other person as the Act pursuant to which the document is prepared directs the documents to be forwarded for such purpose.

April 5, 1977.

And further, Section 6 of the same Act states:

Where at the time a document is received by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council a member of the Executive Council or any other person under Section 5, a spring session or a fall session of the Legislature is then in progress, the document shall be laid before or submitted to the Legislative Assembly (a) in the case of a spring session within 15 days after the session commenced or within 15 days after the day in which the document was received, whichever is the later; (b) in the case of a fall session within 15 days after the session commenced or within 15 days after the day in which the document was received, whichever is later.

The Acts covering both the Crown corporations mentioned in the Point of Privilege have a year ending December 31st and both are required to table their reports under the requirements of The Tabling of Documents Act, 1973, in both cases within a year ending December 31st. The maximum time allowed for the corporation to submit its report to the Minister responsible for the corporation is March 31st, i.e. 90 days following the year end. The Minister under the Act has 15 sitting days after March 31st in order to table the report. Assuming that the Assembly sits five days per week the Minister is not required to table the report until approximately the end of the third week of April, in the Assembly is sitting, as it is at present.

I, therefore, find that the said reports were tabled within the time limits described in The Tabling of Documents Act. I rule that there is no prima facie case for privilege.

## **POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

### **MR. EUGENE DAVID**

**MR. J.G. LANE** (Qu'Appelle): — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to raise a matter of privilege under Rule 6. I realize notice hasn't been given but it was a matter raised by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan during the Question Period when he accused Mr. Eugene David of having perjured himself. Is that the statement, that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan said that Mr. Eugene David perjured himself? If that is not the fact, then the Minister should unequivocally withdraw that statement.

**MR. ROMANOW**: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak to this. First of all, I am awfully tempted to comment on what the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan actually said as opposed to what the Member for Qu'Appelle misrepresents the Minister from Northern Saskatchewan as saying, but I am not going to because that's not the point. The point is, as I understand it, that a Question of Privilege relates to a privilege of the House affecting one of the Members. Here the Hon. Member alleges some sort of a privilege or a breach affecting somebody else, one Eugene David or others if you listened to the remarks made. Mr. Speaker, my submission to you is that while I am extremely anxious and I believe that there will be an opportunity shortly to do so, to discuss this matter, I submit to you that it is not within the rules of the Assembly when one talks of privileges in the sense of privilege of Members or Members' rights. Nothing that the Minister said could fall in that category.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Are there any other comments on this particular point?

The Member has had an opportunity to state what he believed to be his Point of Privilege. I listened as carefully as I could when the Member was giving it and it strikes me that what the Member was raising was, in fact, a debating point and is not a point of Privilege and consequently I cannot consider it as a Point of Privilege.

### **POINTS OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER** (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives) — Mr. Speaker, I rise then on a Point of Order and I would ask the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan if in his remarks during Question Period today he referred to the word ‘perjure’ to anyone.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Member is not raising a Point of Order.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I have a Point of Order and I would like to raise my Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. My Point of Order relates to the comments raised a week or so ago by the Member for Regina-South (Mr. Cameron) respecting the prefacing of the remarks of particular Members of the Conservative caucus, prior to making a question. I allege, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the Conservative Party in the Question Period, especially today, totally misrepresented the answers which were given, prefaced those questions erroneously and without justification according to the rules. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you bring them to order in that account.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would ask Members when raising Points of Order to raise the Point of Order and not get into the debate of the particular matter to which they are referring. I think the Attorney General was getting into the debate of the matter.

I would say with regard to the Point of Order that the Attorney General was raising, that I find it difficult to deal with the Question Period if Members quite often frame their questions in a debatable manner, a manner which begs debate from the person who is answering the question. I think we saw that quite clearly today when the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland asked a question a second time, the same question, which incidentally was out of order, and the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan responded in the same manner, which incidentally was out of order as well. I think both Members are to be faulted on the manner in which the question was asked and the manner in which the answer was given. I think there was plenty of error there and the record will show it.

### **MOTION**

### **HOUSE ADJOURNMENT**

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I should like to move by leave of the Assembly a motion, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Finance

April 5, 1977.

(Mr. Smishek):

That when this Assembly adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1977, it do stand adjourned until Monday, April 11th, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 9 — PUBLICLY OWNED NATIONAL RAIL PASSENGER CORPORATION**

**MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK** (Melville) moved, seconded by Mr. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly expresses its support for the creation of a publicly-owned national rail passenger corporation to improve transcontinental passenger service and, within the western region, to operate a Winnipeg to Calgary and Winnipeg to Edmonton rapid transit service.

He said: It might be suggested, Mr. Speaker, that because of certain things happening in passenger transportation in the past month or so that it might be suggested that this Resolution is unnecessary. However, I say that the passenger railway transportation in the West, as proposed by Via, needs to be scrutinized, Mr. Speaker, and needs to be reassessed, therefore, I think the Resolution is very much in order and needed.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to move this Resolution, a Resolution very similar in meaning and content to the one I introduced in this House on April 6, 1976. Not only is it similar in context but, at the risk of offending the present Leader of the Opposition, I maintain that to the western people, the central western people, rail passenger transportation, particularly in the near future, is a very important issue and of a vital consequence. Therefore, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is timely and also one of the important ones on the Order Paper.

Rail transportation, including passenger transportation, is still today a powerful link that binds our country together and serves as a catalyst even today to unite the powerful economic regions with the weak. In spite of some of these geographic regions not being able to provide the economic basis to sustain and pay for such services, nonetheless, these links must be maintained and kept, in the best interests of the whole country.

I am one, Mr. Speaker, who does not believe that only the economically viable regions be maintained, serviced and kept. In a country like Canada with such great wide-ranging differences geographically, economically and socially, there is no way that the viability and the general state and health of this country can be maintained and developed by governments, particularly Federal Governments, applying discriminating practices, based simply on the economics of the case. A country is only as strong as its weakest link.

It has been reported in the news media that Robert Bandeen, President of the CNR, has suggested that profit bearing utilities of the CNR should be sold on the stock exchange to the general public. I say that would be a mistake, Mr. Speaker,

to sell those areas of the CNR bearing profits and retain those that bear a loss. In the area of utilities that affect the whole of our country or the whole province, the trend should be the other way. The keynote, above all else, should be service and not profit, even though we all understand that any operation must pay for itself or, for that matter, that operations in the heavily concentrated areas must help balance out payments for services in the less lucrative areas, or as a last resort, Mr. Speaker, they must be subsidized from the Government Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we, in the West, will receive justice from the Federal Government in any of the transportation policies now being discussed and debated in Ottawa. I have very serious doubts, particularly with the same Minister still in charge of transportation, and vying for more power all the time. According to a report in a western newspaper the Hon. Otto Lang wants to be 'Czar of Transportation'. Really if you look at all the facts assembled, he is proceeding to trample the combined wishes of most of the western people. He is on his way to becoming that 'Czar' unless there is an election soon and then the people of Saskatoon-Humboldt probably will have something to say about that.

Mr. Lang has in no way deviated, Mr. Speaker, from his course of 'user pay policy' although he's dressed up the idea in a new coat and called it 'commercial viability'. This last is readily evident in his argument and approach to The National Transportation Act (Bill C 33) now before the House of Commons in Ottawa.

The new Via concept of passenger transportation is still not very clear. But it certainly is a change in the position of the Transport Minister and the Canadian Transport Commission. The resolutions in this House and debates in this House and others as well, the many petitions to the Federal Government, the briefs presented to the Railroad Transportation Hearing, my briefs as well as those of many other Members of this House presented to the Commission last year, had a definite effect on the Transportation Minister, Mr. Lang, and the Federal Government, because Via is a new idea, and it is an acceptable idea, Mr. Speaker. It has possibilities as a public utility, a Crown corporation and I agree that it is a step in the right direction. But, Mr. Speaker, just taking a step is not enough. Just taking out a weak link in a system, modernizing it in the strong areas (and I am talking about areas where the proposal has already been in effect, the Montreal-Windsor link and the Montreal-Toronto link) but cutting and paring it down to where it no longer becomes a viable and useful service on the prairies is not acceptable to me nor to the people of the prairie provinces. At one time according to a rumor or a leak (that was quite a while ago) it was said there was going to be only one line running across the prairies. Now it's quite evident that they are thinking of two lines to service central Saskatchewan, as the people of western Canada had asked for.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we want and need a passenger rail line service in Saskatchewan. I say we accept the idea that Via presents, with cautious optimism, cautious optimism as expressed by Michael Jackson, the chairman of the Saskatchewan Rail Committee.

Here is some of the cautious optimism that is being stated and some of the specific reservations that we have, Mr. Speaker.

April 5, 1977.

I'd like to include these in the remarks made here this afternoon. The reservations as outlined by the Transport 2,000 Committee and the Saskatchewan Rail Committee are:

1. That the Board of Directors of Via should include consumer representatives.
2. Careful financial arrangements should be made between Via and the contracting railways to minimize costs charged to passengers and the taxpayers, avoidable costing procedures should be used.
3. Canadian Pacific, in being relieved of its obligation to provide passenger service to Canadians, should be obliged to hand over its passenger equipment and stations to Via, free of charge or at a minimal salvage value.
4. Passenger rail should be improved across Canada and not just in the Ontario-Quebec corridor. We strongly protest against the cutbacks in Maritime rail service threatened by Mr. Lang and this goes for the western regions as well.
5. Substantial capital investment is needed to modernize our rail network; government priorities should be shifted from air to rail in the context of a coherent national transport policy.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the five reservations that we voice as a Government and also as a people of the Transport 2,000 and the Saskatchewan Rail Committee.

These questions must be answered, Mr. Speaker, before approval of this Crown corporation is given in western Canada. We want to know where we stand in regard to adequate service for all of Canada, not just the high density areas of the Montreal, Windsor, Toronto area, Mr. Speaker, but all of Canada.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I could repeat the many reasons outlined in my last year's presentation as to why rail passenger service should be improved, updated and modernized in Canada. I will just briefly itemize them.

1. The energy question.
2. The pollution question.
3. The rail line as a connecting link of Canada as a whole country.
4. The economic advantages to the people in the lower state of income who cannot afford to fly, Mr. Speaker, except of course, the Transport Minister, Mr. Lang, who doesn't care for the regular flight service, but has a jet of his own now. Wouldn't I like to have a jet of my own and many others of us here as well!

**MR. CAMERON:** — . . . have your own . . .

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — I see the member for Regina South wouldn't mind having a jet of his own either.

5. The outpouring of money by the Federal Government to air services, airfields, would be better, far better

served in the future on a rational rail line passenger improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I could mention many other points which indicate why we, in Canada, and particularly we, the people of the prairies, need greatly improved transcontinental rail line passenger service, but I think that the points I have outlined are enough to open up the debate on improved passenger service.

This Resolution was put on the Order Paper way back in November, Mr. Speaker. As I already indicated, many things have happened since, in approaches and discussions regarding rail line transportation in general, but a great deal is on the table right now in Ottawa and elsewhere, regarding this very important question, and this discussion should go on.

Bill C 33, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is being debated right now and I do hope that our western MPs, including Mr. Horner from Alberta, will band together to assist Les Benjamin in his attack on that Bill, because it is clearly evident that the Hon. Otto Lang persists in his approach of "user pay policy", even there. The Bill as is, fails to come to grips with the fact that passenger rail transportation in Canada should be operated as a public utility rather than as a private business for profit.

I think that we, the people, including Members of this House, make it obviously clear where we stand on these questions. I am certain that others will want to participate in this debate on passenger rail line transportation and I would hope that we express our approach on this specific question by endorsing this Resolution unanimously and, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move this Resolution.

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG** (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, for the relief of those opposite, I'll be very brief. I won't go into a long drawn out dialogue on the benefits of a publicly owned national rail passenger corporation. I believe it's very apparent, particularly over the last week to week and a half, when one sees the carnage on our roads, when one sees the depleting amount of fuel that we have in known supply, when one sees the terrific amount of pollution that's evident throughout the country and throughout the world, that we must use the most efficient forms of transportation that one can visualize.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support and second the Motion by my hon. colleague. I believe he has put the case very straight forward as to the reason and the method that should be used in bringing about the ends to the Resolution that he has proposed at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we are still bound in this country with those people who believe that air is the only method of transportation. I'd like to suggest that all Members of this House had an opportunity and all parties again had an opportunity before the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission, to express their views to that Commission not too long ago this past summer, as to the use of rail transcontinental passenger service in Canada.

I regret again to mention that those opposite did not, to my knowledge, take advantage of that opportunity provided to make their views and their party's views known before that Commission that travelled across Canada.



April 5, 1977.

I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is rather difficult, as my hon. colleague has suggested, when one notes what the Hon. Member of Parliament from Crowfoot, Mr. Horner, said in the House of Commons in Ottawa as to the use of transcontinental passenger train service. I'm not certain if he was expressing the views of the Liberals or Conservatives at that particular moment, but at least he did take exception to his brother in Alberta as to the position that he adopted in that province. It's rather remarkable when one views the difference of opinion of the same family when it comes to the type of transportation system we should have in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention one particular area that is associated with the rail passenger transportation in Canada, and that is the national rail passenger corporation, Via. I believe that all communities and all municipalities should pay particular attention to the type of efforts being put in by the Federal Government, supported in the main by the provinces, to bring into effect a national rail transportation corporation in order to serve efficiently and quickly the people of this country.

I would like to remind the Members who are representing various municipalities that they do have within their municipality rail stations of some great magnitude. I would like to suggest that in Regina and Moose Jaw, as two typical examples on the main line of the Canadian Pacific which goes from Montreal to Vancouver, they do have stations that could be used and should be retained as transportation centres that will serve, not only rail passengers, but also the bus transportation. I'd like to say to my hon. colleague on this side of the House from Regina, that I would hope that we would support the position of retaining this rail passenger station here in Regina, to serve the needs of the people. If there is a way, of course, the means are available to bring that about.

Already in Moose Jaw we have had good consultation with the Canadian Pacific management and the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation and with the various departments of Government to try and retain that rail station for a multi-purpose use insofar as bus and rail service are concerned. Of course, all of us are waiting, at this particular time, for the final determination of the Railway Transport Commission insofar as transcontinental passenger train service is concerned.

I would hate to think for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that if, in fact, when the commission does rule, that they fail to take into recognition the need of the two services particularly from Winnipeg to Vancouver, serving both the north and south parts of our western provinces. There is no question whatsoever, that under Via and with the new equipment that can be supplied and is being supplied, that we can bring about a renewed type of effort to get people off the roads back onto the rail, where they can have that safe, fast, efficient rail passenger service.

I would think that the service particularly from Winnipeg to Vancouver must remain on both the north and south routes from Winnipeg through Saskatoon via Kamloops to Vancouver and the same from Winnipeg through Regina, Moose Jaw, Swift Current, Medicine Hat, Calgary and on to Vancouver, on the Canadian Pacific mainline. I do not think that there is a duplication of service, Mr. Speaker, in this particular regard. It appears to me that we must wait now and see whether or not the commission

realized that we are entitled to that type of consideration. We did have some commitment from the Federal Government when they had their meeting in Calgary, two or three years ago.

I would sincerely urge that the Members of this House support this Resolution. I think there is no question at all that we are entitled, in the West, to some type of recognition of the type of rail service that could be evident and I do believe that under those conditions the Resolution is completely in line. I might just suggest to the Members of this House that some of the evidence that has been produced indicates that with the rail service now from Montreal to Vancouver, the average speed at this time is 41 miles per hour on the Canadian Pacific. On the Canadian National it's 39 miles per hour. If you increase that speed, which can be done with the existing trackage and existing equipment, to 60 miles per hour, you can pick up 12 hours from Vancouver to Montreal. This is a considerable saving in time and compares favorably with other modes of transport, other than air service, if you take that into consideration.

Of course if you take the shorter runs on rail service compared to air service, it has been proven beyond any reasonable doubt that you are still able to, in a 200 mile radius, travel by rail downtown to downtown much more quickly than you can by air service from downtown to downtown. I think Mirabel in the Montreal area is a typical example. It is an airport that was built long before it was necessary, which has been proven beyond any reasonable doubt. With the \$25 taxi fare from downtown Montreal to Mirabel and the time involved there, you can travel much quicker from Ottawa to Montreal by rail than you can possibly travel by air, and that is nothing unusual. In fact, the Toronto-Ottawa area is the same way. The Edmonton-Calgary area, Mr. Speaker, is the exact same situation. That has been proven beyond any doubt whatsoever.

With those few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I express my complete support to the Resolution. I urge all Members to support it. I do believe that we have the makings now of a publicly-owned national rail transportation corporation under the term Via. I believe it is a logical approach to a long-standing problem that we have had and I certainly, in closing, again ask the Members opposite to support this Resolution.

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South) — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to direct some comment to the Resolution. It never ceases to amaze me how a Member can place before the House a Resolution which, standing on its own with no argument, could probably draw the support of all of us, and then finish up after his argument, making some of us have second thoughts. And I say that, not with reference to the Member for Moose Jaw, but with reference to the Member for Melville. The Resolution in itself is a very good Resolution, and indeed, it is a good subject for this Assembly to be debating, particularly currently because there are fundamental changes going on in this area. But as I say, it never ceases to leave me with some bewilderment and amazement that the Member can put a Resolution of this nature on the Order Paper and then make a speech designed almost deliberately to draw Members to vote against and not support him in it. I do not know what sort of level of paranoia exists with respect to some Members over there, about the Minister of Transport, but it is strange when that Minister can be doing the very thing the Member for Melville asks him to do and still be criticized for it. Because that is, of course, exactly what the Member for Melville was doing.

April 5, 1977.

The Member knows Bill C 33 is now before Parliament. He invited us to stand beside Mr. Benjamin and fight against it for some strange reason. That Bill C 33 is one which we have been fighting for in this part of the country for a very long time, and not only we, on this side of the House I say to the Member for Melville, but his own Attorney General and some Members from his Government have sought the provisions that are in that Bill C 33. Let me quickly remind you of some of the provisions that are there.

In the first instance, it clearly recognizes that more emphasis has to be placed on passenger rail travel, that there has not been in the past. There has not been sufficient emphasis on that respect. That was a failing in the past, the romance that we have had for air in the past couple of decades.

Secondly, and far more important, is that that Bill C 33 recognizes that competition, as such, can no longer govern the rate structure and the organization of freight transport services in the country. It recognized that the transportation policy of 1967, which was founded upon competition and a mature transportation system all across the country, was a failure. It is going to give to the Federal Government power to do those things it has been impotent to do these last several years.

In concluding may I say these things. One, we must end once and for all and forever the inequity which we in this part of the country have suffered under rail transportation Acts and that is the existence of long haul, short haul anomalies. The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) will know of which I speak when I talk about those anomalies.

The position there was and still is, as some Members know, is that you can ship some goods from let us say Toronto to Vancouver at a lesser rate than what you can ship them from Toronto to Regina or Saskatoon. That is what is known as a long haul-short haul anomaly. Bill C 33 would end that inequity with which western Canada has suffered these many years.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Crow's Nest rates . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — It has nothing to do with Crow's Nest rates. If the Member knew anything about Crow's Nest rates he would know that Bill C 33 has nothing whatever to do with Crow's Nest rates. Nothing.

Secondly, Bill C 33 will do that which we asked it to do, which your own Attorney General, as the former Minister of Transport, asked it to do and that is to vest in the Government power to determine minimum and maximum rates that the railways can charge. Here is the present situation. Where the railways operate with competition from trucks and air and water modes, the competition keeps the rate in line. Where you don't have competition, and in many cases on the prairies you don't, you then find the railways charging rates which are clearly exorbitant. We have instances of freight rates on products moving into western Canada at 200 to 250 per cent above cost. Well what that Act is going to do, is to empower the Government to set maximum rates and one need not prove in the circumstances that one is a captive shipper as one has currently to do to obtain relief. There is a great deal of merit in that Bill C 33 which is not before Parliament and far from joining the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) in wanting to fight against it, which would be quite contrary to what the Attorney General wanted when he was the Minister in charge of Transport in the province

and rightly so, we ought to be supporting the Bill. More directly in connection with rail passenger service, as Members know, there is now a very new emphasis on passenger rail service as a result of a lot of things, including particularly the energy crisis that we have seen in the last few years.

The Federal Government has already indicated that it is establishing Via Rail Canada, a Crown corporation, which will take over passenger rail services in the country from both CP and CN and it will be run as a public utility, a Crown corporation, at cost, at least. Members know too that the Federal Government is, right this month, assessing bids made for the acquisition of new train sets. The Government is committed to acquiring three new train sets and as many as ten new train sets, which will be turned over to Via Rail Canada.

In addition to that, it asked the Canadian Transport Commission (CTC) to look into rationalization of Trans-Continental Service, because in many cases duplicate and triplicate and indeed, in some Maritime cases, quadruplicate services exist which we can't continue to afford. What it said to the CTC, was to go out and conduct public hearings and come back to us with a preferred plan, give us a plan of rationalization which will meet the social and economic conditions of the various regions of the country. And of course the CTC has now done that. It made its initial report, and will soon make its further report on the preferred national transportation railway plan.

So that all of the problems that you people put your finger on this afternoon and talked about earlier, are problems that are being given very immediate attention. They are being given a good deal more than talk. As I said, the Via Rail Canada is now being set up, people are being hired in respect of it. New equipment is being acquired and the preferred plan is being studied by the CTC. I hope we are going to maintain two routes, I hope that is feasible. As a matter of fact, additional things are going on and I want to comment on the remarks of the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) about a misunderstanding that he and so many have in one other respect. And what they do in the process of talking about it is continue in this cynical way to sort of trade off one region against another or one interest against another. What is going on in the Quebec City-Windsor corridor, which Members know is the most highly populated area in the country, is an experiment in passenger rail travel. The Federal Government has said let's take one section of that corridor, let's take it over and run the trains. Let's get some decent equipment on the trains. Let's promote the service as best we can. Let's link the schedules with other transportation services available and in this way determine what is required to provide a top notch rail passenger service. That is the experiment that is now going on. The experiment will serve as a model for all other areas of the country, including the prairie region, once it is determined what sort of equipment is necessary, what kind of scheduling you need, what sort of good service you have to have to make passenger rail attractive again. It will serve to provide a model, too, for its western Canadian counterpart, after we settle the preferred system to be recommended by the CTC, acquire new equipment and bring Via Rail Canada into place.

To sum it up, there is a great deal being done here in fundamental terms. I think it is very good work that is being done at the federal level, and I am sure that Members opposite would say that. That is what leads me to wonder why always the Member for Melville should rise in moving a resolution which he ought

April 5, 1977.

to be able to anticipate would get our support, and indeed will get our support, and then in the process virtually talks us out of it. And more strangely, why he should advocate the very things which the Minister of Transport is now doing and somehow finding criticism for him in doing it.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK** (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few comments to the comments already made on the Motion before the House. I don't really have a lot to say. I would agree with the Member to my right that our caucus would support the Motion. It was a reasonable Motion until it was presented. One question that is in my mind is that if we are going to run this passenger service over a single line, I suggest that we should look at what our real priorities are. We want a better freight service; we are looking at a passenger service in this Motion. I suggest to you that a better freight service to this province would be more in keeping with good Government policies. This would require bigger trains; it would require unit trains which would necessitate heavier equipment to handle those trains and heavier lines. We want to speed up the service. We should look at improved grain transportation and the grain hauling system in this province. The only way we can do that is with the heavier equipment, bigger trains and unit trains which I have suggested.

Now if we are going to run a passenger service over this same line, I think that it may become very confusing to say the least. I would rather put grain transportation and improved freight services as priorities over passenger service in this province. I suggest that we look at one or two points that I will put forth at the present time — improved changes in the rail grain transportation system, an improved general freight system so western goods can be shipped about more cheaply. Then the passenger service would be considered.

I agree with the Motion but I suggest to you that we should not lose our perspective or our priorities in this Motion. I personally feel that we have, in the comments that have been made by the Member who proposed the Motion and the seconder and to some extent, those who have spoken on it.

We will be supporting the Motion and that's all I have to say on the matter.

Motion agreed to.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 11 — SPECIAL CARE HOMES**

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN** (Regina Rosemont) moved, seconded by Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to seek agreement with the Special Care Homes Association to ensure that residents of non-profit Special Care Homes and Housing facilities be given direct representation on the Boards of Directors of such facilities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my remarks this afternoon will be fairly short and of a non-controversial nature because I believe the idea behind this Resolution is generally a good idea and I think can be supported by all Members of the House.

In rising to move this Resolution, I do so in response to

a particular situation in Pioneer Village in the Rosemont constituency. However, I believe that the case could and should apply to all non-profit nursing homes and senior citizen facilities in the province. There is an organization representing the residents of Pioneer Village in existence and for a number of years now these people have been trying unsuccessfully to get representation on the board of directors. When they go to the board, they are told that the board is appointed by the city. When they go to the city, they are told to talk to the board. It appears to me that these people are getting the run around from both the city and the board.

Mr. Speaker, Members will note that my Resolution asks the Government to seek agreement with the Special Care Homes Association. It does not ask the Government to pass regulations to ensure representation of residents on the boards of these homes. I have not asked for regulations for two reasons. First of all, while the association does not have power to enforce this with its individual members, I believe the organization has a tremendous suasion power over its members. Secondly, there are 126 licensed homes, licensed by the Department of Social Services, and of these, 119 are non-profit homes that provide levels I, II and III care. Regulations would have to apply to, and be followed by, them all. Not all the homes would likely have residents who might wish representation on the boards. For these two reasons I am not asking that regulations be passed at this time.

Some people might ask, why should residents be represented on the boards of these homes? Isn't there a conflict of interest here? Well I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the same argument could be advanced to prevent students and the university from sitting on the Senate, the different boards and committees of the university. There are other examples I suppose that could be used. Housing authorities would be one example that comes to mind.

But I believe that the reasons for, or in favor, are much more compelling. First of all, these are non-profit homes and are expected to break even and they must do so regardless of who sits on the board. Secondly, if we truly believe that people should have a voice in the things that affect their lives, how can we deny to our pioneers a voice in the thing that most affects their lives, the place in which they live? Thirdly, many of the problems that have arisen in the past have come about, I believe, because of misunderstandings and these could be reduced by greater communication with the residents through their own board members on the board. Fourthly, these homes, from my experience, have a tendency to become like any large institution — dehumanizing. If they are to be real homes, surely people should be able to make some decisions about their homes as they would do if they lived in their own houses somewhere else in the community. And finally, fifthly, these people are not asking to take over the boards of the homes. They are only asking to be represented. In the case of Pioneer Village, in my constituency, they have only been asking for two members out of a total of nine to sit on the board. And I do not believe that this is too much to ask.

## **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. G.N. WIPF** (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, there is a group of students in the east gallery who will be leaving in five minutes. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you, I would like to

April 5, 1977.

introduce a group of students from the Westmore Junior High School, the second group that was in today. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Pennefather. I shall be meeting with them for pictures and drinks and I am sure the Assembly here will join with me in wishing them a safe trip back home and I hope their stay has been educational and informative.

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Resolution 11 — **Special Care Homes**

**MR. ALLEN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, these people are not asking to take over the boards. In the case of the Pioneer Village, they are only asking for two members out of nine. And I don't really think that that is too much to ask. At the Sherbrooke Community Centre in Saskatoon, two residents do sit on the board and from all the reports that I have been able to receive, this is an excellent board and the two residents, elected by their peers, are making significant contributions to the board.

I would, therefore, move this Resolution.

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD** (Wilkie) — In looking at this Resolution, I don't think that very many, or any of the Members in the House, could be against such a resolution — asking for an agreement between the homes by the Government, by a government motion, is indeed a worthwhile endeavor. I am sure you've understood, by my comments previously about the problems that we are having in the nursing homes, that the Special Care Homes Association would like to meet with you and draw your attention also to a number of problems they are having regarding the rising costs of running the homes, regarding the fact that they would like the cost of living increases built into the rates. They have been trying to get some sort of an agreement for increased money for levels I, II and III. This, perhaps, might give them the opportunity also to solve some of the problems that they are having, as well as trying to discuss this problem that you are bringing up. So it might be indeed a beneficial arrangement if you can negotiate to have better policies for both levels. I think that in the nursing home care there are indeed a number of problems, which I have outlined previously and I won't take the time of the House to go through again. A number of senior citizens, 56 per cent of them by the way, in Saskatchewan are not getting assistance other than their grant that the Government gives to all levels, therefore they have a large amount of their payment for their care on their own shoulders. I think we should get down to the root of the problem and look at the main goal which is indeed assisting the senior citizen. This Resolution that you have presented, I think, adds a valid cause for us considering it and we will be in support of allowing representation on the Board of the Special Care Homes Association. I think that it should be a representation that is perhaps under review yearly. That is our only proposal and our caucus will be supporting the Resolution.

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON** (Souris-Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I think we have achieved some sort of a record today. We have two Resolutions, two consecutive Resolutions on which we find some common ground. I agree that the residents of the special care homes should indeed have some representation on the board of directors. My only fear is that

under this type of centralist government that we have here, that the representation might be appointed rather than elected. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move an amendment to the Resolution, seconded by Mr. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):

That the following words be added after the word “facilities” in the fourth line:

and that such residents be elected to the boards and not appointed.

The debate continues on the Resolution and the amendment.

**MR. H.H. ROLFES** (Minister of Social Services): — Just a few words on the amendment and the Resolution. I don't think that the amendment really adds a thing, because again the Members of the Conservative Party weren't very specific in what they were suggesting. Who should elect them? I can set up a group of people in the city of Saskatoon and ask them to elect all the representatives to the board of all the special care homes in the Province of Saskatchewan. It doesn't mean a thing, the amendment. I know the intent of what they wanted to do but I think the Conservatives have missed the point of the whole Resolution. If they knew anything about special care homes, as the Member for Regina-Rosemont pointed out, they are all non-profit, all non-profit institutions and the Government, as such, has no control over them whatsoever. We license them, yes, we set regulations, yes, but we do not appoint the boards of the non-profit homes at all. There is absolutely no intention of the Government to change them to institutions that would come directly under the Government and, Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that the amendment was simply brought in, yes I think as the Member for Saskatoon said, simply for frivolous reasons, purely to try and grab the headlines again.

I would like to make a few comments, however, on the Motion as such because, although I support it in principle, I think it must be clearly understood, clearly understood, that all the Government would do, would be to suggest to the Special Care Homes Association that this may be something that they should look at. Because in no way, in no way, Mr. Speaker, do we want to infringe on the rights of the non-profit special care homes to carry out their goals and their objectives as they see fit. That's why we set them up in that way, that each individual special care home could meet the needs of the individuals and the residents in that special care home. We don't want it to be uniform and I appreciate that some homes have already taken the step and have seen fit in their own institution, in their home, to put members on the board. We give them that right. And I would hope that if the boards and administrators of a special care home saw fit, in their particular circumstances, to allow residents to have members on the board, that they would discuss this with all the residents in those homes to see what they could work out that would be suitable, not only to the residents, but to the boards of directors and to the administrator.

Mr. Speaker, in referring to some of the remarks made by the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford), in the last year I have met at least, I think, three or four times with the president of the Special Care Homes Association. I have told him on a number of occasions that my door is always open, to phone whenever he feels the need is there. He has done so. I communicate with him frequently, and he communicates with me. If we have any



April 5, 1977.

particular problems, we discuss them as soon as they arise. So I don't want the Member for Wilkie to mislead this House that there is no communication. There have been many actions taken. I wish you would talk to those people.

Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Wilkie said: "Let's do something for senior citizens." I would like to respond just briefly to that. As I have indicated on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, this Government's record for senior citizens is unparalleled in the provinces of Canada. When we came to power in 1971, the Members opposite provided a net assistance to senior citizens of \$500,000, a net of \$500,000. In this year's Budget alone, in the Department of Social Services, we are going to be providing \$49 million; 27 per cent of my Budget goes directly or indirectly to senior citizens. The Government in total, if you take into account all the programs, the Government will be providing approximately \$79 million, as compared to \$500,000 net by the Members opposite when they were on the Treasury Benches.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) should realize that the people in special care homes don't pay power, they don't pay gasoline, they don't pay insurance. That is correct. I'm glad the Member brought that to our attention. I want to tell the Member for Regina South that the average rate for people in special care homes in level III in 1971 was \$310. They received Old Age Security at \$135, therefore, each individual senior citizen paid \$175. Today the average rate is \$775. Our subsidy is \$398, the Old Age Security-Government Income Supplement is \$264. They pay less today than they did in 1971. So don't tell me, don't talk to me about what you people did for senior citizens. The record is very clear and I will repeat that time and time again, because you want to convince the people of Saskatchewan of the great things that you did — \$500,000 net in your budget as compared to what we did and what we are doing for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, even though we have done all these things, there is a lot more that has to be done and I will be the first to concede that. There is a lot more that has to be done and we intend to do it. I think that the Resolution brought forward by the Member for Regina-Rosemont is a good one. I would like to have a further look at the amendment brought in by the Conservatives to see whether or not we can go along with that particular amendment and also I would like to discuss it further with the Special Care Homes Association. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 15 — CONDEMNATION OF OTTAWA'S CENTRALIST POLICIES**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER** (Leader of the Conservative Party) moved, seconded by Mr. E.A. Berntson (Souris Cannington):

That this Assembly condemns the Liberal Government in Ottawa for its centralist policies which are encroaching on provincial jurisdictions, against the spirit of Confederation; which fail to recognize, in a meaningful way, the regional, cultural and economic differences in Canada and which have now placed the very essence of Canada in uncertainty.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are, I think,

as a country and as a province and as a people facing some very serious times ahead. We heard them alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition, we have heard them alluded to today by the Attorney General. The prime reason in our judgment for these serious times and the serious crisis facing our country is not getting back our Constitution or changing our Constitution, but to start getting back to the Constitution. Let's think for a moment about what the Fathers of Confederation thought about it as it related to Canada. What they saw was a large country generally unpopulated, and it still is in terms of our total area, populated by peoples of different ethnic backgrounds, populated by people of a different cultural and social background. And what they saw was a country which they did not want to make a homogeneous mass like the country that they saw to the South. What they saw in the South was the formation of a country which saw immigrants to that country and the existing peoples of that country becoming one people — Americans. And what our Fathers of Confederation believed could be created in the northern half of the North American continent was a group of individuals, a group of people, who could recognize their language, recognize their region, recognize their social and economic backgrounds, retain their cultural similarities in those regions and still call themselves Canadians. In other words, we could invite immigrants to come to our country and they could retain their cultural heritage and those immigrants who already were here, the two founding races, the French and the English, could recognize their language differences, their cultural differences, their social and economic differences in the various regions of the country. And they could be proud of themselves as Canadians but as French Canadians or as English Canadians or as Ukrainian Canadians or as Indian Canadians or as any other kind of Canadians who wanted to retain their culture. And the kind of policies, generally speaking, that our country followed up until the mid 1930s, were policies designed to promote that kind of a country, were policies designed to create the kind of a country that allowed individuals of different regional cultural backgrounds to exercise their differences. In fact, it was the very differences in Canadians that we were proud of. It was the very fact that we could be proud of ourselves and our differences as Canadians.

The 1930s were dreadful and drastic years for Canada and required dreadful and drastic action and as a result we had to, as a nation to survive, allow our central government more powers. And then came the Second World War and we had to allow our central government even more powers because we were faced with a national crisis — wartime. After the Second World War, if we had been wise, and if we had been reasonable as Canadians, we would have started to disseminate these centralist organizations in our country and started to once again encourage the regional governments, that is the provincial governments, to exercise authority over those areas of personal endeavor in our country which the Fathers of Confederation foresaw. Those areas of personal concern, the health, the education, the welfare, the roads, the municipalities, those organizations and institutions of our society which affected individuals personally, were to be the provincial government's responsibility under our Constitution. And those areas which of necessity had to go to the Federal Government to create a country, foreign exchange, foreign affairs, money supply, etc. went into the hands of the Federal Government as they should. But as a result of the 30s and the war years and increasingly after the war years, the central government in Ottawa gradually usurped the powers of the provincial governments in those personal areas. They started to

April 5, 1977.

dictate through the taxation policies and the planning policies of Ottawa, what kind of health care plan would be had across the country. They started to dictate what kind of higher educational institutions would be created through their grant structures, through their taxation policies and through their planning bodies in Ottawa.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Education, too?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Education too, for the Member for Regina South and he should check with any administrator, with any university in western Canada and find out how much influence the Federal Government has on the educational institutions of our province.

In the areas of welfare they continue to increase Federal Government control, Federal Government planning on a nation wide basis on the provision of certain kinds of welfare and certain kinds of social service. That's a similar one, that's right, Canada Pension Plan is another one. These items of concern to regional governments, these items of concern to primarily, in fact, one regional government in our country would seem to have a few more problems than others or they apparently had. That was the Government of Quebec which had primarily a different language for a great many people in our country and primarily a different kind of social and cultural background than the vast majority of the rest of Canada. Quebec and the people in Quebec began some years ago, to wonder whether or not a Canada with the central government in Ottawa was attempting to create a homogeneous mass similar to that in the United States and to eliminate the cultural and regional differences in our country.

They began to wonder because those very areas over which provincial and regional governments had authority, had power, presumably because Ottawa was a better taxing authority, and equalization had to be organized in our country if we were to have any kind of reasonable stake in our country, they began to think and they began to believe that the regional governments were not going to be recognized and that somehow we were attempting to create and eliminate their cultural and language rights in our country.

By 1966 we had developed in our country, as a result of the centralist policy, a schism that was so serious that two per cent of the population of Quebec espoused a separatist doctrine that wanted to split Canada. A man came upon the scene who was appointed Minister of Justice, who was going to be the 'saviour' of Confederation. He was Minister of Justice for two years, specifically responsible for the separatist group in Quebec in attempting to bring it into Confederation and making them understand that Canada was in their best interest. During that two year period, separatism in Quebec rose from two per cent of the population to 10 per cent of the population.

At that time, this man, this 'saviour', became Prime Minister of Canada in 1968 with a mandate to bring Canadians together, a mandate to make the people of Quebec realize the benefits that they gain from Confederation and, therefore, want to belong to Canada. For that four year period, from 1968 through 1972, this man and his group were such terrific 'saviours' that separatism in Quebec rose from 10 per cent of the population to 25 per cent of the population in Quebec. In the meantime this Government, the Federal Government, increased its power and authority over provincial and regional governments across the country. It

started confrontation policies against all provincial governments, including the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Quebec, which have been ongoing ever since. The confrontation policies said no, we have to centralize power in Ottawa, the very thing that has been creating the problem.

This man was elected again in 1972 and formed a minority government with the party of the Members opposite for two years. During that period of time the separatist movement in Quebec for some reason, because there wasn't very much authority continuing to be centralized in Ottawa during that two year interval because it was a minority government, stayed relatively constant, around 25 per cent.

From 1974 when he was re-elected with a majority and continued the promotion of his ideas and the Liberal Party's ideas of centralizing power in Ottawa, the separatists grew from 25 per cent of the population of Quebec to 40 per cent and formed the provincial government in that province.

Now how this man and his corps could be considered in any possible way a saviour of our country, how this man and his confrères could in any way be construed to have allowed Canada to be brought together and the people of Canada to feel good as Canadians, no one can possibly know. Yet there are some members of the press corps, for example, primarily in eastern Canada who suggest the only possible Canadian who can hold Canada together is this man who is tearing it apart. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that events will show that the people of Canada will never again be fooled by this so called 'saviour' image of Pierre Trudeau and his confrères.

I predict no matter what motivations might motivate some individuals to perform selfish acts, the people of Canada will never buy that 'saviour' role again. They will realize and do realize that it was the centralist policies of the Trudeau Government which have exacerbated this split, this split in Canada which has created not only a schism between Quebec and the rest of Canada but a promotion in western Canada of a feeling of alienation, the promotion of a feeling in British Columbia that they no longer get benefits from Canada. That kind of attitude on the part of Canadians will not hold the country together.

It is our suggestion that our present difficulty in terms of Confederation are not irreconcilable. The fact of the matter is that people in Quebec and people in western Canada and people in British Columbia and people in Ontario want exactly the same thing, they want to govern themselves. They do not want to be governed by an Ottawa civil service gone mad, over which there is no control. They do not want to be governed by planners in Ottawa who don't know local conditions. They want to govern themselves and the person in Trois Rivières is no different from the person in Drumheller who is no different from the person in Victoria. They want to govern themselves and they are not today able to do that because of the all powerful, all pervasive attitude of our present Prime Minister and his group in Ottawa, who somehow seem to believe that only their answers are worthwhile. I notice very few comments from the Members opposite because they know, as the Government, what this central Government has done to the Province of Saskatchewan and to the ideas of the Province of Saskatchewan and to its ideals. They know what the central Government in Ottawa has attempted to do to the people of Saskatchewan with reference to resources and with reference

April 5, 1977.

to cable television and with reference to the provincial educational services. They know that they have attempted to be dictatorial and have attempted to tell the Government in Regina and the people of Saskatchewan what they are to do. I am pleased and proud to say that on that issue I support the Government Members opposite. On that issue, on the issue of standing up for Saskatchewan rights, I support you and if you don't want my support you are going to get it anyway.

Canada can work if we recognize that the people in the various regions of our country want to govern themselves in the fashion that the Fathers of Confederation foretold. They want to govern themselves as it relates to the provision of a health care program. They do not, Mr. Minister of Health, want to be told that here is a national hospital bed average and you will get this hospital bed average even though you are over double the national average, in terms of people over the age of 65. Here are the grants that you will be granted, Mr. Minister of Health. They do not want to be told how to operate their welfare and social service programs. They do not want to be told how to build their roads and what roads to build. They want to govern themselves. That's what the people of Quebec want in those personal areas. We will have a strong Canada, we will have a strong country if we recognize the differences in Canada and recognize that the people in the various regions are different and not like the United States of America.

Unless we are prepared to come to grips with these economic and regional problems, with these social and cultural problems, people of this country will continue to focus on side issues. One side issue that is being focused on by governments and politicians is the language issue. It is a side issue because the real issues in the Province of Quebec are whether or not the people of Quebec can have a decent life and a decent lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, we can bring Canadians together by recognizing their differences. We can bring Canadians together by recognizing what the Fathers of Confederation recognized and what we, as Canadians, recognized until that time that we had to act in the 1930s and the 1940s and that is that Canada could work as a different kind of country than the United States. It will not and cannot work as the same kind of country as the United States. That, Mr. Speaker, I submit is what the present Prime Minister has attempted to create. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the present Government, the Liberals in Ottawa, has attempted to create. That is why they are being rejected en masse throughout western Canada.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that together we can do something with this country, providing we recognize these differences. We believe the present Government in Ottawa is not recognizing the regional differences; they're not recognizing that Canadians are different from region to region; we're not recognizing what Canadians really want in a country and for that reason I move this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.C. MALONE** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wish the curly headed Whip would be quiet over there.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the remarks of the Member for Nipawin the first thing that comes to my mind is that it's not Pierre Trudeau or the Liberal Government of Canada that is causing division within our Confederations, it's speeches like the one that was just delivered by the Member for Nipawin.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — It was a typical Tory speech that we've been hearing for so many years, where they criticize and condemn and harp and hate all the people that form the National Government in Ottawa. At no time do we hear Tory spokesmen, either in this House or in the House in Ottawa, give us their solutions to problems of transportation, problems of energy, problems of bilingualism and biculturalism; no solutions whatsoever as to how this country should deal with the Province of Quebec, both now and in the years ahead. It's the type of speech that the Member for Nipawin just gave that causes conflict within this country, that sets region against region, that causes Canada to be in despair, and to look at what we are doing now and to wonder why we are doing it.

The Member says they have centralized. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party is a national party, and it is a party that recognizes that for it to become a national government, it must be national in scope. We have kept the country together more than any other party, ever since Confederation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is because of the policies of the Liberal Party, that we have such things as Unemployment Insurance that covers this country. We have such things as the Canada Pension Plan. We have equalization payments that try to bring the poorer provinces up to the same level as the wealthier provinces. We have equalization plans that guarantee health care across this country; guarantee education and welfare across this country, to all Canadians. From listening to the Member for Nipawin, one can only suspect that what he wants is a poor part of Canada and a rich part of Canada; a part of Canada that could be a Tory Government, if it was the rich part, because the poor people don't vote for Tories; a part of Canada that would be very much different than the Canada that we know today.

What the Member for Nipawin is really advocating, is a return to the Middle Ages in this country. A return to a balkanization where we have, as I say, region set against region.

The Member for Nipawin very conveniently overlooked a period of time when there was a national government that was led by a man from Saskatchewan — the Diefenbaker government, and I don't recall anything done by that government to decentralize any of the operations from Ottawa. Indeed, if anything, Mr. Speaker, that government did more and more to centralize the process of government in the national capital.

Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Nipawin is doing is playing old Tory games. He talks about ethnic backgrounds and how they should be respected. The last time a Tory government formed the government of this province, those ethnic backgrounds were not respected; indeed, a campaign was run which was the most vicious campaign that we have ever seen in this province. And,

April 5, 1977.

once again, we see the Tories running the same type of campaign in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I heard a speech similar to the one given by the Member for Nipawin, it was given by a man from Quebec, a man by the name of Levesque, who advocated many of the same things that the Member for Nipawin has advocated. The last time I heard a speech where the theme was 'bring us together' it was given by another Dick. This one's last name was Nixon, and we all know what happened under his regime in the United States of America. He said almost the same words, 'bring us together', and we saw what happened to the Republican Party in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, what the Liberal Party tries to accomplish is to be a party that is national in scope, as I have said earlier. It is a party that recognizes that each region has legitimate claims for its aspirations. It is a party that says in Quebec the same things as it says in British Columbia. It is a party that campaigns in the West on the same platform as it campaigns in the Maritimes. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the only party in Canada that does this; it is the only party in Canada that has done this in the past and will do it in the future, and that is why we have had the Government of Canada, since 1867, mainly in the hands of the Liberal Party, and why we are going to continue to have the Government of Canada in the hands of the Liberal Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — Let's just take a look to see what the Conservatives have done recently to try and heal the wounds that have been opening between Quebec and the rest of Canada. I think that their last leader, Mr. Stanfield, acknowledged that for the Conservative Party to be successful and become a national party, that inroads had to be made in Quebec by the Conservatives. Those inroads were not made. One could only guess why they were not made. I suggest that one of the reasons why they were not made was because of certain individuals in the Conservative Party who did not recognize Quebec's legitimate aspirations, who did not feel that Quebec deserved some special treatment so that their culture and their religion and their language would be recognized by the rest of Canadians. And Mr. Stanfield is no longer the leader of that party.

Even the current leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. 'Who', is trying to do some things along these lines, but again, is being restrained by other Members of the Conservative Party from doing those things.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party in Canada, the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan, has done nothing whatsoever to make this country a unified country. And I think that all Canadians recognize that. In fact, one Canadian in particular is recognizing that today, the Member for Crowfoot in the House of Commons.

Let's look at another Member of the Conservative Party and see what he is doing to heal the wounds of Confederation, a Mr. Roche LaSalle, one of the few Conservative Members from the Province of Quebec in Ottawa. Mr. LaSalle, if the Leader Post and other newspapers can be believed, advocated some time ago that the Conservative Party in Quebec and the Parti Quebecois

form an alliance, an accommodation to defeat the Liberal Party in the upcoming by-elections in that province. You know there is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, that 'politics make strange bed-fellows.' But that relationship, I suggest to you, borders on the obscene. And what do we hear from the Tories in Saskatchewan about that relationship? Did we hear anybody deny it? Did we hear anybody say that it was a bad thing or a wrong thing? I am still waiting, Mr. Speaker. The issue arose in the by-elections. There is no suggestion in the by-election that there is anything wrong with that attitude. The Tories are so power-hungry, Mr. Speaker, that they put their own interests before the interests of the country that we live in.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a number of other things to say about this Resolution. I want to look at the remarks from the Member for Nipawin, such as they were, and accordingly at this time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 27 — NO FAULT REPARATIONS PROPOSALS**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South) moved, seconded by Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan and the Minister responsible for SGIO to delay implementation of the "No Fault Reparations Proposals" being advanced in respect of automobile accident insurance to at least December 31, 1979, so as to give the people of the province more opportunity to consider the fundamental issues raised thereby.

He said: The purpose in putting this Resolution on the Order Paper and the purpose of sparking some debate in connection with it, is to attempt to persuade the Government opposite to slow down the Reparations Proposals which, in very many ways, is of fundamental importance in the province. It raises issues of a very fundamental kind, and I refer to the proposals by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, which they refer to as the No Fault Reparations Proposal which is being advanced by SGIO.

Despite the fact that there has been some effort by SGIO to publicize what it has proposed to do, by way of the publication of some pamphlets, by way of the Minister speaking occasionally about the program, and by way of some public hearings, there is still within the province a very embryonic understanding of the proposals that are being advanced. That is to say, the understanding has not yet begun to grow very thoroughly in and around the province. I find in talking to people about the SGIO Reparations policy that, generally, they have not yet had sufficient time and sufficient opportunity to really begin to look at some of the fundamental changes that are being proposed in that policy.

In short, what SGIO wants to do, and I am sorry the Minister is not here, is to alter in a very fundamental way the kind of car insurance that we have enjoyed in this province for so many years. Some will object to the principle itself of No Fault Reparations. Others will have grave concerns, more about the practical effects of those kinds of policies.



April 5, 1977.

Speaking for myself, and only for myself, I have less difficulty with the principle of a No Fault Reparation Proposal than I have with the practical aspects of it in the light of the experience that we have had with it. And I will refer to that more fully in a few minutes.

The principle of the No Fault Reparations Proposal is one thing that, for the time being, I would like to set aside, and concentrate more fully on the practical aspects of it, because that happens to be my own particular concern. One should, in understanding exactly what Government Insurance here is doing, take a look at the present system which features an aspect of No Fault, and then to see how that present system would be radically altered with the Reparations Proposals.

Now, we have had in Saskatchewan a dual car insurance system. One aspect of the current system is to be able to recover damage from the tort person who is negligent. We have had that since the beginning of this province. We have had, in addition, a No Fault aspect of our insurance plan for about 30 years.

Now, the present No Fault Reparations Proposals would replace the right of a party to seek out the full extent of the damage that that party sustained in an automobile accident from the party in fault in that accident. In other words, what it would do is to take the concept that we have now which is a dual system — no fault in some respects — the common law position in respect to the other aspect of it; combine it into one simple no fault system, and replace the current package of rights the people have with one which would be a system devised by SGIO with a schedule under which people would claim for damages.

Now let me, by way of illustration, take an example of the kind of thing that I am fearful about in terms of a No Fault Reparations Proposal. Take a standard automobile accident which occurs very often in this province — someone barrelling down the road, coming over a hill on the wrong side of the highway, and smashing into somebody else. Often these kinds of accidents result in very serious injuries to the person who was driving the other car. Typical injuries are pelvic destruction, broken bones in the legs, and perhaps neck injuries, facial injuries, and so on. A person who sustains those injuries, current under our present law, is entitled to do two things. One is that under the Automobile Accident Insurance Act, Part 11, the No Fault we now have, he is entitled to claim from Government Insurance for some of his damages. For example, he gets \$60 per week by way of compensation for loss of income, or \$240 per month. He gets a small percentage, a varying percentage depending on the injury, of a total amount of money which cannot currently exceed \$10,000. That is to say, if he suffers a permanent disability, perhaps assessed at 20 or 30 per cent of his total bodily function, he then gets 20 per cent of \$10,000, or \$2,000. This is pursuant to the No Fault side of what we now have and I will come back to that in a little while.

In addition what the injured party is entitled to do is seek out in full, his damage and his loss against the wrongdoer. He, therefore, is entitled to be compensated for whatever pain and suffering he sustains in that car accident. He is entitled to be compensated in full for his loss of income, and is entitled to be compensated for loss of future income, as well as the permanent disability that he sustained.

The kind of accident to which I have referred would result

in probably a damage settlement, in this province, of between \$55,000 and \$75,000, perhaps as high as \$100,000. Under the No Fault Reparations Proposal, that right to seek out your full damage against the negligent driver of the other vehicle would be a right that would be lost. One injured in those circumstances would have absolutely no right to claim his damages against the driver of the other car. What he would be entitled to is payment based upon the schedule, which is approved by the Government and is administered by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. And I will take a look at that in more detail in a moment.

What concerns me particularly about the current proposal is that these schedules of payment which are set up in substitution for every other right that a person has, very often are even to begin with, inadequate; and secondly, over the course of time, are permitted to become even more inadequate. And that is exactly what we have seen with respect to the No Fault provisions we currently have in the Act. Those provide for, as I said, a maximum in the event of death of \$10,000. They provide in respect of injury, some percentage of \$10,000. They provide, for example, for funeral expenses of \$300, when we know funeral expenses today are 200 or 300 per cent more than that level. They have not been changed for at least five years. The result of it is that the coverage which we used to enjoy under the No Fault provisions has been permitted to decline drastically.

The question is, why? The answer lies in the reluctance of a government insurance program and a government to increase premiums to keep pace with the rising costs and the effects of inflation on the benefits that are payable out of the scheme. That's a commonplace concern and difficulty with governments in this area — being loathe to have premiums keep pace with the outgoings from the program. The result of it is that premiums tend to be kept at a fairly static level. All the while the benefits are declining and are being eroded through inflation.

I'll give you some additional examples, if I may, of the current No Fault scheme, to give you some indication of the difficulty that these things have because they tend to get frozen and they become very static.

For example, if one is injured in an automobile accident and loses a toe, that's how comprehensive the schedules are and that's how comprehensive the schedule under the Reparations Proposal would have to be, you get \$100. If you lose a big toe, you get \$500. If you lose a little finger you may get \$100. If you lose an eye you get \$4,500. Irrespective of what use you may have put to the eye, you get \$4,500. If you're blind, totally blind, you get some percentage of \$10,000; loss of an eye, \$20 a month. A child age six years, who is killed in a car accident, brings currently under the No Fault provisions \$100 — a \$100. This is the sort of almost ludicrous results you begin to get from a No Fault system, which has a schedule of that variety set up and which is not adjusted frequently to keep pace with the effects of inflation and rising costs.

Under the plan too, and these are the kinds of things again that you find with some of these No Fault schedule provisions, is that an old age pensioner, for example, who is totally disabled in an automobile accident, gets \$60 per week, or \$240 per month, which I said earlier is less than the minimum wage. Incidentally none of us can get any more than that under the No Fault provisions as they now exist.

April 5, 1977.

Then it goes on to say, in respect of those old age pensioners, that you get your \$240 a month less what you get under Canada Pension, and less what you may get by way of the Old Age Pension. That's how generous those provisions are at the moment with respect to older people — a lousy \$240 per month, less than the minimum wage in the event of total disability, and reduced by the amount you receive by way of Old Age Pension and Canada Pension benefits. Those are the kinds of unjust and insensitive things that can arise under these No Fault provisions that have a schedule of remuneration and damage in place of a right to recover your full loss, whatever it is.

I was most distressed some weeks ago to read some publications that were put out by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office with respect to these proposals. They were a series of pamphlets which are, to say the very least, destructive, I think, of understanding, which people need to assess this program. They were particularly exaggerating pamphlets which were twisted and biased and determined to get to a certain result and that was the acceptance by the people who read them, of a plan which is pretty suspect.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of people thus far and organizations that have spoken out against moving with haste with respect to this proposal being advanced by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and while I refer to only a few of them, one or two, I think, are very good. When the committee held hearings in Saskatoon in October, the Saskatoon Board of Trade appeared before the committee and expressed its dissatisfaction with some aspects of the proposal and asked, in effect, the committee to go back to the drawing board and have another look at it. These views were obviously views of young businessmen in the city of Saskatoon. Some of them had the opportunity to look at it and when they looked at it in detail, expressed their reservations about the program. There was a particularly useful exchange, I think, in Saskatoon as well, with a Professor R.V. Fritz from the University of Saskatchewan and he commented in length on these proposals. It's worthwhile, I think, Mr. Speaker, to mention some of the comments that he had to make. He said:

If No Fault car insurance is adopted in Saskatchewan, even innocent drivers involved in an accident will pay heavily.

And that's correct.

Inadequate protection for most will cost an enormous sum in addition to basic premiums in the costs entailed in accidents.

These are two of the many difficulties with the scheme, proposed by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office according to Mr. Fritz, the professor of insurance law for the university.

Not only will both parties of an accident have to pay their deductible, which in itself is a problem, but if the No Fault plan goes through, as now presented, extensive coverage will be out of this world in terms of premium cost, according to Mr. Fritz. He said that even aside from the deductible, the cost of extension coverage has other problems.

One blatant example is the recovery for death. If a man was killed in an accident the maximum his wife would collect would be \$7,500 plus \$1,000 for funeral expenses and \$375 a month for

being a widow. That, too, is a fact under the proposal. The maximum one could recover in the event of a breadwinner is \$7,500 and \$1,000 for funeral expenses and he says, rightly so, that almost everyone earns more than that now so the widow's lifestyle would have to radically change. It's even possible she would not be able to make house mortgage payments on the basis of the monthly insurance income. Furthermore, Mr. Fritz said that the SGIO proposal contains nothing for pain and suffering, only for actual injury and again, that is a fact.

He said, and I quote:

Any new scheme has to be fair. I don't think this one, the SGIO proposal, now before us is.

It was an interesting program that a high school in Kindersley conducted with its Grade 11 and 12 students, who had an opportunity to take a look at the material published by SGIO and then make comments to the committee on the Reparations Proposal. I would like to read some of these, Mr. Speaker, to the Members. I think they are extremely interesting. These are Grade 11 and 12 students. One writes:

Re: Reparations Proposal. The proposal is supposed to be a suggestion put forward for consideration, discussion or acceptance but I found that your little booklet on the Reparations Proposals tended to present your ideas with a very biased opinion.

And went on to say:

If you are taking the fault out of accidents, you are actually contradicting society's values of right and wrong by saying it's okay if you aren't responsible to drive safely for the protection of others and their property.

Further comment:

I feel you should consider your proposal a little more before it becomes law. Don't be too hasty to change the system just to say you've got something new.

That's from a Grade 11 student.

Another one said:

The main brief that this proposal brings to mind is the fact that innocent parties in an accident are made to pay the first \$200 damages done to their vehicle and I feel this is not a good idea and I myself don't go for the idea of paying for someone else's mistakes or carelessness.

And another comment:

And I also feel the choice should be the public's and they should be the ones who decide if they want to abolish the fault policy or not.

Another one, again a letter from a Grade 12 student to the Committee:

I regard your question and answer concept, the little book that SGIO put out, as making the situation even more unclear. For example, on page three, the question, "Does

April 5, 1977.

that mean that insurance premiums would go down?" is answered with "probably not". I must say this is simply a poor way of getting across the correct answer.

Another one says:

Basically I find a lot of merit in the principle of the thing, however, there are a few points I would like to make. In removing the option to sue, aren't you removing a basic right given by civil law, that of the injured to sue those persons involved? Also that bit about the \$200 deductible, to put it plainly, is ridiculous. There's no reason on earth why a person completely innocent of any fault should be made to pay the \$200 deductible. The person causing the accident doesn't have to do anything in the way of direct reparation toward the person he has injured, financially or physically. That's one of the basic failures of your plan as well as being ridiculous. It's illogical in my opinion and unfair.

The Saskatchewan section of the Canadian Bar Association, Civil Justice and Law Section prepared a rather lengthy submission to the committee that was taking a look at this and made a number of points, some of which I want to refer to. The essence of the thing was:

The program we currently have is one which has been sifted and refined over the long course of time and shouldn't be discarded hastily or readily by substitution of some other system.

I hope what we will see, Mr. Speaker, before the Government moves with respect to this policy, is a slowing down of the process, an opportunity for the people to have a more thorough look than they have had at what is proposed in order to better understand it so that they can think about it. As I say, what we are doing in the process is affecting, very fundamentally, what their rights are. Any lawyer at least can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure many Members of the Legislature can too. Very often we will move too rapidly to amend laws in this way without the knowledge of the people. People will come to us six or eight or ten months later or a year later after the laws are changed with a problem, if we continue to press forward with this reparation you are proposing. Someone who has suffered a very serious injury, enormous loss of income, permanent disability, will come and ask, under what law am I entitled to only \$750 per month for a maximum of 60 months? That's all he would be entitled to under this proposal. Where is my right to bring an action against the person who caused me the injury? Where is my right to get \$40,000 or \$50,000 or \$60,000 as I previously could under the old common law system? You would say to them, sorry, the right is now gone, we've legislated it away, you're entitled to a system of payments which is set up under a schedule administered by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and you have no access to the courts and you have no right to sue.

I wanted, if the Minister had been here, to take a little issue with him about a statement as it appeared in a magazine published by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. I find it strange indeed that the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office should say this about his SGIO proposals. He said:

Court procedures are too time consuming and too expensive.

The justing to determine fault is costly. Security for persons permanently injured is not assured.

And then this:

Probably the people best qualified to assess the need for change and the necessity to introduce a reparations plan are those at SGIO.

I was going to tell the Minister that that's the height of nonsense. Those in the best position, the best qualified to assess the need for change are not those at SGIO. Indeed, they may very well be the least qualified because they are looking at it from the point of view of the insurer, from the point of view of the public servant, rather than from the point of view of the protection of the individual and his rights. So I say to the Minister, that while he may be prepared to surrender his judgment to that of a public servant employed in the insurance industry, certainly the rest of us are not.

I hope what we can do in sparking some debate here are two things. One is to gain a better understanding of what is proposed and a better understanding of the fundamental change that's at issue here. Secondly, I hope that we can persuade the Government to slow down the process, to not be buffaloeed or stampeded by people within the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to get on with this, in order to save the difficulty of having to raise currently the premiums to provide for the benefits which are quickly being eroded. If we can accomplish a slow down in the process so the people can have more time to further examine this proposal then, I think, Mr. Speaker, we would have served those people well.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move this Resolution.

**MR. H.W. LANE** (Saskatoon Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, if I might add several points to the discussion which has taken place so far. I think the Resolution is a good one and I will be supporting it.

One of the problems, I believe, under the present system as I understand it is this: if someone does an injury or a wrong to you, you are entitled under the present law to appear before the court and the court will then establish, as difficult as it is, a dollar value to compensate you for whatever loss has happened to you by reason of the tort that is committed against you. Over the years this system has been colored, of course, by insurance. The whole field of insurance is always in the background behind any piece of litigation regarding negligence or torts of that nature. What, of course, is happening is that because insurance companies are behind this, and I don't believe government controlled insurance companies are any different in the terms of the lobbying they do, the situation now does not recognize a case where you have been injured in a vehicle accident by a drunken drier. It is very true that you have the right of action as an individual against the person when he commits a tort against you, whether he is drunk or sober or otherwise, if you can establish that he has committed a negligent act, and you have, as a result of that, suffered a loss. The difficulty is that if a person who has caused you a loss is drunk, then his insurance is voided. It seems to me that probably somewhere behind the concept of No Fault insurance, that consideration is one of the things that is leading up to it and

April 5, 1977.

certainly as the saying goes, 'you can't get blood out of a stone.' If the person who has committed a wrong against you doesn't have any money and his insurance is void, all the judgments in the world won't do you any good, you won't be compensated for your loss.

Perhaps, though, to go into the general No Fault insurance scheme is an over-reaction to the situation. One of the faults of the present system, that has been brought to light in promoting the idea of No Fault insurance, is the cost of negotiating and finalizing settlements as they presently are. Of course the immediate thing that people refer to is the cost of lawyers, the cost of pleadings and court rooms and examinations for discovery, the cost of people in the department to help negotiations underway with the various lawyers and, of course, the cost to SGIO in hiring their lawyers to deal with the situation. I'm not sure but I have my reservations whether a No Fault insurance scheme, Mr. Speaker, will bring down the cost of settling these matters. If it does, I suggest it might be at the expense of justice to the individual. Will the No Fault insurance scheme as it's brought forth by this Government recognize individual differences? A very small example might be a situation where, perhaps, a lawyer and a carpenter are driving along in a car; they are hit by a person who is being negligent; they each lose their left hand. Under the No Fault insurance scheme, I suspect the bureaucrat will pull out his table; see what kind of indemnity is provided; they will look at the two individuals and give them each \$600 or whatever the number happens to be. The point is that the lawyer's hand is not worth as much to him, since he doesn't need it to earn his living as the carpenter does, and under the present system the court will assess those differences in individuals and compensate the carpenter, in my example, to a greater degree because he no longer has the ability to earn a living as he had before, whereas the loss to the solicitor would be less in terms of an actual dollar value.

Also in dealing with the matter of costs, I think it should be pointed out to those, who believe that these matters are always litigated, that a large majority of cases of negligence that are launched are settled prior to court proceedings. They are negotiated to a conclusion satisfactory to both the injured plaintive and to the defendant's insurance company, which is usually by virtue of their subrogation legislation back there somewhere defending the action.

The most difficult concept with No Fault insurance and the part that concerns me the most, of course the mover of the Motion has already alluded to this fact, is whether or not an individual will be barred access to the courts. That, I find particularly repugnant, the fact that we would be so concerned with efficiency that perhaps we would not be entitled, as we have been in the past, for any individual down through the years and under the common law who felt aggrieved to seek redress in the courts. I again question and I urge the Minister responsible to have a very close look and to scrutinize this concept and to figure out whether he indeed wishes to bar citizens of this province from access to the courts.

My final comment is that I don't believe, and this is probably another matter of great concern, that under a No Fault system there is anything done to encourage persons who are careful and certainly there isn't anything done to discourage the careless.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Assembly through you, that I wish to support this Motion and having said that, I wish to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 1 — CUTBACK IN HOSPITAL SERVICES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview):

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for the cutbacks in hospital services, which have resulted in the reduction of hospital staff and the closure of significant numbers of beds in this province, and calls on the Government to restore Saskatchewan's basic services to their former level.

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the Assembly that at the end of my remarks with regard to this particular situation, I will be introducing an amendment to the original Motion.

I would like to make some general comments with respect to the general tenor of the proposed Motion, which deals with assumed cutbacks in hospitals, and I would like, particularly, to draw to the attention of the Assembly two events that occurred during 1976 relating to approved volumes of service in our hospital system.

Firstly, the Members of the Assembly should be alerted to the fact that the approved patient days for all of the hospitals operating under the global budget system, those are primarily hospitals that have 50 beds or more, were reviewed for the first time since 1973. Several hospitals in this group had reduced their actual patient day volume over the three year period from 1973. Initial adjustments for 1976 were simply a reflection of the actual experience of those hospitals in 1974 and 1975. The total approved patient day volume for all hospitals, I hope the Members of the Assembly will pay attention to this, the total approved patient day volume for all hospitals was established at a level higher than actually experienced in 1975. In April, a five per cent reduction in approved patient days for all hospitals was announced to be effective on July 1. This adjustment did require some effort on the part of hospitals and physicians to utilize in-patient hospital beds more effectively. We asked for their co-operation. It must be viewed, however, in the context that hospital utilization rates in Saskatchewan are much higher than they are anywhere else in Canada, and the five per cent reductions still left approved volumes at a level well above the national experience. Some moderation in that policy was announced for Saskatoon hospitals in September.

Staffing reductions did occur in 1976 as a result of the initial reassessment of approved volumes of service, and a subsequent five per cent reduction which occurred. This does not mean that staffing standards used in Saskatchewan were reduced and, in fact, in many instances higher standards were set. During the 1973 to 1976 period, a number of hospitals reduced their patient day volume without affecting any corresponding staff adjustment, with the result being an actual decline in



April 5, 1977.

productivity, if you want to use that term. I realize that is a difficult term to apply to hospitals, at a time when wage rates in hospitals were escalating at a pace well in excess of the normal wage adjustments generally being made in the economy. The 1976 staffing adjustments were simply an effort to restore some of that lost productivity. We would not argue that staffing levels in Saskatchewan are more generous than the rest of Canada, neither can we accept any suggestion that our hospitals are under-staffed. As an example, on the average, the Saskatchewan standard for the total nursing staff is slightly below the national experience but set against this is the fact that our ratio of professional nursing staff to other nursing staff is much higher than it is in the rest of Canada.

I would like to say a word, Mr. Speaker, about the level of funding. The increase in hospital spending from 1975 to 1976 was in the order of 25 per cent. Many other provinces have provided significantly lower proportionate increases in hospital funding for 1976 compared with 1975: oil rich Alberta 11 per cent; Ontario 10 per cent; Quebec no budget increase at all in the first portion of the year, and a total for the entire year of less than one per cent. Based on an unaudited year end report, Saskatchewan hospitals provided 37,000 fewer patient days in 1976 than they were authorized and funded to provide. And I think Members of the Assembly should take note of that. Regina hospitals provided 20,800 fewer patient days than were actually approved in Regina hospitals, and Saskatoon hospitals 15,500 patient days less than were actually approved and funded for in 1976. The number of in-patient operating room visits remained virtually unchanged. In 1975 there were 64,881 and in 1976, 64,256. General out-patient visits increased from 712,500 to 774,400. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Government did approve an adequate volume of in-patient services since hospitals, in total, fell well below their approved volumes.

For other basic services the Government did not initiate any reductions and experience would indicate that none have occurred. In total, Mr. Speaker, hospitals employed about 100 fewer staff than were approved by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. For nursing staff, the approved and actual staff complements are identical. Based on the December monthly reports, and I admit they are unaudited, hospital expenditures exceeded the approved budget by \$1,200,000. Now that is on a total expenditure in the range of \$205 million. Final settlement reviews will take place after audited statements have been received and assessed. It is reasonable to expect that some hospitals may receive an additional payment for 1976 and, in some instances, some funds may be recovered where the actual patient days fell significantly short of approved patient days.

In addition to approving what represents a very significant increase in operating funds to hospitals in 1976, the continuing developments of new and improved services were carried on during the year. Initial funding for the neonatology unit to service southern Saskatchewan was provided in 1976. This program is now developing at the Regina General Hospital. Funding for two new day surgery programs in Saskatoon was also provided in 1976. We have announced additional new program funds in the hospital field for 1977-78, including the high risk obstetric unit at the University Hospital and approval for a computer axial tomography scanner — a major new equipment development which helps to keep Saskatchewan apace with current technology in the health field.

Incidentally we were criticized very strongly in the House, Mr. Speaker, for not moving faster in terms of what is termed the CAT scanner. I would refer Members of the House to the Medical Post, February 15, 1977. I certainly can't take time to read all of this but it is headed "The Cats on a Hot Tin Roof," and when you really look at all the problems related with computerized axial tomography you are going to find that we were wise to wait a bit, in terms of securing equipment, which is extremely expensive to operate. We are not arguing that it will not be very useful but frankly the obsolescence factor in terms of computer axial tomography scanners is extremely high. And currently there are some 3,800 of these in North America and the expenditures involved with them exceed \$1.5 billion.

We often hear criticisms of waiting lists in hospitals and obviously the only way you can deal with patients coming to hospitals is in terms of a waiting list, particularly where the base hospitals are located. Members of this House should be aware of the fact that in 1976 the waiting lists in Regina hospitals declined by some 400. In Saskatoon the overall waiting list did increase slightly and in September we took steps to meet that problem with the two expanded day surgery programs that we announced.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — We expect this to have considerable impact on waiting lists, when these programs develop to their full potential. Again, Mr. Speaker, I must draw to the attention of the Members of the Assembly the fact that we have a real problem in terms of hospital separations and hospital patient days in this province, in relation to the rest of the country.

In 1975, and these are the latest statistics we have available from across Canada, the separations per 1,000, that really covers the number of patients being released from hospitals, in Canada was 153.6 per thousand. In Saskatchewan it was 217.5 per thousand. We have the statistics for 1976 for Saskatchewan. We have not got them for Canada for 1976. But the separations in 1976 in Saskatchewan were 208 per thousand even after the five per cent reduction that we heard so much criticism about. In terms of Canadian patient days for 1975, it was 1,493 patient days per thousand of population. And for Saskatchewan it was 1,916 and even after the reduction, the five per cent reduction, the hospital days were 1,823 per thousand for Saskatchewan in 1976. Again we have not got the statistics available for 1976 for all across Canada.

I would like to cite to the Members just a brief comment with respect to hospital costs as a percentage of total health costs. Obviously, it is difficult when you start making these kinds of comparisons if you go to regions that are somewhat different than our own. Therefore, the statistics I wish to give you are related only to the prairie region. I am comparing Saskatchewan with our sister provinces of Manitoba and Alberta in the prairie region. We hear criticisms that we cut back on hospital beds. Hospital costs, as a percentage of the total expenditures of health care costs in this province in 1971, were 53.1 per cent. In 1976-77 there were very close to 58 per cent. In the same period Manitoba's was 44 per cent in 1971-72 and the latest statistics we have available from them for 1974-75 was 49.7 per cent. In oil rich Alberta they were 45.3 per cent in 1971-72 and declined to 44.6 per cent of their total health care costs in 1974-75.

April 5, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that information, it is quite clear we are not suffering a deterioration in our health services and that we are standing up very well in comparison with other provinces across Canada. I would like, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite willing to table this in the House, to read some letters from some people who appreciate the situation with respect to health care in Saskatchewan. This letter I will table is a letter from an individual who happens to work in the Ministry of Health in the Province of Ontario. This person was called back to Saskatchewan with an illness in his family and I hope you will listen carefully to this.

Last week it was necessary for me to travel to Swift Current, Saskatchewan where my mother was critically ill. Unfortunately she passed away within three or four days of being admitted to hospital which left us with a very serious problem as to the future care of my father.

The reason for writing you today is to comment on the comprehensive and well organized health care system which you have developed. I must say that the care provided to my mother through the intensive care unit of the Swift Current Regional Hospital paralleled with the quality of care available anywhere in North America. The staff were extremely courteous, sensitive and professional in carrying out their duties, not only to their patients but to the family members. I must compliment you, sir, for the well organized and comprehensive system that you have allowed to develop in this region.

Shortly after my mother's death, I was in contact with your local community social worker, a Mrs. Alice Elias, and through her arranged a visit with several senior officials of the Palliser Hospital. My own professional background is in hospital administration and based on my past observations of any facility, I can honestly state that the Palliser complex is one of the better long term facilities I have ever seen in Canada. It is rare, in my opinion at least, to find such a sincere interest being displayed by so many persons within one centre. For that reason I did want to write to compliment your system and particularly your staff of that hospital and Saskatchewan for the extremely excellent work they are doing with severely handicapped or dependent persons. I compliment you and your department for structuring a health care system which is very personal in nature and extremely sensitive to the human needs of those it serves.

Now that is signed by a gentleman who is employed by the Ministry of Health in the Government of the Province of Ontario and I would like to table that, Mr. Speaker.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — I would also like to quote, Mr. Speaker, from a letter that was recently in the Leader Post. This individual, and I will just briefly comment on it, said:

I would like to commend doctors, nurses and workers at the Pasqua Hospital. I was in a car accident on

January 28, and almost lost my right leg. After seven weeks I was finally discharged; my leg is not completely healed as yet but it has a good start on the way.

During those rough days of healing, everyone was so nice to my wife and myself. We say thanks to everyone who had a part in making my long stay a reasonable one. We are from the United States and as outsiders we can compare "below the border" health plans with the one Saskatchewan has. The Government of Saskatchewan has given its people one of the greatest health plans in the world. I would also praise Saskatchewan for the combination of car license and insurance.

This individual, incidentally, comes from Pennsylvania and I am quite willing to table that one as well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning that I did not agree with the Motion as proposed in the House and concluding my remarks, I would like to move, seconded by my seatmate, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy), the following Amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for its continuing support of high quality hospital services in Saskatchewan as demonstrated by the 20 per cent increase in estimated Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan expenditures in 1977-78 and the 197 per cent increase in hospital and related expenditures from 1970-71 to 1977-78.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON** (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I have volumes and volumes to say on this and I should like to give the Assembly the opportunity to hear me without interruption and therefore I call it 5:00 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed from 5:00 to 7:00 o'clock p.m.

### **WELCOME TO ST. THOMAS WOLF CUB PACK**

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) has asked me to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature, the St. Thomas Wolf Cub Pack Number 58. I understand there are 22 boys in number. They are accompanied by Mr. A. Tomach and five other adults. They are going to be with us for about half an hour in the Legislature and then they will be taking a tour through the building. I do extend to them, on behalf of Mr. Baker and all the Members of the Legislature, a warm welcome and I hope that their stay with us this evening will be a pleasant experience that they will remember for a long time.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

April 5, 1977.

## The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Resolution No. 1 — **CUTBACK IN HOSPITAL SERVICES**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, to add to my remarks briefly made before 5:00 o'clock, this Government has refused to recognize that we have a higher percentage of citizens over the age of 60 than any other part of Canada. It has also refused to recognize that because of this higher percentage of the aged, we need more home care, more Level II, III and IV care facilities in this province. Consequently to aggravate a cutback in hospital services, there is a saturation of hospital beds with people who would otherwise be in nursing homes. This in turn creates a rather heavy load for the reduced hospital staff because this type of patient, Mr. Speaker, requires more care than the average hospital patient and, in fact, we should have more staff in our hospitals, not less.

The Minister was reading letters of praise for the health care in Saskatchewan. I think I can produce just as many letters that indicate that we do not have the hospital services that the Minister suggests. One that comes to mind is a letter from Local 80 of CUPE, the hospital workers at St. Joseph's Hospital in Estevan. I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Hospital workers are concerned by the cutbacks of hospital staff which has been the policy of the Provincial Government and we feel this is discriminatory against the hospital worker and is unfair to both employees of St. Joseph's Hospital, do protest all of the hospital staff cutbacks and, furthermore, that all past hospital staff cutbacks be reinstated and no further cutbacks be made.

Another that comes to mind, Mr. Speaker, is a lady from my constituency requiring surgery for a prolapsed uterus. It is not a life and death situation, but it is, I understand, very uncomfortable. She is on a 12 to 14 month waiting list for this elective surgery.

This Government has got to get its heart and its head together — a little less potash and a little more hospital care.

I have several more of these letters on file and I am sorry I do not have them here as I would like to lay them on the table for the Minister, but while we await their arrival, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 24 — VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Thibault (Kinistino):

That this Assembly deplores the increasing violence in television programming and the consequent desensitizing effect on viewers and urges the Canadian Radio Television and Communications Commission to take steps to:

(1) study the effects of constant exposure to violence, particularly among young viewers; and (2) set standards for programming which prevent excessive amounts of violence.

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY** (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, the other day I spoke for a few minutes in support of this Resolution. In the meantime I decided to ask the opinions of certain clergymen, educators and homemakers in Saskatoon. And the one thing that came through loud and clear was that Shakespeare was right when he wrote, “the appetite grows by what it feeds on.”

It would appear that television violence can be blamed for much of the violence we hear about almost daily in North American society. It would appear that the television set has, in many instances, become a babysitter, something akin to a third parent in this age of fast living and high pressures and, should some question this, I should like to point to a well known North American statistic and that is — by the time children reach school age, most will have spent more time watching television than, say, a university student will have spent in class instruction on a four-year program. Further to this, Mr. Speaker, by the time most high school students graduate, most will have spent 22,000 hours watching television as compared to 11,000 hours in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, evidence that exposure to too much violence, whether through television or not, hardens or dehumanizes individuals, especially those of tender years, can be probably best shown by the fact that in many television violence-infested areas, the dying are left to die alone, the person in an accident is quickly passed by, the sufferings of others are ignored and those who would be hardened by such things feel no guilt or shame because violence, or its counterpart, passive indifference, becomes the accepted norm.

Mr. Speaker, in the matter of television violence and violence through any other media, I suggest to this House, there is no reasonably easy way for parents and other citizens to register their protests. To whom should one direct his or her anger, should he or she run across a program of violence, violent words and violent behavior? Should he or she direct his anger at the network or the local station, or the sponsors? Mr. Speaker, no one knows.

I know that individuals can register complaints and so can organizations such as Home and Schools, service clubs, etc., but I feel that far too often those citizens who are really concerned, who often represent a majority of viewing families, are too often ignored because they do not have the means of making themselves vocal enough to the right party.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the CRTC studies not only the effects of violence on television but also a more effective means by which citizens can register their complaints relative to the many television programs which have as their theme violent actions, words and suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, there are many wholesome themes around which television programs could be centered, themes that stress the good and the natural, themes that stress fair play, compassion and the brotherhood of all humans on this earth. Why is the bizarre stressed? Why is shysterism sometimes presented as a challenge? Why is it that criminals are sometimes made out to be the real heroes on many programs?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is really the fault,

April 5, 1977.

in the main, of greedy corporations and individuals who would feed anything on television as long as it makes money for them. They are conditioning us, and we are buying the whole package — vulgar television programming and their advertised products.

Mr. Speaker, if the CRTC can try to throw its weight around relative to cable television, surely it can try to regulate violence on television. This it hasn't done and I urge it to start living up to its obligations before it is too late; before violence becomes a permanent part of our lives; before we, too, reach a state as can be found in certain areas of the United States and central Canada, where, as a recent study conducted by the "Enquirer" indicated, many would, without it bothering their consciences, without hesitation, pull a trigger to kill a fellow human being for a fairly small amount of money if they knew they would not be caught. I believe this state of affairs has not infested most of Canada, but if it ever does, we will have forsaken the ideals and principles of our ancestors, who came to this land in search of peace and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, as seconder to this Motion, you know full well I am completely in favor of it, its intention and its implementation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. LANE** (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I will have a few remarks to make and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY** (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of **Bill No. 78 — An Act respecting The Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be rather brief on this Bill.

The intention of this Bill is to officially recognize the accredited public accountants of Saskatchewan. It would appear to many in the province, although I grant not all, that it would be a wise decision on the part of this Legislature to grant this official recognition.

One reason for that is there are many people who would be affected, many people who live in smaller communities of Saskatchewan. I deem it a pleasure to move this Bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

**MR. J. WIEBE** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few comments that I should like to make to this Bill and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT** (Regina Wascana) moved second reading of **Bill No. 82 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act (No. 2).**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave before I begin my remarks regarding Bill No. 82, if I might on your behalf welcome

the Boy Scout Troop from St. Andrew's School. It is the second year that a number of young men have come here from St. Andrew's Boy Scout Troop and I think that all Members of the House would welcome them. I am pleased to see the Boy Scouts taking that interest to come to the Legislature to see the way government works.

Mr. Speaker, before I comment particularly on the amendments that I proposed to The Marriage Act, I want to tell the House that the reason that I have moved a bill, separate from introducing amendments to the Government's own amendments, is that it was not possible for me to simply add to the Government amendments, amendments which would appropriately do the job that I believe need to be done and that other Members, some Members on this side of the House believe need to be done, including I believe some Members of the Government.

I, Mr. Speaker, moved a bill with some reluctance because I fear to some extent that the Government chooses not to pass amendments by way of bills, simply because they have fallen into the habit of feeling that they lose some face if they pass an Opposition bill. I don't think that the press interprets it that way. I hope that the Government will have an opportunity to look at the merits of amendments had those amendments been proposed at a time when amendments were going through with another Act or where an Act was being brought in by the Government.

It is a problem that I have been looking at for a number of months. I had obtained, Mr. Speaker, copies of legislation from other jurisdictions, including California, and Bill No. 82 is patterned upon the California legislation. Then when I saw the Government moving amendments to The Marriage Act, I thought that this was the appropriate time to bring these matters before the House but I was advised by the Legislative Council that it was not possible for me to attach my amendments to those of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I should mention that the amendments that the Government proposed to The Marriage Act don't trouble me particularly and I don't think they trouble others of our party. You heard a few days ago my colleague from Regina South talking about the problem of teenage marriages that Bill No. 82 addresses itself to, the problems that are created in that way.

Mr. Speaker, from my experience in the practice of law, I found that a distressingly high proportion of those youthful marriages end in failure. Frequently the marriages are precipitated by a pregnancy and the young people are pressured to marry. Indeed, in too many cases, they are in turn pressured by their families to marry. Although the frequency of youthful pregnancies is declining, still in the last year for which there were records, there were 36 women who gave birth to children when they were themselves under 15. On 36 occasions, in that year, a child was giving birth to a child. I don't think that we should encourage the marriage of minors and indeed I think that is an area at which society has to take a look and decide whether something should be done by the Legislature.

All too often in my dealings with those young people, when I see them at some later time after they have been married for some years and are perhaps contemplating a divorce, I find that they have not really looked at the marriage in the terms of a long-range concept but have looked at the marriage in terms of



April 5, 1977.

the spectacular show they hope to put on for their friends. You need only to listen to radio advertisements that talk about the bridal boutique and the photographs and getting a dinner jacket or a tuxedo for the occasion, the flowers and the travel, the sale of diamonds. Those are the kinds of things that people are encouraged to think about when they marry at a young age and all too few of them think of the more practical problems of washing diapers and buying washing machines. Particularly with a 16 year old or a 15 year old, the romantic side of marriage is perhaps too attractive and it may be necessary for society to take some part to ensure that the marriage is founded on more than simply the romance of the hour.

Mr. Speaker, our law now permits anyone who has reached the age of 18 to marry without the consent of their parents and certainly without the intervention of the courts in any way. I think that we would all accept that in some situations people have reached a maturity at an age beneath 18 and they might rightly contemplate marriage. But I suggest society has a responsibility to help young people to better plan their lives. Society will be the loser if their marriage fails, because of the effects on the party, because of the effects on the children, on social welfare costs, on the possibility of a problem of juvenile delinquency. Since society will be so much involved, I think that it would be appropriate for society to become, in part, involved in the decision making process of whether they marry before 18 or not.

The legislation that this Act proposes would have the prospective marriage partners, if they are under 18, obtain the consent of a Queen's Bench Judge. We now require that an under age marriage partner obtain the consent of his or her parents or guardian for the marriage. If they can't obtain that consent and that provision would be continued, we now permit them to apply to a Queen's Bench Judge to dispense with that consent. The judge may grant an order to dispense with the consent and the marriage proceeds. That discretionary power will be continued under The Marriage Act as amended by the Government regulations and as amended by Bill No. 82.

Orders dispensing with consent are granted in appropriate cases, and some expense is involved, granted, to go before the court to obtain that order. An application costs \$100 or \$150. That doesn't frighten me because I don't think there is anything too wrong with asking a young couple, who propose to be married, to bear that added expense, if that added expense will result in a better chance of their marriage being successful, a greater understanding for them of what the marriage will be all about.

The amendments that are embodied in Bill No. 82 would maintain the power in the court and they would also add a new responsibility. It may be that if The Marriage Act were changed and the responsibility is taken from the Court of Queen's Bench, that Bill No. 82 should then have the responsibility placed in some other court as well. But for the moment the Court of Queen's Bench has that responsibility.

Every prospective marriage partner beneath 18, after Bill 82 becomes law, if it does, would have to apply to the court and the discretion would lie in the court to decide whether this is an appropriate case for a marriage. There would be an unfettered discretion for the judge, with the suggestions in the amendments, to consider the economic situation of the parties, and prospective union, their maturity, their financial circumstances and any other factor that he might consider pertinent.

It would be an unfettered discretion for the judge to decide whether that 16 year old or 15 year old should marry.

The legislation will direct the judge to set a time after which the parties will marry. If, for instance, in dealing with an under age couple, the judge decides that he will allow them to marry but feels there should be a cooling off period of six weeks or two months, then he would have the power to order that they might not get married the week after next, which is usually what a young couple wants, but to have a bit of a breathing space and perhaps they would be allowed to marry two months hence, if the judge thought that was appropriate.

The Amendments will also direct the judge to have the parties undertake marriage counselling. Marriage counselling, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is available very cheap all over this province and in most cases there is no expense at all. And for any couple intending to marry, marriage counselling would be a valuable thing, to discuss the legal ramifications, the duties that one would expect from the other, the results of their marriage, what they can expect marriage will be all about. For any couple, whether they be 16 or 36, that would be valuable. But for a 16 year old it is all the more valuable. The court would be asked to impose marriage counselling which would deal with the social, economic and personal responsibilities that will flow from the marriage.

Again, Mr. Speaker, bringing to the attention of young couples that marriage is a very serious matter, the Province of Quebec requires that every couple at least go to a lawyer and spend a half hour discovering some of the legal ramifications of their marriage. I suggest that this kind of marriage counselling that they would receive by going to a marriage counsellor or one of the social service units would be very valuable for them.

Mr. Speaker, why you might say do we draw the cut-off at the age of 18? We cut off at 18 because we have decided that that is the legal age of maturity. We have said that an 18 year old is able to enter into contracts. But for marriage purposes, 18 tends to be the age when high school is concluded as well. People then find themselves in a different area, perhaps with people who are married, and they get the advantage of the peer group advice just from being in a more mature group of people.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is very similar to legislation that was introduced in California by Assemblyman Mr. Haze in 1970. It has been on the books there for seven years. The state is very pleased with the effect of that legislation, very pleased to have something beyond merely the consent of the parents as a bulwark to protect society from bad marriages and to protect the people, themselves, from too quickly entering into marriages that may not be appropriate for them.

Many jurisdictions have a higher age for marriage, an age where they have to have marital consent beyond 18. I believe that it is certainly not inappropriate for our Legislature to ask a 15, 16, or 17 year old to go through that extra bit of counselling, to lay their plans before a court, to convince someone other than their mother perhaps, that the marriage is appropriate even if that 15 year old is pregnant. To go through, Mr. Speaker, that tiny extra bit of delay, those few precautionary extra steps, I think would be very valuable.

April 5, 1977.

I hope that the Government will consider the amendments and that the Government will view these amendments in the way that they are intended. They are intended to add to the dignity of the institution of marriage, at a time when we see all around us marriage falling into disrespect. I think that it is little to ask that a 15 or 16 year old go through a little extra effort to help ensure a better marriage, if that marriage is ultimately entered into.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Marriage Act No. 2.

**MR. D.G. BANDA** (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I can see a number of problems with respect to passing a law which states that no one under the age of 18 shall get married without obtaining the consent or an order from a judge. I can also see problems related to a law that is going to encourage more common-law in our society. I want to say more on this matter after I have time to study the proposal a little further and consult with some of our younger people that certainly will be discriminated against. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES — VOTE 36**

**HON. H. ROLFES** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Chairman, it is certainly my pleasure to introduce the staff. When I saw the group outside before we went into Estimates, I asked my Deputy Minister whether we should bring in a white flag or a red flag. When I walked into the House and saw the Opposition, I suggested to them we should bring in a red flag because we might as well go into the attack, Mr. Chairman.

The individual sitting beside me I don't think is a stranger to this House, Frank Bogdasavich, my Deputy Minister; Mr. Richard Fontanie, my Assistant Deputy. In the back are Don Cameron, Director of Social Services; Terry Thompson, Director of Corrections; Alf Zimmerman, Director of Income Security; Ian Potter, Director of Planning and Evaluation and Walter Cherabin, Director of Central Administration. Sitting directly behind me are Paul Bujaczek, Budget Officer; Jack Funk, Director of Core Services; Dick Baxter, Director of Mental Retardation; Mike Lipka, Assistant Director of Core Services, and Dick Fedora, former Director of the Human Resources Development Association.

#### **ITEM 1.**

**MISS L. CLIFFORD** (Wilkie): — Mr. Chairman, we are going to briefly start by looking at the number of positions that we have in various items. As you well know or, if you can recall, last year we were asking a number of questions about this. We found that there were a number of different figures taken out of Permanent Positions so I should like to first ask you, why the difference in the administration section — a removal of 25 permanent positions?

**MR. ROLFES**: — Mr. Chairman, very simply, 32 people were transferred to income security from administration.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — I should like to also touch on Item 7. You have got an increase of 19 and we go down to the Riverside Home, Item 29, you have an increase of 19 but the most contentious area is Item 31 where you have an increase of 103. Can you take those individually and explain why these increases were needed?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, regional services, all were conversions except for two, which I believe went to Saskatoon for crises situations. And the Riverside, I believe those were expansions to Level IV beds and there will also be some conversions, I am not sure — how many conversions did we have there — the third one, Valley View, I believe those were temporary put on permanent.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Last year you took them from permanent and put them on temporary.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, there is a very simple explanation. The simple explanation is that it was very difficult a year or two ago to get qualified people. We were able this year to get people, I believe from Quebec and Ontario, who are qualified to fill these positions and we've now put them on permanent.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Mr. Chairman, last year we precisely pointed out that you were saying that they were on temporary positions. You denied the fact that you were trying to do this and now you've got them switched over to permanent positions. In your department, as per usual, you're trying to kid not only the people in the Legislature but the people of your department by trying to cover up positions and where you are putting your finances.

I'd like to go ahead. You said in Item 3 that you've got an increase of 41 in the income Security Administration. Previously you said you've tried to overhaul the Income Security Division. What exactly are these additional positions? How exactly are they going to help the Income Security Administration?

**MR. ROLFES:** — We've already explained that the 32 were transferred from Administration to Income Security, for the Social Assistance Program and Family Income Plan. There were six people for SAP verification and there were three who were on temporary and have been put on permanent.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — I'm glad you started to talk about SAP and FIP. As you well know I've been trying to get an answer from the department and it is sitting on the Order Paper. One of the most controversial areas as an MLA dealing with constituency problems is the area of overpayments in the Family Income Plan. Could you tell us roughly, I'll even take within a couple of hundred, the number of overpayments that have been charged in the last year? I realize that the Minister has said that it's hard to tell from when the program started. I'll take within a hundred, within the last year.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I think it's important we first of all have the philosophy of the Family Income Plan. When Alex Taylor, the former Minister, introduced the program into the

House, he made it very clear that one of the functions of the Family Income Plan was to meet the immediate needs of the family as quickly as possible, not to meet the needs in the future, but to try and respond as soon as a family was in need. Because the payments initially were based on estimates, estimates that were submitted to us (if I take the literal meaning of the word overpayment), a family could have an overpayment if their actual income changed in a particular month. Therefore, you could have an overpayment almost at any time if the actual income happened to exceed what the family had estimated. We must examine what some of the outstanding payments are at a particular time. I can give you that figure. We did a calculation as of April 1, this year. The outstanding payments amounted to 3,444 as of April 1st of this year, for a total sum of money of \$932,263. Those are outstanding as of April 1st of this year.

Now, it has to be understood that this amount outstanding as of April 1st may not be outstanding a few months from now.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, 3,444 people or instances may not seem like a lot and you've said that it deals with the immediate needs of the family. Well, part of the problem, I admit, is the fact that they do not estimate their income correctly. But would you not agree that in order to alleviate this problem, two of the suggestions that I have given previously; one, first simplify the forms that you are using . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — I didn't get that.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Two suggestions that I have given previously to help alleviate the problem are, one, simplify the forms. I know it says directly you're not supposed to underestimate your income, but those forms are rather complicated. Two, have at least a quarterly audit on all your people receiving assistance, so that overpayments of \$1,000 to \$2,000 per family are not run up. That's quite a shock to get a letter from your department saying you have an overpayment of \$1,800. You are required to pay this immediately. Now do you not feel that these two suggestions might help your department alleviate some of the problems?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the Member does make some valid observations and I don't think at any time have we said that we weren't prepared to have a look at FIP. I think the former Minister said that they were going to let the plan work for a year and then see what some of the problems were and then they would make some changes. I have made a number of changes since I became the Minister; in fact, I made a number of changes in January of 1976 and again, I made some changes in January, 1977. I would suspect that we will probably make some changes again in maybe a year's time or so, to work out the kinks that are in the program. I think that we have done some of those things.

I would like to turn over to the Member opposite a kit that we have developed that goes out to each individual. Have you got the kit? She's got a copy of the kit. I think from it you will recognize that we have taken a lot of steps to help the individual make absolutely certain that he does not make any errors if at all possible. I think if you look at the form itself you'll find that we've simplified it as much as possible. We have made absolutely certain that each step is followed very closely. We've indicated to them what times for example the

January cheque would be mailed to them, the February cheque would be mailed to them and the declaration form for 1976. Each thing is itemized in the form, month by month, what will happen. I think this will make a considerable improvement over what we've had in the past. If you look at the Family Income Plan work sheets, you will find that we give every help possible, work sheet on pages three and four, work sheet on pages five and six. We try and give every assistance that we can. I recognize that the form is complicated, but I just don't see how you are going to get away with an oversimplified form when you need some of the information that we do need.

So, I think we have taken some steps and we realized when we put the program into effect that we were going to have some problems. But I'd like to say to the Members opposite, compare this program to programs that are taking place, for example, in New York where they, I believe, have over 25 per cent overpayments; California at 17 per cent overpayment. The experimental program in Manitoba, between Manitoba and the Federal Government, solved theirs by simply dropping all overpayments under \$250 at the end of the year. So what I'm saying is that we are open to suggestions, but we do think that we have taken some significant steps to improve the program.

Let me now answer your question on a quarterly audit. My officials tell me that we have really gone to a quarterly audit insofar as we demand that the recipient must issue us with a cheque stub return on a quarterly basis. If they don't, we simply withhold the cheque. The quarterly cheque stub has to have the actual income earned up to that date, the quarterly income. So I think we are doing what you are asking us to do.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Mr. Chairman, I found it rather unique that you were comparing such areas as New York and California and the fact that you've almost got \$1 million in overpayments. I doubt whether you could find any province in Canada that has anything comparable to having that many people being charged overpayments or having that amount of money. I don't know how you can say that you are keeping a quarterly audit. Now if you are, fine, but I know of a number of instances in my own area where they have sent in a cheque monthly, their stub, and yet they have still been charged an overpayment. So somewhere there is some lack of communication and consistency in that area.

I'd like to ask a question regarding public assistance. We are one of the few provinces that do not have assistance for blind people. As far as I can check, most other provinces, I would say 90 per cent of them, do have some sort of assistance. Although the Federal Government does give some assistance, it is being phased out. Would your department somehow consider doing something for a blind person who is in need of temporary assistance?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Wilkie had asked the Member sitting beside her, he would have told her that that was done away with in 1966. Let me say that except for the residual cases, but I do want to make the comment that even though we do not have a specific category to which I would be opposed in principle, our program is just as rich as any of the others. We provide ours through the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. It's just as rich as the other provinces. So our people do not suffer

because the category was done away with and I agree with the former government when it did away with that category.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — I don't particularly agree with your statement that the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan will cover people with problems like this. We got into a debate last year about the philosophy and whether or not this was an important factor. I haven't had a large number of people who have come to me with this problem but those who have come to me have said that they don't want to go on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. You're not going to get away from society's ingrained feelings. They just would like some monthly temporary assistance because they have this unfortunate problem of blindness. They don't want to have to go on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, but a few additional dollars perhaps might help them.

I don't doubt that he wouldn't likely agree with me if his constituents, who happened to be the same ones as mine, came to him with the problems. I haven't had much problem trying to relate my problems to his.

Last year in Estimates, I asked you about your corrections system and the number of people who were assigned per probation officer or parole officer. You said that that problem was being looked after and you were hiring a large number of new people. It's too bad that this wasn't recorded at that time, but I'll have it for next year's Estimates. I would say that it was around 35 new people whom you were considering hiring in that area. How many people have you actually hired to look after the probation system?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Did the Member wish me to comment in general on that category? I simply want to add that, in our discussions with the Federal Government — and I'm not blaming the Federal Government, don't get me wrong, in fact, I agree with Marc Lalonde on this — they made it very clear that they did not wish to go back to categories and I think most of the provinces in Canada agree with that. Some provinces still have categories, however, most of the Ministers who were there agreed that we should get away from the categories. A deserted wife has a specific category because she's deserted; that's a real difficulty. You can have a person who is mentally retarded. You can have a physically handicapped person. You can have a person who is very hard of hearing and may be handicapped. You can have a blind person. There are so many different categories that you can have. All I'm saying is let's recognize that the need is there and let's provide compensation accordingly. I would like us to recognize that all people who are on public assistance have special needs.

Now, just give us a moment on the probation officers. Mr. Chairman, I also wish that last year had been recorded because my recollection tells me and my officials tell me also that I had indicated that there would be some additional probation officers. I believe if we could check, you would find that I said that there would be about five extra probation officers. We did not hire the five, we hired three. The two that I had indicated we were going to hire, we did not, and I suppose it had something to do with budget restraint and we felt that we would go with three. But I can assure you that we will hire the extra two in this coming year, plus two more. So we will hire four additional people this coming year.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Mr. Chairman, do you not agree, Mr. Minister, that at the best you have 48 people per probation officer, with the statistics that you gave me during the Throne Speech, I think it was? Do you not agree that this is indeed a serious situation considering the amount of work that they have to prepare, pre-sentence reports as well as doing their everyday activities and that this should indeed be a major priority to get more, perhaps five people, because the workload that they have is, indeed, too heavy?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think I indicated in the Budget Speech that we had five supervisors plus 40 probation officers. I think we also have to add to this the 12 native probation officers who work on reserves. You have to add on to these the 12, for a total of 57. I will agree that I would like to have more, but there are many other areas where I would like to have more. I have to recognize that you can only do so much and I think the Opposition has constantly criticized us, that our civil service is becoming too big. I know that you want more probation officers, someone else wants something else and I think that we have to make that judgment. I agree with the Member and I would like to have more probation officers so that they could do their job very effectively. But so would other departments like to have more people. We have to make that judgment call and I guess that is what we have done. We have said that we would hire an extra four this year and that, I believe, will be the limit.

**MR. LANE:** — (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, I should like to exercise a bit of tradition in the Assembly and say a few remarks, very brief, of course.

There has been a fairly constant difference of opinion between the Minister and myself. We have had a basic difference of opinion as to exactly what is happening with the department in the way of income support or in the way of social assistance. It is our position that our traditional efforts have, in fact, failed. The Minister gets very upset when one says that.

The Minister has in the past been critical of the Opposition for criticizing the fact that the people on social assistance in Saskatchewan are the senior citizens and are the people that can't work. We have shown in the past that, in fact, the department has done several things. First of all, the department hasn't been able to, in the past, prove its statistics. It never had, for example, a verification unit until pressures from the Opposition caused the implementation of a verification unit. It seemed to us rather strange that a government department would call for application forms, with no system to check the accuracy of the input into the application form. In other words the system had built up, for many years I might add, wherein the application form was taken at face value. It wasn't, I believe, until last year under pressure from the Opposition and the Provincial Auditor that, in fact, a verification unit was established.

There are some very, very basic facts that the Minister, I don't believe, can refute. First of all, since 1956 in the Province of Saskatchewan, in practically every year except 1969 to 1971, there has been approximately 40,000 people in the Province of Saskatchewan receiving social assistance each year. Now



I would hope that the Minister doesn't refer to departmental statistics and integrate into his the DNS statistics as well.

Each year the expenditures have increased, in some cases, dramatically. What have we done? In essence we have admitted that our present system has failed, that we have not, in fact, developed any system to either eliminate poverty or remove people from the assistance payrolls which should be the goal of any such system.

The Minister, as I said, has defended the Government's position on many occasions, but the Minister can't refute the fact of the failure and his bible says, and I quote:

... the more valid criticism of the welfare state was raised by Walter Stewart in an article in Maclean's Magazine, January 24th.

He is concerned about the fact that welfare statism has failed to end poverty. He noted that although welfare expenditures in Canada have soared from \$2.6 billion in 1965 to \$14.3 billion a decade later, the gap between the rich and the poor has not been eliminated nor even greatly or significantly narrowed.

That quote comes from something that I know the Minister lives by and it is called The Commonwealth. I am referring to The Commonwealth of March 9, 1977 under the column, To the Point.

We have argued and argued in the past that one of the reasons for the failure of our present welfare system is the fact that the management of our welfare systems has not been able to do some very basic things, like determine the specific goals and assess the attainment of goals. I understand that the department has now implemented, I believe, the PMIS System. I will be asking the Minister some questions on the internal management and the verification and the assessment of goals in each specific program and I am sure that he will give me a full report on those particular areas.

My first question to the Minister is: at the time of your annual report, dated March 31, 1976, setting out the number of recipients, I believe on page 10, can you tell me how many recipients at that time were on the continuous needs payroll and I would like the same figures for March 31, 1977 if you have them?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, while the officials are looking up some information, I should like to say a few words in comment to some of the statements made by the Member.

Not one word, Mr. Chairman, did we hear from him as to why the disparity between the rich and the poor has really existed, and still remains. It has very, very little to do with the welfare payments that you are talking about. It is because of decisions made by people who give breaks to the rich, but do not give these same breaks to the poor people.

You should have been in the House when I spoke about the hidden welfare system, where the Federal Government gives the rich people in this country \$6.4 billion annually in tax credits or other means, but this is not given to the poor people. If we took \$2 million of that \$6.4 billion and

applied it to a guaranteed annual income, then yes, we could narrow the gap. But constantly you were arguing against the very thing that would have helped the poor people. The poor people need help because our society doesn't recognize that they do have needs, that they do not fit into this system, that they are the last to be hired and the first to be fired, that the governments do not provide full employment.

Why do we have almost a million people unemployed at this particular time? In Saskatchewan, we have probably the lowest unemployment rate in this country, due to the fact that we have a buoyant economy, but also due to the fact that this Government believes in a full employment policy. We have taken measures to make absolutely certain that opportunities are available for those people who do not fit into the regular system, the free enterprise system, that you always support.

I tell the Member opposite that if he was really sincere about the poor people, then he would make absolutely certain that the money that the Federal Government collects through tax credits and now gives to the upper rich would instead apply those credits to a guaranteed annual income for the working poor. Then, yes, I would agree with you. Then I would support you in the criticism, but not if you come out and say, "Oh, well, don't do anything for the poor; don't give them any more welfare; don't you dare give them a guaranteed annual income." What do you suggest I do — other than providing a full employment policy, other than providing a guaranteed annual income, other than making absolutely certain that the poor people get a break? Yes, you people would love to have me resign and put someone in that advocates your kind of policy.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the Members opposite. Since 1971 we did raise the welfare payments but I think that it has to be remembered that much of those payments, the large percentage increases, went to the senior citizens and to the mentally retarded.

The Members opposite are saying that they shouldn't be on welfare and I agree with them. Just as soon as we are allowed, no longer having our dollars at the federal level put in danger through cost-sharing, I will carve out of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan all those people that I possibly can, like the mentally retarded and the senior citizens. Then we will know what the Provincial Government is truly spending on those people who are in need, through no fault of their own; for example, the deserted wives, those who are blind, those who, through no fault of their own, are emotionally disturbed or have alcoholic problems.

As I indicated in my Budget Speech, the assistance for welfare people has only gone up 25 per cent. If you want to criticize, then criticize us on the 25 per cent. Don't criticize us for the help that we have given to the mentally retarded or to the senior citizens. All you need to do is go to the month-end report, all those figures have been given to you and I gave them to you again in the Budget Speech. I don't accept that our money for welfare has drastically increased, and that we have found no solution. We have found a solution for the mentally retarded; we have found a solution for the senior citizens, but I agree that those people who will be constantly in need, through no fault of their own, do not fit into this economic system. We can either say that we are going to keep

them on the welfare system that we have or we are going to provide them with a guaranteed annual income through a full employment policy. That is what we agreed with the Federal Government; that is what most of the other provinces agreed to. And that is what I hope will be introduced into the Parliament of Canada within the next year or two.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, one suggestion has been made about starting to solve the problems to which, I think, you have already alluded. I will tell you some other things that you could be doing to solve the problem.

First of all, recognize that there is one. Recognize the very fact that the mere expenditure of money doesn't solve any problems; that, in fact, our welfare levels have stayed practically standing for the last 20 years. Obviously something isn't working.

Secondly, I will give you one concrete example and that is don't buy potash mines. Cut the taxes to the businesses and allow them to expand in this province and encourage industries to develop and give jobs and give a stable work force to this province. Those are the things you should be doing. If you were really concerned about the unemployed and establishing work for the people in this province, you would have encouraged that. You have turned a blind eye to everything. You are convinced in your own mind that the expenditure of money, under the guise of the poor and the disabled, solves problems. The fact is that you have failed and a guaranteed annual income will be a disaster for this country.

I will give you an example of why. The same type of approach was used by the Government of Canada when it recommended changes to the Unemployment Insurance Commission, I believe, in 1971. And yet the Economic Council of Canada, five years later, had to stand up and say that the unemployment changes of 1971 added one to one and a half per cent to our unemployment rate in the Dominion of Canada. Obviously, that system, a disincentive to work, in spending more money added to unemployment and was harmful to the country of Canada. I say that the guaranteed annual income will be a bigger disaster.

When you talked about your position, about the poor, you should have told this Assembly how many new permanent jobs your department created for people, and you certainly failed to do so. You are blinded to the fact that you can rest easy with your conscience, by spending millions and millions more and demanding more and more money, but you haven't yet shown the guts to get down to the basic problem. Let's look at each separate category and each problem and start solving them and look at permanent solutions, so that we can come back here 50 years down the road and there will be very few people on our welfare system. The fact is the present system has failed and your approach is part of the cause of the failure.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not going to defend the policies of the Federal Government re: employment, neither the Conservative Government of Diefenbaker nor the Liberal Government of Pierre Trudeau. I am not saying that an NDP Government in Ottawa could do any better because tackling the unemployment situation is not an easy task. But I want to remind the Member opposite

that we have the lowest unemployment in all of Canada today, in all of Canada today! I want to ask the Member opposite, when he was in the Attorney General's Department a few years ago, how many people were unemployed at that time? There were very few in this province, but where were they all? They all left, about 24,000 of them left for Alberta and British Columbia because you refused to make projects available for these people. At least our population is increasing and yet we still have the lowest unemployment in this country. But as I have said before, that is not enough. We have got to constantly look for new avenues to provide more opportunities for those people who do not fit into the regular force, who through no fault of their own, may have a very low education, who may be physically handicapped, who may be emotionally handicapped or who may have alcoholic problems. The private sector refuses to hire most of these people. They refuse to hire them. It is true that most of these people will not be hired, especially in a time when you have high unemployment. When they can pick and choose, these will be the last people to be hired. But having said that, the governments of this country haven't got a very good record either. The governments haven't got a very good record of hiring people who are handicapped. Maybe we need to look at the possibility of forcing not only the private sector, but also the public sector, to have a certain percentage of their work force filled with people who are handicapped, disadvantaged people.

What I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I just don't buy the criticisms that the Member opposite is levelling at this Government. I think we have a pretty good record. If you look at the facts, they show that we have. Could we do more? Of course we can. Do we have to have an open mind to other solutions? Of course we do. I am saying that when you look at the records and if you keep an open mind you will find that we have a pretty good record.

**MR. LANE:** — You have just told this Assembly that you, as Minister of Social Services, are accepting a minimum figure or constant figure of 40,000 people in Saskatchewan receiving social assistance. You said that there is always a certain number who can't make it or there are always a certain number who have alcoholic problems. There are always a number with low education. It is funny that that has been a pretty constant figure since 1956 in the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't believe that to be the case. I think what is happening is, as I have said before, you are turning a blind eye to the real issues and the real problems and that is your failure as a Minister.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, we could go on and on and on and we are not going to come to any solutions. We haven't in the last 100 years and I suppose we won't in the next 100 years. All I am asking the Members to do, and I think this is public information, is to have a look at the monthly report. If you take out of the welfare rolls the senior citizens because they are included in the total number, take out people who have ill health, take out people who have a permanent disability and can't qualify for Workmen's Compensation for one reason or another, and take out the mentally retarded, you're taking out 14,000 people right there. Now let's have a look at the second category, absence of spouse. I would just like to ask the Members opposite, what do you do, for example, if a spouse passes away and a mother or a

woman or the husband has to be at home with a family of three or four children? What do you say? Tough luck. Do they leave those children at home or make some other arrangements to go out and work? Do we say that we are not going to give any assistance for a short period of time until they can make some arrangements or until the children are old enough and are in school? Or do we say that we will seriously look at giving assistance to those people, or those deserted by a spouse? I know the Members opposite will also ask, what do you do for maintenance? Why don't you force a husband who leaves his wife and family, why don't you force him to pay the maintenance? I would love to. But how do you go about doing it? If he leaves this province, goes to Alberta or goes to British Columbia or heads to New Brunswick or goes to the United States, what do you do? By the time you catch up with the person, he is gone again.

I think the Member for Regina South alluded to that some time ago in this session or the previous session. I agree with him. We have got to do something. All the provincial Ministers agree. We did set up a committee, we set up a committee to have a look at it. I want to quote from an article of which I am sure most of you people are aware. It is entitled "Losing Cause" from New York:

The city collected \$5.7 million last year in child support payment from missing parents, said a report from the Community Council of greater New York. But it spent more than \$18 million to do it.

They collected \$5.7 million but it cost them \$18 million to do it. Now that is not a paying proposition. So what do you do? What alternatives do you have? You go down the list; we could go to spouses who are in hospitals or in mental institutions. Again what choice do you have? Spouses for example who are in penal institutions, what do you do with the family? Separation and divorce are great concerns of ours. And the rate of divorce and separation is alarming. But again what do you do with the family who suffers those consequences?

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, if you take out these two groups, that is 14,669 and 10,172, you are up to almost 25,000 people. I would like the Members opposite to tell me how they would deal with those situations. What would they do?

We can argue about those, if those are the ones you are arguing about. Okay, let's argue. Let's argue about what you would do, for example, with people who have insufficient earnings from full time employment. If someone earns the minimum wage or gets four dollars per hour and he simply can't support his family on that, isn't it better to supplement that family, to give them additional income so they can have a decent living, so that he can give his family the kind of support that they need so that they don't have to live in poverty, which then very often results in crime? I say that we have to give some assistance to these people. I said our unemployment is fairly low, we only had 243 cases with insufficient earnings in this particular month — January, 1977.

We have personality problems. The ones I am referring to are those who may have emotional problems or those who may have alcoholic problems or something of this nature. Here again, we can argue that we have to be tougher on these people. I will agree, maybe we have to. I will tell you one thing; if somebody has an alcoholic problem there is absolutely no way that

that person will hold a job, unless we first of all deal with the problems that that individual has. We have attempted to do that.

Okay, let's talk about those required to stay at home or people on strike. I guess we had about four people on strike who were getting some kind of assistance or four recipients who were receiving some kind of assistance because of a strike situation.

I say to the Members opposite, you throw around the figure of 34,000 or 40,000 people. That is why I suppose I get angry, because out of that number, I think most Members of this House would say that for the 25,000 we can't do very much. We can't do very much about those. For the others, I will recognize that we may have to do more.

I will match up our record in this province to any other province in this country for it is a good record. I would like to ask the Member opposite to give me indications where they are doing better than we are in this province.

I have one further comment. I should like to tell Members opposite that I have heard Members saying, and I often get letters from people out in the various constituencies saying, a certain person is on public assistance and shouldn't be. Well over 95 per cent of the cases that we get, and we check them out, our department has never heard of those people. They aren't on the Family Income Plan; they aren't on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan; they may well be on unemployment insurance but they certainly aren't on our programs. We have received letter after letter where people have indicated to us that so and so is on public assistance; they are receiving a big income; they should be taken off. The people simply haven't been on public assistance.

I say that some of the criticisms that are levied simply aren't justified.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — (Indian Head-Wolseley) I am going to make some comments later on but I think it is about time that the Minister stopped talking about 25,000 and 40,000 people. He talks about hidden welfare benefits. I've been trying to establish how many of the people are on welfare in Saskatchewan. I have a memo from his own department about the Family Income Plan. How much of it is shared by the Canada Assistance Plan — \$8,303,059. That means of the \$20 million of the Family Income Plan that is paid out in this province, \$16 million of it are welfare payments. Every welfare program in Canada is covered under the umbrella of the Canada Assistance Plan as the Minister well knows. In every province they call their welfare programs by a different name. Some call it social aid, some call it this, some call it that. In Saskatchewan we call it the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan and the Family Income Plan. When you start talking about 40,000 people, in reality it is 60,000 people. Let's not kid ourselves. These are your own figures, Mr. Minister; I don't know if it was leaked to me or not. As a matter of fact, it was written by a nice guy and even mailed to me on April 22, 1976. All I am telling you, Mr. Minister, is when you start talking about the number of people on welfare, let's include everybody. When you start talking about 3,400 people in this province who have been overpaid to the tune of \$1 million in one program,

that is a disgrace. Thirty-five hundred people were overpaid in one year in one program. What is that, 20 per cent or 15 per cent of the people overpaid in one program? I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, when you talk about welfare in Saskatchewan, don't give us these figures of two hundred and some. Include everybody that is under the umbrella of the Canada Assistance Plan because the minute you drop that Family Income Plan, those \$16 million will be transferred directly to the Canada Assistance Plan and the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. And don't tell me it wouldn't, because you know it would. Nobody can qualify for welfare payments the same as any other province in Canada. All I am telling you, Mr. Minister, is when you start talking about people on welfare, include all your welfare programs. Don't get up here and give us these tears about the poor deserted wives; everybody pays the deserted wives across Canada. The Family Income Plan has been a disgrace. It needs to be tightened up, when you start talking about 3,500 overpayments in one year. The tragedy of it is that some poor woman or some poor widow, who has got a bunch of children, is asked for an estimate of her income; she give you an accurate estimate according to what it is and then a year later she gets a bill saying that she owes you \$1,800. That is a disgrace of your administration under the Family Income Plan. You talk about your deserted wives; you talk about your separated and divorced people, who are now trying to find money in the hundreds of dollars to pay you back for the maladministration of a program. That is exactly what has happened under the Family Income Plan.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I really don't want to reply to those remarks because they are absolutely stupid. They have no basis in fact whatsoever, none whatsoever. If he had listened, I told him there is a monthly cheque stub which we ask people to submit. If their income changes, we ask them to submit that to us to indicate that their income has changed, so that we can change the Family Income payment that we send to them. If they don't submit that to us, how are we to know that their estimated income has actually changed from the actual income that they have received? I would like to ask the Member to try, by logical reasoning, to at least explain to us how he could say that we shouldn't collect that money back, when we have asked the people, through a cheque stub that we provide, to indicate to us that their income has changed. How could he say that it is a disgrace when it is 9.3 per cent and all other programs anywhere are at least three times as high as ours; well, at least two times as high? I think it is a pretty good record. The Member says these are overpayments as though the money is lost. That money isn't lost. That money will be coming back or most of that money will be coming back to the province. Because we wanted to meet the immediate needs of that family, we wanted to respond as quickly as we could and that is why, for example, we will have more payments that are outstanding at this particular time. I don't apologize for that. We could have made it a foolproof system by simply saying we would delay payment for a full year. We could have paid the following year, after we get the actual income submitted. Mr. Chairman, all I am saying is that we could avoid any overpayments but then the program would not be responsive to the immediate needs.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I told you it was bad administration. I am going to read you a few letters. Just listen to them. I will take the responsibility for them. The first one is to Miss Clifford.

Every month I copied the exact amount on our cheque stubs onto the benefit form, so they knew exactly what we received in wages. Now they send us a letter that they have overpaid us and we shall have to pay back \$844.

That is from the deserted, the divorced, the widowed. Here is another one.

I will try to explain. In 1974 the Government sent out forms to fill out the family income. We filled ours out and sent it in. Then we received \$337. We had eight dependents under 18 in 1975. After March, we had seven dependents, then we received \$859 in 1976. I copied the amount on my cheque, on my husband's cheque, onto the form. So they knew exactly what we earned every month.

These are almost the same words in two different letters. The point is that you're going to try to collect that back, \$1,000 from a widow and \$1,000 from some deserted wife. You'll collect it back all right. I'm telling you, Mr. Minister, that program is a bad program.

In the last three years, perhaps the Minister would tell me how many farmers are on the Family Income Plan, how many have received family income benefits? In the greatest years of farm income in the history of Saskatchewan, some of them with \$100,000 worth of assets, and you know what the value of land is, are still receiving family income benefits. And their neighbors know it. With the Family Income Plan you had a responsibility to verify payments, to check out applications and do something, not give people the taxpayers' dollars and then turn around after you've maladministered it and collect it back. So don't tell me what I'm saying is not a fact because it is a fact.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Again, I'll say that the Member simply doesn't base it on facts and I would like to ask him if he would be so kind as to give us those letters, so that we can check them out. We will certainly do that because we very often find that there is something that the individual has not related to us and therefore the program hasn't been able to respond. It could well have been, for example, that that person was working and he got, for example, a hefty settlement at the end of the year through the unions. That may well have happened in that case and certainly he would have been overpaid. They may have submitted those cheque stubs on a monthly basis, but if at the end of the year they received a sum, either through their union negotiations or through some other means, and therefore received a substantial increase in their income, there would be overpayments. I think we are justified in trying to collect back that money because it's based on an annual income. I think there is no other way that we can do it.

So, I simply want to say to the Member that I just don't buy the accusation that there has been maladministration. I think it's a well run program and I think the 9.3 per cent of outstanding payments right now certainly indicates that to us.



I'd like to again draw to the attention of the Member another item. It says there are overpayments in the millions. It doesn't refer to the Family Income Plan. This item, for example, is from Ottawa. Overpayments to persons receiving unemployment benefits, totalled \$48,217,000 in 1975 and \$39,876,600 in 1974, the Commons was told Monday. In a written reply to Ron Huntington, the Government said there were 13,003 overpayments in 1976 and as a result 262 persons were prosecuted through the courts. There also were 6,550 fines, totalling \$541,808 in 1976, out of a total of \$40 million.

So I'm saying to the Member opposite, look, there are problems with all programs. Let's be fair and compare ours to other programs. I think that you will find as I said before, even though the Family Income Plan is not without its problems, it is probably one of the best run programs that you will find anywhere and I mean anywhere.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Chairman, I wanted earlier to make some comment in response to the Minister's opening comments which I objected to very much because they are based on the assumption, as that Minister and his companion, the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. Faris), so often do, that they somehow are the sole repository of all sensitivity and all care and all concern and all compassion. It is as though they were the people that somehow invented charity and I want to tell them that they aren't. Charity was allowed long before they ever arrived on the scene. I can tell them that 99 per cent of the people in this province understand fully that they have obligations to those who need care. They don't have to preach to them and nor does anyone else because that is part of the fabric of Saskatchewan that has existed for a very long time. These implicit assumptions, that you can't trust other people to carry out their social obligations, are the ones that we object to so much. They continue to confuse too, as they always do, an economic system with a social system. When you refer to the free enterprise system, you are referring to an economic system. Socialism is an economic system too. We both have a social system and a social conscience and our social programs in the past are the equal of anything that they have ever put before us. I refer to universal pensions across this country, medicare and national hospitalization programs, education support, housing procedure . . . yes, yes, my friends may not know this, but the fact of the matter is, there is a national program . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! Order! Order!

**MR. CAMERON:** — The fact of the matter is, as Members know, that that national program was instituted by a Liberal Government and is now in existence as a result of a Liberal Government. I refer only partially to the list of the Liberal Government's programs in the past — native programs and native housing programs. My friends are familiar with the Off Reserve Housing Program and all the other ones we provide in respect to the native people. That's true provincially as well as nationally. My friends opposite always forget the concern that the former Premier, whom they always paint as such a reactionary to the native problem in this province, had. He had some programs, far better in that respect, than you people have ever devised.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — They didn't even mention, Mr. Chairman, legal aid programs, compensation for victims of crime, which we instituted and a whole host of other programs. These have demonstrated clearly for everybody our concern in a social sense. And why can't the Members opposite, for whom we give credit for having done a reasonably good job in their term in office on the social side of things, give us the same credit? There is always that implicit assumption that the Members over here, who believe in a different economic system than they believe in, can't at the same time have the same sense of charity and social conscience that they have.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** — I suppose, as one pious Member to another pious Member, I don't need any preaching either. But I will, Mr. Chairman, stand here and condemn those who will go out during elections and by-elections and from house to house saying to people that there are thousands and thousands of people on social assistance who shouldn't be on it. I will condemn those who, during the last provincial election, took out ads saying that we spent some \$40 million in our last year, ads saying the NDP Government is spending \$93 million, but not once, Mr. Chairman, not once did they indicate that the large bulk of that increase went to the mentally retarded and to the senior citizens. That's what I despise. I don't say that you don't have a social conscience, but at least go to the people and tell them the truth. If our budget has increased from \$40 million to some \$100 million then at least tell the people that 25 per cent of the increase is due to the people who are in need. We are going to be giving \$49 million out of this year's budget to senior citizens as compared to the low assistance that you gave to senior citizens in 1971-72 but I recognize that the need wasn't as great then as it is today. But at least tell the people that that's where the money is going. Don't try and scare everybody and say that all you need to do is sign your name and you can get assistance.

In the last by-election in Saskatoon, we heard this, not from the Members sitting over there to my left on that side, but certainly from the Members to their right. I didn't hear it from the Official Opposition, but I certainly heard it from Members to their right, who tried to use the increases that we made available to the mentally retarded and to the senior citizens and tried to put them in a total package saying that this Government was wasting their money, throwing it away on those people who didn't want to work. I have said time and time again that anybody that can work should work. If you show me somebody that's on public assistance and shouldn't be there, I will do everything to make certain that that person is on it no longer. If you're not going to supply me with the names, don't go out and say that there are thousands of people on it who shouldn't be.

You may directly criticize me as a Minister; that's immaterial. What I get angry at is what you do to those people who deserve that money, who deserve to be on assistance — the senior citizens and the mentally retarded. That's what I can't stomach. I'm not saying that you don't have a social conscience. All I'm saying is that please, let's be honest. That's all I'm saying.

**MR. CAMERON:** — I say to the Minister, don't you tell me that I haven't,

in discussing your department, been fair in my criticism of it. I want to tell you that there is an area of legitimate criticism in what you are doing. Don't always take that criticism and exaggerate it to the nth degree as though we had no concern for any activity in your department. We have a lot of concern. You may have seen a report that I did for my constituents some months ago on your department. It said that we had 40,000 or 39,000 people on the public assistance rolls in the province. It went on to say that a good number of those people have to be there for a good reason. They are old people, some of them are children, some of them are young people, many people that require assistance. It did, however, go on to ask why your department is providing people on strike with public assistance. If they choose not to work, we question why your department is paying them. Incidentally I want you to tell me why, in respect of your Estimates, when we come to the item under Public Assistance, you're got here a 25 per cent increase in your budget for public assistance . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — Which Item are you on?

**MR. CAMERON:** — Item No. 4, which I want to speak to generally and I'll speak to more specifically when we come to it. You had an estimate last year of about \$60.8 million for public assistance. This year you are budgeting \$75 million or an increase of about 25 per cent in public assistance payments. What's interesting is to observe how you are applying that percentage increase. In respect of the aged, you've got about a 30 per cent increase. These are rough calculations. In respect of the physically and mentally retarded, you've got about a 10 per cent increase. People with social and family problems, you've got about a 20 per cent increase. And then for this one, unemployed persons classed as employable, you have an increase of 60 per cent — not the 30 per cent you give to the aged or the 20 per cent you give to the physically handicapped, but 60 per cent. Then you've got an additional item, employed persons. You are budgeting \$2.6 million for those, by way of assistance. That's an increase of 100 per cent over what you had last year.

Those are the kinds of areas that we are singling out for questioning — legitimate questions. They are legitimate areas of concern. And may I say to you also that there are many very decent people in this province in the middle income range, who are growing concerned about fewer and fewer supporting more and more in some of these respects. I don't refer to those who need assistance, I refer to those who don't. And there is a fairly large number of good and decent people in this province who are questioning today some of your programs and the application of some of your money and, as I say, wondering when we're going to cease this business of fewer and fewer people, not the rich but the average guy, having to support more and more.

**MR. ROLFES:** — The Member does make a few valid criticisms. I wish I had his report from the Legislature with me because I was very angry at the way he did put those figures in his report. For example, if I remember correctly, he had indicated that there were 24 people receiving public assistance because they were on strike. What he really should have said is that there were two cases, or three I believe, two or three cases of people. What he did was take 24 recipients in those families as they happen to be two or three big families. He put down 24 people, leaving the impression that there were 24 on strike.

**MR. CAMERON:** — That was drawn from your report.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, but you knew.

**MR. CAMERON:** — . . . don't know . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — Oh, yes you did. Oh, yes you did, because you took it from a month end report. I gave more credit to the Member opposite, that he would know the difference in the month end report. He purposely did not put down the cases, instead he put down the number of recipients. And I'm saying, on that account, he should be criticized because he purposely left a false impression. And then he now says to me in the House, there are a growing number of people who are becoming concerned about the number of people who are receiving assistance. What do you expect when you give them the wrong information? What do you expect? Your people in your constituency, obviously, would and that's the impression you wanted to create in their minds. I would think you wanted to create in their minds that there were 24 families, 24 families who were on strike and receiving public assistance. That is totally at fault. So you created in the minds of your constituents simply what you wanted to create and that is that this Government is making all this money available to those 24 families who are on strike. That's why I think that's wrong. That is using figures falsely for your own advantage. I'm simply saying to you that if we want to create a responsible attitude in the people of this province, then all of us must be honest in the way we deal with these figures. All of us must do that.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, I have one other point to bring up that I think is rather significant. What the Minister is doing here is just digging himself into a hole. If he wants to fight, we'll fight with him all night. You look at the next Item — Family Income Plan in 1976-77, \$21 million. And according to his reports he spent that money, at least according to the report I got. This year it is \$14 million.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! I think I have been fairly lenient. I let the former Member speak on the itemized Item 4. I would like to take these Items, as is the custom of the House, as we are going along and I would like you, if you are dealing with any specific thing, to do it in generalities. We are dealing now with the administration, the total overall administration. I would urge you to try and refrain from taking individual Items and return to the original Item.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything you say. It would appear from the general comment that there is a \$7 million reduction in the Family Income Plan this year. The reason is a very simple one. They did find out it was badly administered and they had to change the rules. First of all, the depreciation of farm machinery is an example. I believe that's one of the rules they are changing. What I'm trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is all of a sudden they are finding out that people are receiving money under the Family Income Plan who shouldn't be. There was \$7 million wasted last year. That's a lot of money. Our job is to ask the Minister questions or to criticize. One of the major areas of public concern in the province is the fact

that money isn't squandered on welfare and that's why it is important to have a thorough examination. Don't stand up here and do your little jig and everything else. Stand up here and act like an ordinary Minister and not sanctimoniously. The next figure, as my colleague from Regina South has indicated, the \$7 million reduction, means that you yourself have had to have your department re-examine the Family Income Plan.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't mind if I have to do a jig to defend the poor in this province; I will continue to do it; I will continue to do it. Mr. Chairman, the Member was referring to the Family Income Plan and I want to indicate to him that we did not spend \$21 million last year, we spent approximately \$14 million last year. The asset test, I think, took off about \$4,000 and the increase in wages took off about another \$2,000. We estimate that we will be spending, I believe, this year about \$14 million. That's the reason why we have the decrease, not because of any maladministration of the program.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK:** — (Moosomin) Mr. Chairman, I feel very sorry for the Minister of Social Services because his own Government policies are putting the people in the position where it would be a lot easier just to draw social aid than it would be to work. You have taken away people's incentives to achieve and to aspire to their goals. You remind me of Robin Hood and his Merry Men; you take from the rich and you give to the poor. Now there is nothing wrong with giving to the poor, those who are deserving, those who can't for whatever reason provide for themselves. We have no argument against that; there is no problem there. In fact the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan can provide for the people of this province, provide the social needs based on the needs of the people and not as a means to power. You have the people of this province thinking that only your Government, only a socialist government, can provide social justice programs. I want the Minister to understand that that is just not so. The Progressive Conservative Party can provide those social needs.

Now I tell you, Mr. Minister, I have met a great number of handicapped people who do not want to draw social aid, who don't want to be on welfare and who want to work. Your department is not providing those opportunities for those handicapped people. One of my questions is, what effort is your department making to provide jobs for those mentally and physically handicapped people? Now in my opinion you are making every effort to turn this province into a social welfare state. A government guaranteed minimum income is a step in the right direction and that is why you are looking at it and why you are negotiating with the Federal Government along the same lines. This puts the Liberals and the NDP both in the same boat and I have been saying that time and again.

We, in the Progressive Conservative Party, recognize a need to provide for those who cannot provide for themselves. I just want to ask the Minister in closing, when are you going to clean up your act and start to get something done?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I will answer the Member's question. I don't intend to comment on what he said because I don't think it is worthwhile commenting on.

I should like to tell the individual that through the Vocational Rehabilitation Development Program for the handicapped, about 1,000 people went through that program and about 800 of those people received jobs. Our Employment Support Program, although it is not a massive program, is very, very effective and I think it proves that if opportunities are made available, that people, who otherwise would be on social assistance, will work if the Government and the private sector make those opportunities available. In 1974-75, we had 599 people; in 1975-76, we had 743 people and this year, we haven't got the exact figures, but approximately 650 people are under the Employment Support Program.

I want to say that so far we have found many, many of these people do not return to public assistance. In fact, I think about 80 per cent of the people who went through these programs have not returned to the public assistance roll. Therefore, the more that governments can do, the fewer people will be on public assistance. But all I am going to say is that there are a lot of people who have special needs and we have got to provide some opportunities for them to develop their skills. This can't be just done by governments; it must also be done by the private sector. And until we convince everybody to take a role in this, we are not going to be successful. We haven't done enough, I agree, but we have at least made a start and I think we have proven by these programs that, if given a chance, these people will stay at work rather than going back on public assistance. But even if they go to work, they may still need that program that was criticized by the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, the Family Income Program. They may still need some supplement so that they can have a decent living. Surely that is a better type of system. Just because people have their incomes supplemented doesn't seem to be a disincentive to these people, because 80 to 85 per cent of these people have not returned to the public assistance rolls. The facts just don't bear it out and, given a chance, the people will work.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, one very short comment. I appreciate what the Minister has to say and I am not in any way trying to be political. I meant it when I said the Minister of Social Services has got a big job. All right, the Government Members want to laugh about that but I am telling you very sincerely that the Minister has a big job. When he says that the people of this province have an individual responsibility to report those people who are drawing social welfare who shouldn't be, he's right. I don't mind agreeing with the Minister of this Government on a question like that. But I want to tell you to take a little different approach to things. I look at those people who are on social welfare and living in slums and I tell you that in many instances your Government is keeping those slum areas alive, not just in the city of Regina, but in other cities and communities in this province.

**MR. ROLFES:** — What do you want us to do?

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — All right, here is what I would like to see the Government do. You can take an approach which is going to bring the people from down there up to meet the top instead of pulling the top down to meet the bottom. Then you will be going in the right direction.

**MR. ROLFES:** — All right, does the Member then disagree with the

Member sitting directly in front of him, who constantly criticizes us for having increased the amount of money we have spent on those people who have to be on public assistance? Just a little while ago, about a half hour ago, he criticized us for that. If you look at 1971-72, I believe the average caseload was about \$141. If I am not mistaken, it is about \$335 today. So for those people who are in need and have no other alternative, we are doing something. You may think that is not sufficient and that is a legitimate criticism but I can't, on the one hand, give them more which is what you request and, on the other hand, hold back. The Member for Qu'Appelle says that we do too much, that we are wasting money. The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley says for us to get rid of all the programs. If I did that, I couldn't act at all. All I am saying is that we have to, in our judgment, survey the total situation and then do what we think is right and what is right for the people of this province.

If I listened to each and every one of you, I would need a dozen heads going in all different directions. We just couldn't make a program work because all of you are suggesting different things which, generally speaking, are contradictory.

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN:** — (Regina-Rosemont) Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to say very much about the Social Services Estimates but I think a few words really must be said tonight about the approach the Opposition has taken towards these Estimates. If I had put myself over on those benches there and I was looking at the Department of Social Services, I would have said to the Minister of Social Services that I knew a person in Prince Albert who had his allowance increased by \$5 a month and at the same time had his allowance for his special diet reduced by \$5 a month by those Members in Social Services, those efficient people with their pencils. That's what I would have said. I would have pointed out that in my constituency there is a family in which the man, who is 54 years of age, is hopelessly crippled with arthritis. He has a daughter who is 18. The rules of the Department of Social Services state that when this girl is 18 years of age she has to go on social services herself. The Tories say he's a bum. This girl is still going to university and she's the pride of the family. He can't provide for her the way other people can. He was given \$90 a month to keep her in the home and now these efficiency experts in Social Services say that she has to come and get her own welfare payment. She has to become one of the burgeoning number of people, as the Members of the Opposition say, who are on social assistance. If I was over there, that is what I would be criticizing. But what do we hear from these hypocrites? The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) says, and I have heard it from all the Members opposite on the campaign trail for the last ten years, that they want to provide for the people who really need it, they want to provide for all those people, but it is all those bums who they want to wipe off welfare. Yes, the bums, like the family in my constituency, the man who was cut back \$5 a month. You Members talk in generalities; you say we have a lot of bums on welfare. I don't notice you sending across a lot of names of people who are taking advantage of the welfare system. How many have you reported, Member for Moosomin?

There are a couple of other things I want to mention. I am amazed and I am sorry to see the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) has left the House. He said that we didn't have all the goodness and all the compassion in the world, to which

I would agree but I tell you it is getting pretty thick when the Member for Regina South takes the credit for medicare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Now he mentioned pensions, universal pensions. I have read history books and know how an unwilling Liberal Government under MacKenzie King brought it in to save their political necks. I know that that is a fact. But I won't mention that, Mr. Chairman. I want to relate a few things that Members of the House will probably remember. They will remember hospitalization in this province, I believe it was in 1947, which was fought every step of the way by the Liberal Party. They will also remember that the Province of Saskatchewan carried that alone, carried it alone until the Diefenbaker Government said they would pick up 50 per cent of the cost. I think that was in 1959 or 1960.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! I would like the Hon. Member to try and stick to Item 1 as close as possible. I fail to see where some of this relates to Item 1.

**MR. ALLEN:** — I am trying to reply to the Member for Regina South. Well, I'll bring it to a close as quickly as I possibly can. In this province we brought in hospitalization, which was fought by the Liberals and Conservatives. We brought in medicare, which was fought by the Conservatives. We brought in Government Insurance. All these things were fought by you Members over there. They have proven to be successful in the Province of Saskatchewan, proven to all of Canada. Liberals now say medicare was their idea. It was their idea!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! I would like to remind the Hon. Members that there is parliamentary language that is permissible and there is some that isn't. I would like them to refrain from using that word. Let's go back to Item 1.

**MR. ALLEN:** — Just in conclusion, I want to say in all sincerity to the Members opposite, that I have campaigned in this province from Athabasca in the North to Souris-Cannington in the South. I have gone from door to door and at almost every door I am asked about the bums on welfare. And I ask them, what bums they are talking about. If you Members had any compassion or any concern, you would talk about the real issues of the province as far as Social Welfare is concerned, to try and get a better deal for the people who are unfortunate enough to have to receive social assistance payments.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H. LANE:** — (Saskatoon-Sutherland) Mr. Chairman, the topic has been raised several times about the way this particular aspect of Social Services is handled on the campaign trail. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of trying to run a responsible campaign we want to deal with all the departments. The Minister of Social Services came under review very recently in the discussion of programs and the concern to make sure that most of the money gets through to the



poor, where you want it to go and where we want it to go. Of course we question how the program is being administered.

I had asked the Minister to deny, here in the House in front of all the Members, what was contained in public ads about money, in the order of \$2 million, being overpaid. I would like him to deny also that the program was so badly conceived at its inception that a person with a two section farm or more could, through depreciation of his farm machinery sitting on top of all those assets, be they hundreds of thousands of dollars, still qualify for money under this program. And that isn't even recoverable money. Now deny that, don't tell me that you will be able to recover something. Deny that that happened and then, of course, you are in a position to say that you are really concerned about poor people, and about getting money into the hands of poor people, but not till then.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deny what the Member has said but let me say this. When we enacted the program in 1974, we probably made an error by putting too much faith in the Federal Income Tax Act. That was our mistake. Under the Federal Income Tax Act there were too many loop-holes. Since that time we had to take into consideration some of these loop-holes and take some steps to correct them. That I think, basically, was the fault of the program. All right, so you learn, but that money, some of that money, as you say, will not be recoverable but they legitimately received it as the program was conceived at first and as we tried to implement it under the Federal Income Tax Act. Those people legitimately deserve that money. I don't find that any more inconceivable then than I would under the present Income Tax Act, where a person who could earn \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year and receives large incentives and credit under the Income Tax Act. Would you say, therefore, the Federal Government is grossly misusing public funds? Yes, I would agree with you, they are. It is a legitimate Act and they give these credits to these people under the Income Tax Act. For example, people in the RRSP or people who have money in the bank, can deduct the interest of that money for tax credit purposes. Now if the Government next year decides that that is a bad part of the Income Tax Act and changes it, would you therefore say that the Federal Government squandered all of this money? Certainly not. Neither did we squander money under the Family Income Plan. But when we saw that the program went further than what we had wanted it to, we took action. I don't think you can criticize us for that. I don't deny the facts that you put before the House but I don't think you can criticize us for what we perceived the program to be. We used the instrument, the Federal Income Tax Act. We have found, since that time, that we maybe should have tightened up the program considerably from the start.

**MR. H. LANE:** — Just briefly, I want to thank the Minister for admitting that the campaign, which we just went through, was a completely responsible campaign in the way it was handled and that we did not, for a minute, use the welfare case from the angle that you were just trying to say it was being used. And that, in fact, we did our job to point out problems with your program that you now admit has problems.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I totally disagree with the Member.

I was not referring to your comments on the Family Income Plan, I was referring to your comments in your letter that you sent to the people of Saskatoon-Sutherland, wherein you said there are thousands of people on public assistance who should not be there. That is what you said and that is what I was criticizing.

**MR. E.C. MALONE:** — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Chairman, I really can't sit here and listen to that Minister explain his own inadequacies and the inadequacies of his department and blame it on the Federal Income Tax form of the Family Income Plan. I can distinctly remember standing in the House, when you introduced that plan, and telling the Government that you did not have proper controls over the plans, that farmers, who chose to take advantage of it, were going to get away with murder under the plan. We warned you time and time again that this was going to happen and it did happen. So I think the Minister should have the courtesy to admit that he was wrong in the manner in which he introduced that plan. Let me just ask the Minister a question. How much money, how much of the money that was paid out incorrectly to the people who didn't qualify, has been recovered?

**MR. ROLFES:** — You are referring of course to overpayments that people received, not because of implementing it on the Income Tax Act. We have that figure here for you. It is about \$1.5 million.

**MR. MALONE:** — What percentage is that of the total that was paid, the total that was paid improperly?

**MR. ROLFES:** — About 65 per cent.

**MR. MALONE:** — What steps have been taken to recover the other 35 per cent?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Exactly the same steps are taken every month. We send out letters every month and collect it in that fashion.

**MR. MALONE:** — Are you saying that you send out letters every month?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes.

**MR. MALONE:** — And that is all you do?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I don't think we have done too badly. We have collected 65 per cent and the others are coming in. We expect to collect the others.

**MR. MALONE:** — And what method do you anticipate taking to collect the balance of these letters that you send out once a month, that don't prove successful?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I can't give you a direct answer. We anticipate that we will collect most of that money but if there are cases where we are not able to collect it, I think we will have to consider prosecution but it will depend on the

circumstances involved. I expect that most of that money will be collected.

**MR. MALONE:** — One more question, Mr. Chairman. How many individuals are involved? How many individuals would this 35 per cent represent?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think it was 3,444 which I had given before.

**MR. G.N. WIPF:** — (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the Hon. Minister off the hook here for a while. First, I just want to say that I enjoyed the speech of the Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) and I want to thank him for campaigning in my constituency. It was a great asset; it helped me a lot. Come back any time. You talked about reading a lot of history and you talked about new policies and programs that had been brought in by this NDP Government. There hasn't been a new plan or policy brought in since the writing of the Regina Manifesto; there just hasn't been, it is all written out there. You read it, it was in there. Your platform was laid out in 1949.

But to the Minister of Social Services, there is a plan in my constituency which is called Par Industries, on which you did spend some money. It is to take handicapped people and underprivileged people and train them and put them out to work. The one problem, in talking with some of these fellows, is that when they come out of there, they are on assistance. They are trained to go out and get a job. They are going to be starting at the minimum wage and they would rather stay on assistance because then they don't have to pay a lot of little extras. Is there any plan for these people that when they are finished training they could be subsidized for example fix or six months? Then they could get some training with their employer, receive a raise and be able to take care of these extra expenses that they have, after they come off the assistance. Do you follow me on that?

**MR. ROLFES:** — First of all, the program is not administered by my department, it is administered by Industry and Commerce. I could tell the Member if there are special needs, and many of those people do have special needs, they do get assistance from our department under Item 7. If they have special needs, they do get assistance from my department for clothing or special equipment or whatever.

**MR. WIPF:** — Thank you Hon. Minister. I am sorry I tried to give your department credit for a good program. I got away from your department and we are back to where we were. You mentioned earlier on, in response to the Member here, that there were only two families who received assistance while they were on strike. They had 12 children or something like that. Could you tell me who those two families were and in what area or region they lived?

**MR. ROLFES:** — No, Mr. Chairman, we don't have the information and I doubt very much if it is policy to give out those names.

**MR. WIPF:** — Mr. Chairman, I haven't the names right now but I will supply you with the names of ten families in Prince Albert who were on assistance during strikes. I will supply to your staff some information before it is over. I can supply this for you next week. I will bring it to you for your own records.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, the month that I was referring to was the month that the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) had referred to in his newsletter but I don't remember what month that was anymore. I do believe that at that time I said two or three families. There may well be, in one particular month, ten families but the one that I was referring to was the month that the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) had referred to.

**MR. J.G. LANE:** — (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, reverting to the Family Income Plan. Certain indications have been made by you as to the errors made at the start of the program. I think the Opposition's advice was good, Hon. Minister. As a matter of fact, it brought to the public's attention the problems that were obvious to everyone at the institution of the program. But there was a very basic administrative error made in the set up of the Family Income Plan, that came to the public's attention in the Public Accounts Committee a year ago. Now any department, that wants to spend several millions of dollars without even bothering to be concerned with public funds and how they are spent, is guilty of gross mismanagement. But it is the disdain with which you hold the public money that is a very basic concern and the fact that you would set up a program like this. Now you are talking about collecting \$2 million or several thousands of dollars in overpayments. The fact is that the reason you were in such a rush to set up the Family Income Plan was to get the public taxpayers' money out to the public, their own money, prior to the 1975 election. Now the good part is not to help the working poor as you originally told this Assembly. In fact, what was happening was that you were paying it to people on assistance, which was not the original intent that had been assured this Assembly by the Government opposite. In fact, you were in such a rush to get the millions of dollars of funds out to the people that you slapped together a program and didn't even set up an audit according to the Provincial Auditor, a year ago, in the public accounts and it means one of two things. I would hope that the individual, who made that decision to set up a program, spending millions of dollars of public money without an audit, isn't around or if he is around, it means that it was a political decision to take that approach. In which case, again, you've proven your complete disregard for proper public spending.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Chairman, about an hour ago I started all this discussion by saying that it was a disgrace that the Family Income Plan was mismanaged; that there were 3,400 people on it who were overpaid. A million dollars was squandered and all of a sudden the Minister gets up with great haste to deny all this and now it would appear that what is coming out is not only true, but perhaps far beyond what we really realized.

Now I want to pursue one more point. You said that you started the plan in error, and I fail to see how it could be an error because even my 16 year old daughter fills out an income tax form and most of them can read it. You turned around and permitted depreciation of farm machinery and you realized that this was in error. Has the Minister done a calculation, I'm sure that the department has, of how much money was paid out to farmers under this original error in the concept of the program? Now you've changed the rules because you don't pay out to farmers; you now don't give them depreciation. Can you tell me how much money was involved and how much of the taxpayers' money was paid out, in error, before you changed the program?

**MR. ROLFES:** — First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Member very cutely uses the words 'in error' and I totally reject them, of course. Just like I said before, if the Federal Government changes any parts of the income tax, whereby a privilege that we may have had before, we no longer have, one would not accuse them that in error some people received benefits, that they now no longer receive.

Under the original concept of the Family Income Plan which we based on the federal Income Tax Act, we paid out certain sums of money. We then realized that maybe there were certain things in the federal Income Tax Act that we had not taken into consideration and subsequently, we made some changes. In those changes there were a number of people who formerly were eligible, and now are not eligible. We changed the rules; we tightened up the program. I don't accept that these people received money in error. We do not have the amount for the Member, I don't believe. We don't have the information.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I wonder if the Minister could, perhaps, get his department to get me some information. They may not be able to get it tonight. Could you please tell me how many farmers received assistance under the Family Income Plan in each of the three years since its inception, 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 and how many farmers at present are receiving assistance? Then perhaps I could do my own calculations and you can count on me that I will do them in a very modest and conservative fashion.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to, because of the remarks the Minister has made about the fact I had used his monthly statistical bulletin, reporting to my constituents on the administration of public assistance by his program, read into the record the report that I made. I challenge you to show me one sentence or one figure that is wrong in that report. I challenge you also to tell me where that wasn't a fair comment upon the administration of your program.

Let me read it to you:

Welfare — all of us happily accept the notion that we should assist those less fortunate than we and most people give generously of their money and time to the United Appeal, to the church, service clubs, etc. We also give to the Government who, theoretically, gives on our behalf. Here is how the Saskatchewan Government gave on our behalf last month — \$6 million. There are two categories set up.

These categories are taken from your report — the reason for payment and there are seven categories and the other is the second column which is the number of people paid.

1. Insufficient earnings; 2,242 people (that is the number of people paid).
2. People without jobs; number of people paid 6,996.
3. People with “personality problems” (which is a designation of your department) number of people paid 385.
4. Workers “on strike” (another designation drawn right from the report) number of people paid 24.
5. People “required to stay at home” (another designation drawn exactly word for word from the report) number of people paid 1,202.
6. Unspecified, 42 people; total 10,995.
7. Others, 2,500; total 36,995.

The source: Department of Social Services monthly statistical bulletin.

The report went on to say:

So last month 37,000 Saskatchewan people received welfare assistance. Some of these are worthy recipients; 2,767 were children in need of help.

But I have a difficult time thinking that we should give to people on strike or with personality problems, or that in today’s circumstances healthy adults cannot find a job if they really want one.

That was the report which I made to my constituents, based upon your monthly statistical bulletin from which I drew the figures and designations verbatim.

The conclusion I drew from this, which is clear, began by saying that we have all happily accepted the notion that we should assist those less fortunate than we. It also said that many of these persons were worthy recipients. I question why we are required to give in respect of two categories, those on strike and those with personality problems. I appreciate that there may be some of those who are classed as personality problem cases who may be worthy recipients, but I know from some personal experience, and I have worked, incidentally, with the John Howard Society for some years, that the designation “personality problems” is frequently applied very loosely and that some people who are drawing some assistance and designation as persons “with personality problems” shouldn’t be.

The essential point of this is that I have a difficult time understanding why we should be giving to people on strike. When there are jobs available, I cannot understand why healthy adults cannot find a job if they really want to. I tell you that I stand by every word of that and every sentence and every figure. Every word is deadly accurate.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I ask the Member to table it. I can't remember the month and I want to have a closer look at it. I can tell him that from first hand observation, I have to give the Member opposite more credit. He knows what he has done. Again, I haven't got his letter before me but I have it in my files in the office and I will certainly get it out tomorrow and I will tell you where you went wrong but you know where you went wrong.

You said that you could not believe that adults could not get work, or something to that effect. You said 24 people, knowing full well from the month-end report that that is 24 recipients, not 24 adults. Towards the end of your report, read what you said about adults not being able to get work. What information did you give before? Twenty-four people on strike . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — I did not say that.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Then table it and let me have a look at it, but don't expect, from what you read, that I am going to know the details of it. I will bring it back tomorrow and I will go through it. The other omission was that out of the 37,000 a large percentage of those people were mentally retarded and senior citizens. Where did you report that in your report? You conveniently left it out and you didn't read it to me.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Don't tell me that I conveniently left that or anything out of that report. I tell you that every word of that report is deadly accurate and was drawn from your own monthly statistical bulletin. Don't tell me that I said there were 24 adults on strike, I did not. Does your department pay people who are on strike?

Listen, listen to this. Under the Public Assistance Vote in your department — listen to this — you are paying people occasionally who are on strike, welfare assistance.

**MR. ROLFES:** — That's correct.

**MR. CAMERON:** — That's correct, I am glad to hear you say that is right. I said in my report, taken from the columns from your report, the number of people paid was 24, 24 recipients, which is exactly right.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Read what you said.

**MR. CAMERON:** — I'll tell you that it is your kind of screwy misinterpretation to think it was wrong.

I will tell you what I said. I concluded by saying that I have a difficult time thinking we should have to give to people on strike. You say you give to people on strike. I say I wonder why we have to give to people on strike. That is the point. I didn't say there were 24 workers on strike. I said 24 people received assistance under your category on strike.

**MR. ROLFES:** — . . . read it . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — You want me to read it again. If you open your ears and your mind and are prepared to listen to reason, I will read it again.

Well I am certainly going to have it as a point of record because I am not going to have that Minister telling me the information that I drew from his report is in any way inaccurate, nor the conclusions I reached, nor the balance that I put on it, because it was a balance criticism. I challenge the Minister to tell me where it is not balanced.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I will tomorrow. I want to have a look at it and I will get a copy of it. I will tell you tomorrow where you went wrong but you know where you went wrong.

**MR. CAMERON:** — The Minister keeps indicating to me where I went wrong and tells me that I know I went wrong. If there is anything wrong in this I will tell you where the error originates. It originates in your own department and in your own monthly report, because those figures and designations are taken, I tell you precisely, from that report. The conclusion, which is the essential point of it, says that many of these people are worthy recipients. What more do you want me to say? Many of them are. It says 2,767 were children in need and we ought to support them. That was the point that I was making. I was questioning some categories of why we should be giving public assistance to some of the categories of people whom you mentioned.

You were good enough to say earlier that maybe in some respect my criticism is legitimate. I think it is and I think, as you acknowledged earlier, that it is. The important, essential point is that some people are saying, as I said to you earlier, that in some respects with these programs, we are getting too liberal, too loose in our administration. Some people are receiving funds who ought not to be receiving them. Every time you have a public assistance program, which is badly administered, there are examples of people who are drawing funds and those with common sense know they ought not to be. What are you doing? You are hardening people's attitude toward public assistance; that's what is happening. That is the great failure of bringing in programs that are half-baked and bringing in assistance programs of this variety and including some people who ought not to be included. Many people of goodwill who are prepared to support it, see that level of public assistance and then find their attitudes toward it hardened. That is the failure.

**MR. W.H. STODALKA:** — (Maple Creek) Mr. Chairman, I should like to change the direction a little and I should like to ask the Minister about some of the payments that he makes to people who are residents in the special care homes. Let's take a look at the Level III of the special care homes.

We will refer to somebody who hasn't any funds of his own or isn't able to pay his own. He is financially limited, you might say, in the amount of money that is available to him. What is the total number of dollars that you make available to a person such as this for personal spending after he has paid for the monthly fee in the senior citizens' home?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Twenty-five dollars a month.



**MR. STODALKA:** — Twenty-five dollars a month. We have heard an awful lot of talking from the Minister tonight about how generous some of his programs are. Does the Minister realize that this doesn't even buy one package of cigarettes a day, it doesn't even buy the odd chocolate bar for his grandchildren who are coming to visit him? If the Minister has such generosity, he ought to increase that \$25 to a reasonable amount.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I said before. I heard that I spent too much from the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley; the Member over here says spend more. If we listened to each individual person over there, we wouldn't spend anything. I do want to say to the Member for Maple Creek that many, many people in Level III care don't spend the \$25. Probably a large percentage don't spend the \$25 they get per month.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Did the Minister not receive correspondence from the boards in these special care homes indicating that this amount of money should be raised?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I don't think we have. There may have been the odd letter but my officials can't recall if we have. I haven't personally.

**MR. STODALKA:** — I should like to tell the Minister that I received a copy of a letter that was forwarded to him.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Okay, would you tell me where it was from? I get hundreds of letters. I can't recall having received one.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Maple Creek.

**MR. G. LANE:** — I thought the Minister was going to endeavor to answer a question for a change. You asked for some basic suggestions. I will give you the first basic suggestion.

In your annual report you quote Section 32 of The Saskatchewan Assistance Act. This is the purpose of the Act, page 2. I am assuming all the officials know the Act verbatim, so it is not necessary to be referred to. The purpose of this Act and its regulations are to make provisions for adequate financial assistance for persons in need and to do so, in such a way that their capacity for self-respect and self-dependence is maintained or strengthened. That is the goal. That is the basis on which our present system has developed. A system, which to submit to you, has failed.

Why is not the primary goal of your department to encourage self-sufficiency rather than maintenance? The immediate question asked is not how much do we give, but how do we get this individual off social assistance in the future? The change in attitude that would develop would probably disrupt the management thinking, but that is the approach that should be taken. I submit that that is a tremendous difference if we don't look at income support as an adjunct but as a primary goal. If you had that approach, certain things would develop. First of all, the senior citizens should not be a welfare problem. That is a position that the

Conservative Party has argued. If there is ever a need for a guaranteed annual income, I submit the only need for a guaranteed annual income is for our senior citizens. The question of a disincentive doesn't exist with the senior citizens. There is no question about having to work. In fact, the problem of our senior citizens is such that a guaranteed annual income should have been implemented years ago. It is justifiable. It has been proven in other jurisdictions that where a government supplies employment for the physically and mentally handicapped, we are not talking about a hundred per cent return on the payment made for work done either, then the mental health of the physically handicapped improves and improves dramatically and the public health savings are reflected. The reverse also applies to the mentally handicapped. That has been statistically proven and I think any psychologist will endorse that concept and that approach. In connection with social and family problems, let's make some distinctions. If our attitude is that people are going to have to get welfare, then the single parent, and I suggest with children over six, should work. In family situations, welfare applications should be reviewed every three months because it has been statistically proven in several jurisdictions that where there are family problems and people are attempting to take advantage of the system, that the situation, as set out in the application form, differs within six weeks. A mandatory review every three months would be a proper administrative decision.

Let's discuss the unemployed person classed as employable. I think it is proper, if we are attempting to break the so-called poverty cycle to get people off welfare, that the Government in fact establish make-work projects for those people who have never been in a work environment so that they learn to function in a work environment. I think the previous Minister admitted that there are people in Saskatchewan receiving assistance because work doesn't agree with them. That was his statement. It was a psychological problem so they were entitled to it. I have a suggestion on that, that I am sure the Minister would not agree with. But, in fact, if we change the attitude and the fundamental approach in dealing with welfare and social assistance and if we change the attitude of those developing programs, I suggest to you that we will go a long way in solving the very basic problem that we have, a problem that has not been solved statistically in the last 20 years in this province. I say it is a problem to which the present approach has failed. There are some constructive changes that can be made.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not going to respond in any great detail because I have already responded before to the Member this evening, exactly on the same topic. He is talking about attitudes and new changes and I can't argue with that. But how are you going to change attitudes and bring in changes with a person who has completely given up on society, a person who has been turned down time and time again, a person who completely lacks confidence, a person who has no basic skills, a person who may have very little formal education? Therefore in an economic system where you have eight or nine per cent of the people unemployed and he or she has to compete, these people are not going to go out actively and compete against people who have more confidence, who have more basic skills, who have more formal education, when they know full well that they are not going to succeed. I can't disagree with the Member that we have to make more make-work projects available. We are.

We have done this through an ESP program and we have put a fair number of people through the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons (RDP) program. If you want to criticize that we haven't done enough, I will accept that as criticism but no matter how much we do, you can always criticize. All I want to say to the Member opposite is that I think we have come a long way. We still have problems, certainly we do. Look at some of the other provinces where you have 10, 15, 20 and 25 per cent of the people unemployed and many of those have to depend on public assistance programs. I think in this province, although not an adequate job or a satisfactory job has been done, we have come a long way in meeting those needs. But we have a long way to go yet.

I want to make a comment on his guaranteed annual income. I wholeheartedly agree there should be an annual guaranteed income for our senior citizens. And we would have had one, had the Ontario Government not disagreed and stood in the way. The Ontario Tory Government said no. They held back the Federal Government and the other provinces. We would have had a program, but they said no. I agree with you, there should be one, we would have had one. But your party that is in power in Ontario and very powerful when it comes to these federal-provincial conferences, simply said no to us and held it back.

**MR. LANE:** — I think the Minister will admit that the Ontario Government opposed a guaranteed annual income period. It opposed the very wasteful program that you endorsed, the very one that you have attempted and the one we discussed a year ago in this Assembly, a program that, as far as we are concerned, is going to create massive disincentives, that is going to be a continuation of the present system in Canada, the present system that has failed. It is wrong, that approach is wrong.

I had asked the Minister at the outset when we were discussing numbers, how many were on the continuous payments payroll and I asked for two dates.

**MR. ROLFES:** — We will have to look those up again; I think I threw it in the garbage. I believe it is around and we will have to look it up again. Could you tell us what it is you want again?

**MR. LANE:** — I asked firstly, the date of your annual report for reference purposes and secondly, if you had it to April 1 of this year, or March, sometime in there, or the latest that you have.

**MR. ROLFES:** — February 1977, 15,613; March 31, 1976, 15,086.

**MR. LANE:** — Are those cases? Your average case is around 2.1, roughly two, give or take a percentage. Really what that means is that there are about 30,000 people who are on continuous payments on welfare in the province. How many years has that been going on? These people are programmed in that the information is reviewed possibly once a year. I think last year the evidence came out that it was spot checked once a year and that these people, in fact, could be on it for their lifetime.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, again I will have to go over it, as I said before. Many of these are senior citizens — 11,153 were in the first category of age and disability. In the next category, absence of spouse, we have 3,473 as of January, 1977. If you say there are too many people, then what you are saying is that the senior citizens and those with a disability and the absence of a spouse should not be on. Do you want to criticize us for making assistance available for those people, you say 30,000? I just don't know what you are driving at.

**MR. LANE:** — Is the system that we have today geared to setting up a system of permanent welfare recipients, doing everything to encourage long-term recipients? I say the opposite approach has to be taken. In Saskatchewan, we have a system of roughly 30,000 on permanent. Now I said we use two as the average on the case load. We have suggested, if we are looking at the senior citizens, that they shouldn't be a welfare problem. And as far as we are concerned, the senior citizens should be pulled right out of this system. Let's get the guaranteed annual income for the senior citizens and get them out of the welfare system period. They shouldn't be there.

For the rest, 3,473 I think your figure was and I am subject to correction on that, what is the longest period of time that those individuals have been under the continuous payments?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, in answer to his final question, we just don't have that. Let me say again, this is the kind of thing that I was referring to before. I can't believe that he can't understand that. He is saying that he is prepared to go out of this House and say again to the people of this province that 30,000 people are on welfare, who shouldn't be. He will say they are permanent. What he fails to recognize and doesn't want to recognize is that this is assistance that we make available for senior citizens and for the mentally retarded people. What is the difference? The reason it is under SAP is because of cost-sharing. Maybe in the future when we wrap up the whole business of cost-sharing and we get the new Social Services Act and we take these out, will it have changed at all? It won't have changed. The dollars won't have changed. It simply will be under a different title. But at the present time we cannot take these people out of these categories under the Canada Assistance Plan because we would lose cost-sharing. In the future when the new Social Services Act becomes law, I fully intend to take out all these people from these categories, and then you people can go out and I hope you do, and say then, that the Government of Saskatchewan has done a wonderful job because now it has taken 20,000 people out of the public assistance plan. I expect you and the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland to put out another newsletter that will state that the social assistance payroll has been reduced by 20,000 people in the Province of Saskatchewan. I expect you people to do that. If you don't you have been dishonest now and you will be dishonest at that time.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:04 o'clock p.m.