

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature**

**January 3, 1978**

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

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**Mr. M.J. Koskie (Quill Lakes)** moved, seconded by **Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley)** That the **First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections** by now concurred in.

**QUESTIONS**

**Regulations Controlling Lotteries**

**Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of Consumer Affairs. Shortly before we broke for the Christmas recess I directed some questions to the Attorney General concerning the regulations controlling lotteries in the province of Saskatchewan. The Attorney General indicated to me at that time that possibly changes could be made and obviously you have received, as I have, several letters and complaints from organizations in Saskatchewan which say it is making it very difficult for the service clubs, Legions and so on to operate. Have you given any consideration in the light of this opposition to some changes in the regulations?

**Mr. E. Whelan (Minister of Consumer Affairs):** — I think the hon. member knows that the principle reason for the regulations as they are written is to guarantee that those who are engaging in lotteries and who are taking a chance by buying tickets will be given an adequate return, that the prize money will be of a substantial amount, and since the Criminal Code of Canada insists that the spells out very carefully what the Criminal Code . . . very carefully sets out as a charitable purpose . . . the regulations were written to conform with the Criminal Code and to guarantee, one, that people would get an adequate return, that there would be a substantial portion of the lottery undertaken for charitable purposes. We did a great deal of monitoring and, of course, as the Attorney General said earlier we are prepared to listen to representations prior to the time the regulations were written. We did carefully scrutinize many returns from many lotteries and we think the regulations, as they are constituted, are fair and reasonable but, of course, as I say, we will listen to representations.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister then is prepared to listen to representation (and I am sure that he has already received some), the question I want to present to you, Mr. Minister, at this particular time is this: would you not think it advisable and imperative for your department to notify the provincial head offices of such organizations as the Lions Club, the Kinsmen Club, the Legion and so on, and to spell out to them in laymen's language what the new regulations are so that they will not be embarrassed throughout the year 1978 that is before us by conducting illegal lotteries and certainly that would be embarrassing to them. Would you not consider then, your department, contacting the head offices of the many organizations and making it clear to them what now constitutes a legal lottery in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Whelan:** — I think the Criminal Code has been written for a long, long time, in answer to the hon. member and these organizations are probably well aware of how the terminology is spelled out in the Criminal Code, which is fairly accurate and fairly easy to comprehend. In addition, I would like to point out that we have advised all the municipal organizations in the province and they have full details in this respect. In addition we are preparing a handbook which we will make available for anyone that wants it, including these organizations. It is written in laymen's terms and it is easy to comprehend and we will make it available to them and it is just about ready to come off the press.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — I believe I will take a new question.

### **Gain Resulting from Increase in Oil Price**

**Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):** — A question to the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Mineral Resources. As the House is aware, the price of oil increased by a dollar per barrel effective January 1. The advice we have received, Mr. Speaker, is that the province of Alberta stands to gain approximately \$170 million as a result of this increase in price.

My first question, to either minister, has any calculation been made as to how much Saskatchewan will benefit because of the increase?

**Mr. J. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, the average general increase will be \$1 per barrel. I think the member is fully aware that that applies to certain grades of oil in different ways so that it is not in fact \$1 across the board but I think for average or general figures the price of \$1 per barrel will apply to about 60 million barrels of production in the province of Saskatchewan, so should generate approximately \$60 million to the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Malone:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government decided yet as to what portion or proportion of this increase that they will allow to remain with the oil industry for the purposes of exploration and production in the months ahead?

**Mr. Messer:** — We have a policy that has been in effect for something approaching a year now in relation to price increases and I and the government gave assurance to the industry that for future price increases that 60/40 split would stay in effect and that will be the division of the increased profits to the province and to those who are involved in the oil industry.

**Mr. Malone:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view then of the tremendous cost for energy and related products that is being paid by the people of Saskatchewan, has the government given any consideration whatsoever to cushioning the taxpayers and the users of this particular product in Saskatchewan against this latest increase, in view particularly of the dramatic increases in SPC rates, the dramatic increases in the cost of fuel and so on? Does the government have any programs at this time that it can announce to cushion the taxpayer against these increases that have been coming?

**Mr. Messer:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member should first, I think, be fully aware that when we talk about a \$60 million increase in revenues to the province and that is not all accruing to the government of Saskatchewan, that the consumers of

Saskatchewan oil do not pay that total bill. About two-thirds of that production is shipped out of the province of Saskatchewan and thereby most of the revenue that occurs to the province and the related industry comes from consumers outside of the province of Saskatchewan. In relation to his question as to whether or not the province has given consideration or is undertaking to give consideration to try and cushion the increases to the consumers of energy in the province of Saskatchewan, I think that we have already in a number of areas undertaken to do that even though he relates to what he terms dramatic increases for natural gas and electricity in the province of Saskatchewan. Those increases are certainly less than what other consumers of natural gas and electricity have been confronted with in other parts of Canada and in other parts of North America. We announced in the Throne Speech the establishment of an energy conservation secretariat which will be involved in undertaking to educate consumers as to how they may be able to get better returns for dollars spent on energy.

**Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan):** — I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if there is any ongoing confrontation. I shouldn't say confrontation although this is probably what it means — but is there any ongoing consultations with the federal government in attempting to come up with a bigger share of that export dollar on our Saskatchewan oil?

**Mr. Messer:** — Well, as the member is fully aware there are some differences of opinion in relation to the federal and provincial attitude in relation to the sums of money that will accrue to the province. Yes, those discussions are ongoing.

### **Drug Dispensing Fees — Senior Citizens**

**Mr. H.W. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of health. The Senior Citizens' Council for Saskatchewan has gone on record as objecting to the increase recently announced by your department for drug dispensing fees. I have a copy of the news release dated December 28th, 1977, making that announcement. The government you are associated with has advanced or has committed itself to advancing \$2.6 million to a private cable television firm. Would you be prepared to advance an equal amount to help defray the cost to senior citizens of the increase for drugs as a result of the news release of December 28th, 1977?

**Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health):** — Maybe I misunderstood, Mr. Speaker, but I can't recall the government of Saskatchewan advancing \$2.6 million to a cable TV firm. I understood it was a guarantee of a loan. But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, that's not relevant to the question. The question is with regard to the prescription fee that is charged for prescription drugs. I would like to point out to the member that the consumers of Saskatchewan by the Prescription Drug Plan are saving in excess of \$4 million a year and, therefore, it is a considerable saving to all consumers including senior citizens. The announcement made recently, last week, indicated that there was going to be an increase of 20 cents per prescription. That may not necessarily be passed down by all pharmacies. In fact some are indicating and will indicate that they will not be increasing it by 20 cents. It is a choice that they have and, therefore, the consumer under that kind of a scheme has an opportunity to do some shopping around.

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Do I take it from the answer that you have given that you are not prepared to make any special accommodations with respect to this particular increase insofar as senior citizens are concerned?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — There is not a proposal, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, for a special accommodation. We have for senior citizens many other programs that we provide, including the income subsidy that we provide the senior citizens in need and I think that those kinds of programs are a much better way to make sure that senior citizens have an adequate income than doing it on the basis of bits and pieces through various kinds of programs that we have. I might also add that many of the programs and benefits that accrue from our health programs are to the benefit of senior citizens already.

### **Increase in Deterrent Fees**

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health in relation to the increase in deterrent fees from \$2 to \$2.20 and the Pharmacare plan, Mr. Speaker. The question I would like to ask and direct to the Minister of Health is: is he aware that last year there were some 3,600,000 prescriptions written in Saskatchewan which would come to approximately \$8,200,000 of deterrent fees? By increasing by 20 cents the cost to the patient, brings an added increase of \$730,000 approximately, to the cost to senior citizens and those sick and the old and halt, all that need this particular care. Can the minister indicate why the government of Saskatchewan has not agreed to pick up a portion of the 20 cents of the increased cost of the administration of the Pharmacare plan?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, the commitment of the government when we committed the program to the time that we developed it was to provide drugs to Saskatchewan citizens at reduced cost. This commitment has been fulfilled and I believe fulfilled very adequately.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Now it is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear members from the Liberal caucus get up and ask questions of that kind about a program which last year some of their members, recorded in Hansard, branded as being a frill program. Surely, if it's a frill program then the thrust of the questions is a little bit misdirected.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I think that the minister is aware that the cost of this particular program to a family of our in the province of Saskatchewan is \$75. Could the minister tell me, did he give any indication to the industry that the government of Saskatchewan would be paying an increased portion of those deterrent fees, or any portion, in any negotiations with the pharmaceutical association?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I am not aware of such a commitment of that kind. Probably the member is referring to a newspaper article which I read as well as he did, last week. I was as mystified by the newspaper article as I am sure some other people are. I might add that the government, even with that charge that now the consumer has to pay, does indeed pick up some portion of the dispensing fee and so the government is making some of the cost pick-up that is involved with the cost of prescribing or of dispensing the drug.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am going to ask the minister a question. With the tremendous increase in cost and inflation, with an increase of something in the neighbourhood of 10 per cent in the dispensing fee above, once again, the anti-inflation guidelines in the Dominion of Canada, a cost of \$730,000 to the sick

and the old and the halt, would the minister indicate whether or not the government of Saskatchewan will consider the absolute removal of the deterrent fees in the drug program for senior citizens?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The last time, Mr. Speaker, we had deterrent fees in Saskatchewan was when that member opposite was sitting on this side of the House. We do not have a deterrent fee. The development of the Prescription Drug Plan was such as I indicated earlier, that it was intended to reduce the cost of drugs to the consumer. It has done that and there is no doubt about it.

Now the member asks if the government is considering the total removal of the prescription fees — my answer to the member is: — no, we are not at the present time considering that. I find that the consumers of Saskatchewan, including senior citizens are quite satisfied that our Prescription Drug Plan is an adequate plan, it's working very well and it provides the lowest cost drugs to consumers anywhere in Canada.

### **Canadian Beef Exports**

**Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin):** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that United States farmers are today picketing Canadian border crossings with complaints and objections surrounding the importation of Canadian beef, they have left the impression that Canadian beef exports are costing the American farmers \$8 a hundred on their livestock. Will the government immediately consider sending Department of Agriculture officials to each of the Saskatchewan border crossings to supply accurate information to the picketing US farmers and protect the Saskatchewan cattle exports?

**Hon. E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the people who are handling livestock, who are shipping livestock across the borders are quite aware of the balance of trade and the problems that are related to the crossing of cattle over the border, and they will be using all of the arguments available to them through our department and any other facilities they have, to make the right arguments.

I would be prepared at any time to have our people available to them for any additional information they might want but I am sure that most of them have the information at hand.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister of Agriculture is not prepared to accept those responsibilities on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan, then I wonder, Mr. Minister, would you consider requesting the federal government officials of the Department of Agriculture to have their officials at all border crossings and protect the Canadian cattlemen and all of their interests as it pertains to the export of Canadian beef to the United States?

**Mr. Kaeding:** — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian officials are aware of what is happening and that they are taking the proper mechanism to deal with it. I would think that nobody is stopping those cattle from going across the border. There are pickets there attempting to convince the truckers that they should not cross. I am not aware at this point in time that any trucks have been stopped and until such an emergency arises I think we should not interfere.

### **CPN Monthly Rent to Sask Tel**

**Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, to either the Attorney General or the minister in charge of Telephones, will CPN be paying the same monthly rent to Sask Tel, namely \$3.90, the rate that is not yet announced but will shortly be announced for conventional cable operators?

**Hon. N.E. Byers (Minister of Telephones):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the rate that the CPN would pay to Sask Tel in the event that CPN becomes operational has not yet been finalized.

**Mr. Merchant:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would agree with me that since Sask Tel will have to create traps or filters, and secondly, supply converters, and since even buying those items in bulk will mean that Sask Tel will face a price of approximately \$100 per subscriber, that to amortize the cost of that \$100 would be about \$2.50 per month, and that a reasonable rate for CPN if \$3.90 is the reasonable rate for cable, that the reasonable rate for CPN would be \$6.40 per month.

**Mr. Byers:** — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the terms for the monthly rental and any arrangements between Sask Tel and CPN with respect to traps and converters is still being negotiated.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree with me that not only will CPN drive up the price of programming for all of the conventional stations in Saskatchewan with a cost to Saskatchewan people but that also if you charge a rate less than \$6.40 it will mean that a Crown corporation is heavily subsidizing CPN in addition to the heavy subsidizations involved in the grants and loan guarantees to date which total almost \$1 million and \$2.6 million which you have now guaranteed?

**Mr. Byers:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of rates as it applies to both CPN and the conventional operators, it is assumed that a rate will be struck that will enable Sask Tel to recover its capital cost just as it recovers its capital cost for most of the hardware facilities that it provides as part of the total communication system.

### **Regional Assistance Program — RCMP**

**Mr. G.N. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, prior to the Christmas break it was indicated that the RCMP were investigating the RAP Program which is run by the DNS. Could the Attorney General tell us if this investigation has been completed and if so will the report be tabled in this House? If it has not been completed, when do you expect it to be completed or do you have any idea?

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it was indicated before Christmas that the RAP Program was under investigation by the RCMP as far as DNS is concerned. I believe the question related to investigations surrounding an individual company or individual, I am not sure which of the RAP aspect of it was or may be incidental to the investigation. Secondly, the second aspect of the question is, will a copy of the RCMP report be tabled and the answer to that is emphatically and clearly, no. Police reports which are carried out as part of investigations for the

possible laying of criminal or quasi criminal charges, have always been, always, not only in Saskatchewan but everywhere in our system of government, confidential and we intend to maintain that policy.

### **Windfall Profits from Increase in Oil**

**Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. A substantial percentage or portion of the windfall profits or moneys that will be accruing to your department as a result of the increase of \$1 per barrel of oil effective January 1st will be paid by the agricultural sector of this province. Could the Minister of Agriculture assure the House and the agricultural sector that they are concerned about the fact that their net incomes will be dropping drastically in 1978 as they did in 1977 and look into our suggestion of re-introduction of the Farm Fuel Cost Reduction Program to enable that industry to continue to operate?

**Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government will be announced in this respect in due course.

### **Request for Assistance by CCIL**

**Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could tell this Assembly if anything has happened during the last week or ten days regarding the request for assistance by Canadian Cooperative Implements Limited and, if so, what has happened as far as commitments by the Saskatchewan government?

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge nothing has transpired in the last ten days or so and I have consulted with the Minister of Co-ops who has been dealing with this on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the government and he advises me that there has been no change in the situation in the last ten days.

### **Contract for Cable TV**

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of the Saskatchewan Telecommunications. Could the minister tell me and the members of the House who no contract (at least there wasn't until just prior to the New Year), why no contract has been signed between Cable Regina and the Saskatchewan Telecommunications and if this contract has still not been signed in the last few days, why has it not and when will the minister indicate will there be a possible signing?

**Mr. Byers:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the agreement was signed some weeks ago between Sask Tel and the North Battleford Cable Co-op. That agreement was subject to final approval by the CRTC and the CRTC finally did agree to that agreement. Once that was cleared away that agreement provided a basis for obtaining an agreement between Sask Tel and the three other operators and to the best of my knowledge that has not been obtained but the discussions are proceeding.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister indicate to the members of the House if it is the generally accepted policy of the government to delay the signing of this agreement in order to promote the interest of CPN ahead of Cable Regina?

**Mr. Byers:** — Mr. Speaker, the conclusion of an agreement between Sask Tel and

Regina Cable and the conventional cable operators in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw has nothing to do with the guarantee by the government to CPN to set up a competitive network.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Final supplementary. Would the minister not agree that the delay in the signing of the agreement with Cable Regina and Sask Telecommunications is seriously hampering the ability of Cable Regina to sell to the consumers of Regina their product and at the same time enhancing the opportunity of CPN to sell their product?

**Mr. Byers:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the three conventional cable operators, aside from North Battleford, that have been awarded licenses by the CRTC are in the process of working out an agreement along the lines of the North Battleford agreement and that is a process that does take some time and I am not aware of any great horrendous problems that are arising as part of that process.

### **Amendments to the School Act**

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, after several months Bill 42 is finally to come down in this session. It is a very large bill and you have indicated both within this House and to the media that perhaps the government itself would be looking at some major amendments to The School Act. Because of the size of the bill and the mammoth amount of discussion that is to take place, would the minister not think it advisable for the government to withdraw the bill, to make the amendments that the government is going to make and then reissue it or ring it into the House at another session?

**Hon. D.L. Faris (Minister of Education):** — No.

### **Signing of Cable Contracts**

**Mr. Merchant:** — A question to the minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications. Is it correct that the contracts in Regina and Saskatoon will be signed today or tomorrow and is the rate a \$3.90 rate?

**Mr. Byers:** — I can't say, Mr. Speaker, whether the agreements will be signed today, tomorrow or any specific time or hour. Secondly, I cannot advise you as to what the specific rate will be. I don't have that information right here.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Is the minister saying that you will not give us that rate, or that you don't have the rate?

**Mr. Byers:** — I don't have the rate at my fingertips.

**Mr. Merchant:** — I wonder if the minister would ask the Attorney General, who I believe has the contract and is aware of the rate, and inform the House whether the rate is in fact \$3.90 per subscriber, per month?

**Mr. Byers:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, you could rise in the House in the opposition and ask the question for any rate. If the member wants to know what the rate is he can put a question on the order paper. He is quite aware of that procedure. We would be glad to provide him with the information.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

### **Return No. 56**

**Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 56 showing:

The revenue received by SGIO for the fiscal years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 from the sale of package policy insurance additional to licence plate insurance from the purchases between the ages of: (a) 18 and 30: — (b) 30 to 45; (c) 45 to 55; (d) 55 and older.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have had these matters on the order paper for some time and the only reason I didn't move them earlier was because it was in the radio time and so on and I anticipated the government being unhappy about some of the remarks that I would make. I say to the Attorney General, it would be better to save this rancour until after Christmas and . . .

Mr. Speaker, the whole series of questions are designed to get at something which I believe to be true and that is I believe that SGIO punishes older users of their services. It is my belief from talking with other insurance companies and line companies that the profitability, particularly in dealing with the types of insurance that are questioned in this series of returns, that the profitability goes up a great deal with the people beyond middle age — 55 and older. That the current insurance provisions that this government has take from the old and reward the young who have the tendency to have more accidents (and serious accidents) and in a way sort of tax the elderly for being cautious, tax the elderly for being careful, tax the elderly for driving well, not having fires, being careful with their possession, not having items stolen from them. This whole series, Mr. Speaker, from 56 through to Return No. 65, all address themselves at that question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am told by government officials that they may not be able to give me these figures. I find that very hard to believe. The breakdown by age . . . I am told by government officials that no records are kept by SGIO of your clientele in terms of age. I find that very hard to believe because line companies keep these kinds of records. I find it surprising that such a large insurance company would not keep records by age and not have some idea of who their clients were and where their customers were coming from.

Mr. Speaker, knowing then the intent of the information that I seek, I trust that I won't hear from the minister that he is prepared to give me certain kinds of information but not give me information about the age of their customers, and knowing as well, Mr. Speaker, that I will have an opportunity to speak to the other returns without any further comments, I move Return No. 56, showing, seconded by Mr. Wiebe, my seatmate from Morse.

**Hon. E.C. Whelan (Minister in charge of SGIO):** — Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Wascana. It struck me as being contradictory when I heard him talk about how senior citizens were being discriminated against. I recall vividly when the members from his group protested very strongly when we allocated a few cents per gallon from the price of gasoline to a fund that would help

alleviate the situation. The request for this consideration financially came originally from the senior citizens. It was based on the fact that senior citizens drive fewer miles and, therefore, the people who drive miles have accidents and those who drive miles buy gasoline and the allocation of 3 cents per gallon for gasoline would enable us to keep the rates at a reasonable level, particularly to help the senior citizens who drive perhaps 1,000 to 1,500 miles per year. It absolutely amazes me that the opposition members would protest against the 3 cents per gallon levy and at the same time go to bat for the senior citizens. I just want to tell him that we take into consideration the mileage but we do not discriminate against citizens or for citizens based on their age. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office records do not classify insurance premiums and claims according to the age of the policy holder. Moreover it is virtually impossible to obtain the information requested by age group category as we do not capture the age of the insured on the policy. In the case of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act we do have the age of the registered owner and the vehicle registration certificate and the age of the driver on the driver certificate. Nevertheless premiums and claims are not classified according to age, to do so now would be virtually impossible and the cost would be inordinately high. Furthermore, in the motion for return there is a reference to revenue received from the sale of insurance and we think that this may best be described as premiums earned. And amounts paid out on insurance policies may more appropriately be defined as claims incurred to obtain the best match between revenues and costs. Also unless the expenses of writing insurance and settling claims are taken into account, those who look at the record will have an incomplete picture of the profitability of a particular line of insurance.

Finally the licence year is a more natural trade for auto insurance than is the fiscal year. In view of the foregoing I propose to move an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Faris, the hon. member for Arm River, which would read as follows:

That Motion Number 56 be amended to read that all the words after 'showing' be deleted and replaced by the following:

The Premiums earned by SGIO for the licence years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 from the sale of package policy, automobile insurance additional to insurance under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment as the minister well knows is absolutely useless, it doesn't give any information that anyone could care less about. That information is fairly readily available. I won't even bother to read the return when I no doubt have it mailed to me a year and a half from now someplace else.

**An Hon. Member:** — Where . . .

**Mr. Merchant:** — Otto's house. The information, Mr. Speaker, is as far as I can tell available. When package policies are taken out, when automobile insurance is taken out, your age is filled into the form. Indeed, there was a time when there was a surcharge based on age. All of that information, I suggest, is available, and even if that information is not available in the specific and easy way that I hoped it was available when I drafted this Motion for Return, I am satisfied that SGIO could give us figures on the profitability of the various age groups. I am also satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that those figures would demonstrate that there is a transfer of money from the old to the young, that there is a greater profitability insurance in dealing with old people than young people. Other insurance companies that that into account, other insurance

companies, Mr. Speaker, such as Allstate, for instance, have special rates and special premiums. I am aware and we'll come to the return, I am aware of a provision by which there is a modestly reduced rate available for a home-pak kind of policy that older people can get. As people reach middle age and go beyond it, their ability to adjust to increased costs ends, they don't have the flexibility basically to go out and earn more. A government insurance office with the power of being able to impose whatever rate they seek, a government insurance office with the advantage of compelling everyone to deal with them, should be able to pass some of those savings, some of the high profitability that they enjoy from older people back to those older people. All of these motions address themselves to the fact that SGIO should be charging a different rate for older people.

Mr. Speaker, I am moving some distance from the amendment. Let me just say one thing further. We have in Saskatchewan now 54 per cent of people over 65 drawing the Guaranteed Income Supplement. That means that 54 per cent of Saskatchewan people over the age of 65 are living, if they are single, on something in the \$260 to \$310 a month rate. They are faced with these kinds of costs and government should be doing what it can to ease that cost factor instead of using a compulsory rate and a uniform rate, which is better politically, the uniform rate is better for you politically, instead of using that uniform rate for the good politics that's in it to really tax the old and pass it to the young.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 57**

**Mr. Merchant** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 57 showing:

For the fiscal years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, the amounts paid out by SGIO on policies of 'package policy insurance additional to licence plate insurance' from the purchasers between the ages of: (a) 18 and 30; (b) 30 to 45; (c) 45 to 55; (d) 55 and older.

He said: This is the second matter dealing with the package policy insurance and I suggest to hon. members that if you have your forms, if you recall ever applying for a package policy you will find that on the form you were asked what your age was. That information has gone to SGIO, SGIO knows the age of people holding package policies. Now if the minister were, for instance, saying to this House, 'Look, the expense of giving you all of that information is too great but we can give you a representative sample.' If the minister were even able to say to this House but he can't because he knows it to be true that there is a higher profitability of older people. If the minister were able to say, look, I saw these motions coming and I knew what you were after (indeed, I think I have talked to him about it) I knew what you were after, I've asked the people in SGIO and they say, no. For some curious reason line companies may make more money out of older people but we don't. Maybe we have succeeded as a Crown corporation in being inefficient in some way and we are not doing as well with older people as we should. If the minister were able to say that, but he's not. If the minister were getting up

and saying, we can't give you all of that information because it's too costly to give it to you, but we'll give you some representative information, we'll go and do a sample of 500 or 1,000 policies and come up with some representative information. If he were introducing that kind of an amendment, then perhaps, Mr. Speaker, people might understand the amendment and might say, well, there is some justification for whatever reason, though SGIO requests to know the age of people on a package policy, they haven't put it into their computer or they haven't broken down the figures. If the minister were saying that it might be a little more understandable, but instead what the minister, if he follows the form that he followed in the last return, instead what he will do is that he will just get up and say, well, we're not going to give you any usable information at all; we are not going to give you information that anybody could care less about.

Now, when he does that, Mr. Speaker, (I won't speak to the amendment at this time) but when he does that, I say to members of the House, you have to see it for what it is. SGIO is making an added profit from older people and they don't want the taxpayers to know that they don't want older people to know that. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that's an improper and atrocious way for a government insurance office to function. It is all the more shocking coming from a party that mouths some support for older people, mouths support for those who are to some extent deprived, and are caught perhaps by inflation and other forces over which they have no control.

We face, Mr. Speaker, an ever-growing number of older people in Saskatchewan and this country. By 1991 there will be approximately 20 times as many people over 75 in Canada as there were at the turn of the century. We face a problem, Mr. Speaker, with more and more people retiring, and when they retire they retire to fixed incomes. They are not able to adjust to rising costs. The costs at SGIO which are acceptable costs, good costs — I believe that SGIO has worked well and served Saskatchewan people well, and frankly, I believe that it is a well run corporation. The costs at SGIO are good costs, it's a good corporation, but it shouldn't be transferring money from the old to the young because of the good politics. And, Mr. Speaker, with those words I move Return No. 57.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Wascana when he talks about Allstate Insurance and their rates. I venture to guess that the Allstate rates, even if they did consider the age of the purchaser of the premium, would still be higher than anything SGIO would charge, particularly when there is a subsidy and 3 cents per gallon gasoline on the mileage, and the older cars have a much lower rate than anything Allstate charges. The senior citizens of Saskatchewan are getting an excellent deal in the province of Saskatchewan from SGIO.

If you look at the overall picture, a dollar's worth of insurance fed into a company like Allstate costs 38 cents to administer while in the province of Saskatchewan, a dollar's worth of insurance fed into the SGIO system takes about 18 cents to administer, so not only are the senior citizens, not only are the young people, not only are middle-aged people or the farm people or anybody else, being exploited to the tune of about 20 cents, but when the hon. member advocates Allstate insurance, that's precisely what he is doing. He is going to bat for a company that takes 38 cents out of every insurance dollar in order to administer its program. Sure, under certain circumstances anyone

can quote separately on special rates for one category or another among the so-called free enterprise insurance, but the overall picture is the 38 cents out of every dollar that is paid to them goes to administration — 20 cents more than is necessary, so all the people who buy insurance from them, regardless of their age are being exploited, and there isn't a doubt in the world that the record will show that every Liberal government in Canada, federal and provincial, is opposed to public insurance corporations. They haven't, in any province where they have been the government, introduced this kind of a program. As a matter of fact, the federal government has put in the way every possible roadblock, legal and otherwise, to prevent the extension and the development of Saskatchewan Government Insurance.

It is all right to come here on behalf of one group, but it has never been the policy of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to discriminate for or against any particular group. We have given them all an excellent rate, the lowest rate that there is in Canada on a per vehicle rate. If you take all of the vehicles in Saskatchewan and divide them into the total cost for insurance you will find that the average cost of the vehicles is just over \$100. You can take any other area, even where there is public insurance, in this country and the cost per vehicle would be \$30 to \$40 higher. If we are advocating extra expenditure, extra time, extra effort in order to discriminate or to locate where the accidents are, I think that is an added expense. The money that is being spent in SGIO is not being spent on this kind of careful research to ascertain who is at fault, but rather to work on a safety program.

This year the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office will spend over \$500,000 on a safety program that takes in not only senior citizens but young people as well.

I just want to move a similar amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Arm River for Motion No. 57 that:

All the words after 'showing' be deleted and replaced by the following:

For the licence years 1974 and 1975, 19975 and 1976, 1976 and 1977, the amount of claims and expenses incurred in respect to the package policy insurance, additional to insurance under the AAIA.

### **Return No. 58**

**Mr. Merchant** moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 58 showing:

The revenue received by SGIO for the fiscal years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 from the sale of licence plate insurance from purchasers between the ages of: (a) 18 and 30; (b) 30 to 45; (c) 45 to 55; (d) 55 and older.

He said: Mr. Speaker, let there not be any doubt in anybody's mind (and I don't think there is) what the minister is doing is he might well vote down the motion; nobody having drafted these questions could care less if he ever sees those replies. You ask for some information about oranges and they don't even tell you about bananas; they mention that a monkey does the Chiquita brand commercials, it is about that far afield. Nobody could care less about the returns that the minister seems prepared to give to me. I am not looking for the profitability of the various areas of SGIO's operations. They may make some good reading to somebody, but I am not in the insurance business and I am not that interested in it.

What really does the minister do?

**An Hon. Member:** — Nothing.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Well he comes in with that motion that his executive assistant drew thinking ‘gosh it will look better if we give them a bunch of gobbledegook instead of just voting down the request for information. That will look better, a little bit of gobbledegook next March’ instead of saying no, we are not going to give you any information at all. We wouldn’t want the press to report that they just said no, we won’t give them any information at all, so he moves these amendments to give information that nobody could care less about. Then, Mr. Speaker, he goes down every alley and follows up every red herring that he can think of, talks about SGIO and says that SGIO is defensible and SGIO gives better rates than Allstate, and maybe it does and maybe it doesn’t and I don’t care whether it does . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, the minister has not spoken on this item which is before the Assembly and in order to be in order the member must relate his remarks to the item that is before him at this time.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have such a good feeling for the member’s thinking that I sort of anticipated some of his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the motion requests, as you can see, certain information regarding licence plate insurance. In asking for the information contained in this motion I want it to be clear that I am not in any way suggesting that SGIO doesn’t give good rates as a general rule. I am not in any way suggesting that SGIO, for instance, doesn’t give better rates than Allstate. Perhaps Allstate gives better rates, perhaps SGIO does. I don’t know. I think that SGIO gives pretty good rates all across the board. What I also believe is that SGIO subsidizes those pretty good rates for the young by extra profits from the old. In similar motions that have come before this House, I have yet to hear the minister deny that fact and the minister won’t be able to deny that fact when he speaks to Return No. 58 because that’s true. SGIO subsidizes younger rates at the expense of older people.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that that’s improper and that it would be appropriate for the figures to see the light of day so that people can decide whether it is fair or not and people could also be able to judge for themselves the level of profitability. That’s the reason that I now move Return No. 58 showing, seconded by the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan).

**Mr. Speaker:** — The seconder is not in his seat. Does the member have some other seconder?

**Mr. Merchant:** — The member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner).

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, in listening to the hon. member for Wascana, I have come to the conclusion that what he wants to do is raise the rates for younger drivers. That’s really what the motive is. Perhaps he should say that next time he speaks because it looks like that is the whole motive. I repeat again, the senior citizens in Saskatchewan have the lowest rates any senior citizens group has anywhere in Canada. The best proof of this would be to consult perhaps on the Alberta border where a senior citizen owns land on both sides of the border and has an opportunity to buy insurance in Saskatchewan and in every instance the insurance is purchased in Saskatchewan. I

know that the hon. member would like us to put together a list of those in every category. I suppose not only in regard to their age but their ethnic background, their religion and goodness knows what all and then we would have a discriminatory set-up where we could quote rates for every particular group according to the performance. We could have a rate for people with black hair and a rate for people with white hair and a rate for Serbian people and Catholic people and every other group. We maintain we should try to charge across the board the best possible rate for the people of the province. Treat everybody on a proper basis and that's what SGIO does. This has resulted, as I said earlier, in a low administrative rate per dollar and the lowest insurance rates in Canada and, therefore, I move, Return No. 58 be amended and that all the words after 'showing' be deleted and replaced by the following:

The premiums earned by SGIO for the licence years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 from the sale of insurance under The Automobile Insurance Act.

Seconded by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Faris).

**Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment or two about this. I find in respect of this particular question and the one that follows, the attitude of the minister to be totally indefensible. It seems to me what he is doing in the process, and some members ought to pay attention to this, is overlooking some pretty fundamental questions here. One of those is that he is responding in this legislature about a public corporation. He doesn't have the kind of luxury that a private corporation may have with respect to the disclosure of information. SGIO is a public corporation. SGIO is owned by the people of this province. These questions are legitimate ones to determine, for example, the question I am very interested in, to determine what portion of the revenue of SGIO is raised by people 65 and older as opposed to what portion of the expense of SGIO is incurred by people 65 and older. I know, for example, that those people are in a special category for two reasons, one is, that they drive fewer miles than most people as a general rule and I think that their driving habits are demonstrably safer than people in other categories. That's one. Secondly is, is that we should be particularly concerned about the position of those 65 and older, particularly in these days of high inflation. What the member is asking from government insurance is, can you tell us, for example, how many — this is the kind of information — what is the revenue derived from people in this age category, 55 and over, from which I would hope we could get that from 65 and over, what number of accidents are attributable to that group of people, what is the expense and consequence to the insurance fund, because some of us rather suspect that people in the older category are being asked to subsidize those in the younger age category.

Now that in itself, it seems to me, is sufficient justification for the answers that the member asks. What adds to the justification for it is as I said earlier, that this is a public corporation. The people of the province have a right to this kind of information, why do you not give it? What kind of arrogance leads you to simply say, no, I'm not going to give you this information. That's the equivalent of what you've done. I say that we have a right to know, the member represents 10,000 people. I represent 10,000 more, that's 20,000 that the request is coming from. What right do you have to withhold this information from us as the minister responsible to this Assembly on behalf of this corporation?

You say that you are satisfied of the older age brackets in this province have the lowest premiums in the country and as the member for Wascana says, "that may or may not be so." I don't know, but of one thing I am certain they have under SGIO the licence plate policy as it now exists some of the crummiest insurance that exists in North

America. They may have the lowest premium but they've got trash, by and large, for insurance under licence plate insurance. As you know they have a \$35,000 public liability and a \$200 deductible. The insurance that they are getting, particularly older people, who stand to get their savings and everything they've got wiped out through a car accident, doesn't begin to satisfy a judgement even of a modest variety and you know that those limits are far too low. The protection they are getting is poor protection. In many ways they are not only being asked, as I rather suspect too, to subsidize those in other age groups and are being treated cavalierly and heartlessly by you but secondly is that you are defrauding them into thinking that they have adequate coverage when, in fact, they don't. I think your attitude about disclosing this information is shoddy, it is to be condemned, there is no reason for it and I think the only reason for it is you are afraid it is going to embarrass you because you like to posture, take the posture that you are so considerate to the senior citizens of this province. Well, here is a point clearly in evidence against you on that count, that you are not, in fact, very appreciative of the particular burdens of senior citizens in this province on some fronts and here is one.

**Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass a few comments to the member for Wascana, the motions that he has on for return, somewhat similar, all of them.

In listening to the debate on the motions, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little bit difficult for me to understand the position taken by the minister. Mr. Minister, you say that no records are kept related to the age and yet I find very strangely that SGIO kept a record as to the type of car and the kinds of cars that were involved in accidents so that the insurance premiums on the hatchbacks and the sporty cars received a higher premium. Now it is a little bit hard to believe that you would keep statistics on the types of a car involved in accidents and yet you say you don't keep track or there is no record kept on the age of the driver involved in the accident.

Mr. Minister, I don't think too many people in Saskatchewan are going to believe, (a) that you keep track of the make of the car that is involved in the accident and the year of the car. Therefore, you place a higher premium on say a Mustang, than you do on a comparable Chevrolet. A Mustang in itself doesn't cause the accident. What you are doing, in effect, is exactly what the member for Wascana and the member for Regina South have already mentioned, you are placing a higher premium on a certain type of car because it was involved in more accidents, when you don't have the courage to come out and say, 'Look, here are the statistics.' What you are telling us in this Assembly, Mr. Minister, is this, that you very carefully have kept track of the number of Mustangs in an accident, the number of two-doors, the sporty cars but you haven't kept track of the age of the people involved in the accidents. Mr. Minister, I just can't believe that and I am quite sure the people of Saskatchewan don't believe that either.

**Mr. Merchant:** — The most obvious fact of all, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister was aware in his initial comments on the first motion. He said, "We don't keep that information." He hasn't said it since because they do keep that information and we all know that licence plate insurance contains the age. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the very information that we are requesting is in the computer right now and I suspect that all the minister has to do is tell his officials to press the button and give us the information that we want. He is not prepared to give us the information because he well knows that that information would be embarrassing to the government.

The minister said that am I, in moving these motions, looking for some kind of a higher rate on the young as opposed to the old. In saying that he admits, Mr. Speaker, that they



know that they are charging a higher rate upon the old than the old deserve to pay. They know that well. They also know, Mr. Speaker, that the reason they are able to do that is that as people get older their driving habits improve and it is a kind of an unfair additional charge that they don't have to impose but the passage of time itself imposes it as people improve their driving habits. This very information, unlike some of the other, some of the other information may not have been available but as the member for Rosetown has said and as I think we all know because we all have applied for licence plate insurance, this information asked in this return and the next is readily and simply available but SGIO and the government are afraid to give us that information.

Amendment agreed to.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. N.E. Byers (Kelvington-Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to beg the indulgence of the House to introduce a group in the gallery. I am pleased to introduce to Mr. Speaker and to the members of the House, 15 air cadets from the Foam Lake Air Cadet Squadron. They are accompanied here today by their Commanding Officer, Mr. Clarence Breant and the Adjutant Lieutenant, Audrey Breant, Training Officer, Mr. Allen Nordahl, senior cadets, Warrant Officers, McCowan and Reynolds.

The Foam Lake Air Cadet Squadron left home about 7 o'clock this morning. They have arranged a full day of visiting a number of highlights in the capital city, among them being the RCMP Depot, the Museum of Natural History, the Sask Tel building, HMCS Queen. I am very pleased today to be able to introduce and welcome this group to the members of the legislature. I hope that this visit to the legislature will increase their interest in the parliamentary process. I invite all members to join with me in welcoming them here on this occasion and hope that they return again and that they do have a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate continues on Return No. 58.

**Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just briefly rise to say a few words with respect to this debate. I want to make two points, one in response to the member for Rosetown-Elrose, who unfortunately is not in his chair at the present time and one to the main substance of the motion made by the hon. member for Wascana.

The member for Rosetown-Elrose argues that because SGIO has information respecting the year, the model, the make and the style and costs of a car, that somehow of necessity and of naturalness, if I can call it that way, it would also flow that SGIO would have the information pertaining to the age of claimants on insurance policies. That, of course, is absolutely wrong. It is perfectly proper, for an insurance company, to keep information respecting the cars which were involved in a car accident. When you come to your rating, namely the amounts of insurance fees that you are going to be paying, a lot has to do with the make and the model and the year and the wheel base of a vehicle. Quite clearly, one example, for example, in the last four or five years we have seen the advent of the so-called bumpers which at three miles per hour prevent any kind of damage being done to a car.

At first blush one might think that this is a terrific saving of cost of insurance. In reality, I am advised, that these bumpers have, to a large extent, been a contributing factor to increased damages for cost repair in an accident, because of the nature of their construction and the certain features that don't work if you are in a car accident over three miles per hour, in a car accident of five or six or 10 or 15 miles per hour which is what all of us are. The result is that when SGIO looks at the kinds of cars that you are looking at, Stingrays and makes and special qualifications of them, you are looking at that from a point of view of determining the amount of the insurance that is going to be paid because, quite obviously, if it is going to be a more expensive car to repair that is therefore a greater risk that falls on the insurance company and as a greater risk on the insurance company you may very well be asked to pay a greater insurance fee.

That, I think, is perfectly logical and understandable. We have been doing that now for a little while and that is part of a rating principle that any insurance company would involve itself with.

Now the second part that I want to turn my remarks to deal with is the substance of the question that the hon. member for Wascana raises and that is, the essence of this question is, to provide information to the House based on the age of the claimant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), chairman in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, from my short experience of SGIO and that is, that SGIO records do not classify insurance premiums and the claims — that is what this information wants, the claims — according to the age of the policy holder. They simply don't capture the age of the insured on the policy.

In the case of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act SGIO does have the age of the registered owner on the vehicle registration certificate and on the driver certificate. That's one thing, for the driver's licence, but for the premium and for the claims on the insurance, the other thing, they are not classified according to age. I guess it could be done, but based on this long-standing practice of SGIO it would be virtually impossible. I think the cost would be inordinately high to go sifting through the drivers' licences and try to correlate somehow to the actual claims on the insurance policy.

I want to remind the members that it is the member for Wascana himself who has for consideration before the legislature of this House, this legislature, proposed amendments to the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights and The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act, all of which would seek to add an additional head, as a head upon which you cannot discriminate the question of age. He says that it shall be, if these amendments are adopted, no longer the law to be able to discriminate on the basis of age.

What these questions are really dealing with, I submit, is the very kind of discrimination by age, or at least selectivity of information based on age, from which presumably certain consequences would flow, that the very member himself in the amendment seeks to avoid, the private member's amendment before the House. I have a great deal of sympathy with some of the general directions and thrusts of the proposed amendments by the hon. member, but if you obviously know on the basis of age, the amounts paid by claimants, then the natural consequence is to discriminate on the basis of age, one way or the other. Either discriminate in favour of the young or discriminate in favour of the old, depending on your particular argument. I think it really begs the questions, for the member for Wascana and the members of the opposition, to

simply say, well we don't really argue that it should be more for the young people or more for the old people. We just want the information. It begs the question, if by their very requests they seek to bar age as a factor in the consideration of corporations and businesses and individuals in their normal course of conduct in the province of Saskatchewan, something with which I have a great deal of sympathy.

So the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it ought not to be a factor of age. We are here talking about if that person is 18, 19 or 99 years of age. We are talking about an insurance program based on driving records, we are talking about insurance program based on the make and model of the car. We are not talking about discrimination based on age. I suppose to put the argument to a ridiculous extreme, you could be talking about insurance if you can talk about age, insurance based on colour or insurance based on educational background, or insurance based on other aspects of potential, what I would say, potentially discriminatory aspects.

So I do say, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House that I do not find it unusual. In fact, I find it to be usual in the insurance industry. I find it the proper thing to do, to find out information with respect to make, models in cars and not to classify payments out, which is what this question wants, payments out based on information of age.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't rise after the member for Foam Lake only because I thought it might delay the process of the House, but I too wanted to welcome the group from Foam Lake because I am probably the only serving member of the Reserve in the legislature. I am a member of the sea component however.

Mr. Speaker, since you were kind enough to allow the hon. Attorney General a fair amount of latitude, namely letting him refer to other matters that are on the order paper and make some discussion of them, let me for a second respond to that.

The hon. Attorney General implies . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . on a point of order, I certainly would have drawn the Attorney General sharply to a halt on the matter. I can't permit the member to indulge in a debate which is already concluded.

### **Return No. 59**

**Mr. Merchant** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 59) showing:

For the fiscal years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, the amounts paid out by SGIO on policies of 'licence plat insurance' from purchasers between the ages of: (a) 18 and 30; (b) 30 to 45; (c) 45 to 55; (d) 55 and older.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will shortly be moving Return No. 59 which seeks further information which I believe would demonstrate that SGIO is transferring money from the old to the young.

Two things have been suggested in the debate, two things have been drawn in one way or another to our attention. First, hon. members opposite may, in dealing with Return No. 59, suggest that there is some possibility that this would mean that there be a greater insurance premium from younger people because if older people are more

profitable and their rates go down, clearly the money has to come from some source. Mr. Speaker, if that kind of an argument is presented to you by the minister or members opposite, I think that I, at least, would be prepared to accept that possibility. If I had those figures it might well be that I in fairness again, would say, yes, the fair thing to do is the people who are costing the money should be paying the premium. And clearly, all that we say here says we're not prepared to see the old going on subsidizing the young.

Another place on the order paper, Mr. Speaker, I have moved a number of amendments dealing with retirement age. In that area again, I believe there's a prejudice being exercised against older people; that's the same problem towards which Return No. 59 addresses itself — a prejudice towards older people. And with those comments, Mr. Speaker, knowing that this information is readily available, I move Return No. 59.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I first want to say that each year since SGIO has been in existence all members have had an opportunity before the Crown Corporations Committee to raise any point or move any resolution. This is in sharp contrast to the situation that exists with federal Crown corporations — Polymer Rubber Company or Eldorado and the millions of dollars where questions remain unanswered: — where the Crown Corporations Committee never meets and is never given an opportunity to tell the public the facts about great sums of money that are left open to question. In sharp contrast the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office gives members an ample opportunity to raise questions about the way we put policies together, the age of those who are premium holders and so forth. This has been a constant practice since the day SGIO was organized and that situation still exists.

I want to re-emphasize in answer to this motion what the hon. Attorney General said, that although we may have the age according to the motor registration or to the driver's licence, we do not keep track of the age according to the premium or to the claims. This has never been done, it's a practice that has never been kept in the SGIO offices and therefore it would only be with the greatest difficulty and a tremendous expense to provide this sort of information. I know of one record that is kept, and it's obvious to everyone and that is when people are found at fault in accidents, a surcharge is levied, and this is levied not according to age but according to the blame in that particular accident.

I would be really interested when someone who belongs to a party castigates SGIO for not keeping records. I would be really pleased if some of those people from that particular political group could quote as a precedent, a publicly owned government insurance company that they initiated somewhere in this country and that could give us these sorts of records. If there they are available we would probably consider the motion, but we have not made it a practice of keeping track of people who are in accidents according to their age. Therefore, I moved, seconded by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Faris):

That Return No. 59 be amended as follows: that all the words after 'showing' be deleted and replaced by the following: for the licence years 1974 and 1975, 1975 and 1976, 1976 and 1977, the amount of claims and expenses incurred by SGIO on insurance provided under the AAIA.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **Return No. 64**

**Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 64) showing:

The revenue received by SGIO for the fiscal years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 from the sale of 'home-pak insurance' from purchasers between the ages of: (a) 18 and 30; (b) 30 to 45; (c) 45 to 55; (d) 55 and older.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Faris), Return No. 64 be amended as follows:

That all the words after 'showing' be deleted and replaced by the following:

The premiums earned by SGIO for the fiscal years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 from the sale of dwelling insurance.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, they definitely have this information and they definitely have this information by age because they have a special premium and a special policy that is available to older people. So that in this area particularly they have done some research. They have done some work, they have the information and again, I gather, Mr. Speaker, they are not prepared to give us the information. The result is that that amendment will be moved and passed and they might as well, Mr. Speaker, have ignored the matter completely. I want to stress that . . . the information that they are giving us is absolutely useless. I couldn't care less what their premiums were from home dwelling insurance. If I had wanted that I would have phoned John Green and asked him. He can probably remember. The information that they are giving is absolutely different from the information requested. It is not getting to the area of which the request is made and as we have moved from one return to the next the information has been more and more readily available. In this area they have actually done studies in order to make it possible for them to impose a special rate and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that even that special rate leaves them with a more profitable level of insurance than insurance on younger people because younger people by and large are faced with fires caused by children and things of that nature. So even in this area where they make big fellows of themselves with a slightly lower rate, even in that area, they are still not doing what would be fair to older people but are instead passing the rate on to the young.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 85**

**Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 85 showing:

The rates charged for electricity and gas for farm use and city use in the form of a percentage average of the four rate categories as of August 15, 1977 as well as before August 15, 1977.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I read the motion into the records of the Assembly, I would like to make a few comments regarding the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It would be very difficult not to deviate into other provincial Crown corporations, but I do feel that this motion is really worthy of the government's attention and that they would do a justice to the people of this province whom they are serving if they provided this information. In light of the drastic rate increases from 7.3 per cent to 20.5 per cent in

one year constituting 180.5 per cent net increase in profits, I feel that Sask Power surely has some answering to do on behalf of its rate structure, the rate increases that it has imposed upon the people of the province.

Both opposition parties have been criticized for any criticisms they may make of provincial government Crown corporations and I feel that that is unjustified if in fact our criticisms are well founded and well meaning and I know that from this side of the House in the Conservative opposition, that our criticisms have been well founded.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — They never have.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — The minister responsible for Social Services says they never have, but he knows very right well they in fact are. That's why he is in such trouble out there in his constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at Crown corporations in this province, in particular SPC, we look at it imposing even further costs to the people of Saskatchewan with its advertising of family Crown corporations. When we brought this to the attention of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, we were criticized for that. The government said, oh there's those terrible Tories again, they are down on the Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure this Assembly and in particular the government across that we are not opposed to Crown corporations as utility corporations that provide services where the private sector can not. We never have been opposed to them. As soon as I say that, Mr. Speaker, you will note that the government yipper yappers start, this bothers them an awful lot I know, bothers them as well with other pieces of legislation that they put before this House that we agree with them and we stand with them on certain pieces of legislation. They don't like to see that, they don't want our help. Most definitely the member for Wilkie says Bill 47, yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that our criticisms of Crown corporations have been well founded. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when you take a look at the rate that SPC has imposed on the people it leads one to believe that this is nothing more than an indirect tax on this province. Mr. Speaker, being as I am a representative of people in this province, I will naturally keep my remarks to this province. I am not representative in other parts of this country at this time, and therefore, I see no need to comment on other provinces. I hear the government opposite though, in many instances does that, they say, oh, look at this province and look at that province. The former Minister of health, in particular, used to do that and I'm sure given time once the new Minister of Health gets his feet on the ground with his new portfolio, he'll be doing the same thing regarding the costs of health care to the people of Saskatchewan. They all say, oh, look at Tory Ontario with those terrible rates they've got down there. But, you know, if you just take a look at the estimates and in particular the former Minister of Health because I commend him for being very sharp with figures and he knows very right well that taking the estimates we worked out for the '77 year divided by the population, you get a cost for every man, woman and child higher than that of Ontario for health care. And I don't care how you play at those figures, those are the facts. Nevertheless, let's take a look at the rate structure with regards to electricity and gas. In particular, with electricity they are broken down into four categories: cities, towns, villages and rural. Furthermore, the rates are charged on another breakdown of four categories per category that I previously mentioned. I have asked in my motion that the answer be put in the form of an average of percent increase. If you take those percentage increases for cities and average it out for towns and average that increase for villages and rural, you will find that in fact we are charging our rural residents a higher rate than we are our large city

residents. Now then, for a government whose philosophy is one of equality, that is to charge everyone the same, everybody makes the same amount of money, nobody should have to spend any more money than the other person; that's the socialist philosophy. Now then, I do not see how that philosophy and this rate structure is consistent. I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, rather this government through you, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the rate increases of August 15, the city rates were as high as 43.3 per cent lower than farm and village. Now with the new rate structure that great difference decreased a small amount to 36.1 per cent. I do not feel that those rates are justified. Furthermore, I might again just deviate from these rates of Sask Power and look at Sask Tel. It is doing something much similar in as much as it having a great input into cable television, for instance. It is investing a great number of dollars. But that service will not be available to rural Saskatchewan for quite some time, and in fact, for those people that live in the city and have that service made available to them, they maybe don't want it. And I would like to know again, why does this government in a situation like that want to make non users of cable television pay for it through Sask Tel? Pay for those that use that service. The rate differences which I have pointed out in the electrical end of Sask Power are much similar to that of the gas rates. The percentages are there and I'm not going to go into them in any detail, only to say that they are, thank goodness, lower differences than those in electrical, that in gas before the increase, they were 21.8 per cent lower in the city than they were on the farms, the rural parts of our province, and after the increase it went down to 8.9 per cent, but still a lower rate for gas users in the city than in the rural parts of our province. And to compound the problem, and I say compound the problem because in checking the average monthly consumption of electricity in this province, we find that our farmers who are providing the backbone of the economy of this province use twice as much electricity as do our city dwellers. Again, I want to point out inconsistency that you on the one hand with your rate structure of being the same on the runoff, suggest that electricity and gas would be cheaper for those that use more of it. Then you turn around on the other hand and charge them more for it, and that again is very clearly inconsistent. You are encouraging consumption on the one hand and discouraging it, by higher costs to the consumer, on the other. And I think you should make up your mind which way you want to go and if, in fact, you have to look at your rate structure and review it and come up with a more consistent rate structure that would be more in keeping with your philosophy then at least it would be proper. But the way you have it now, it surely doesn't make any sense to me. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with those few brief remarks to outline some of my concerns, I feel that if you as a government would take a look at your rate structure, do some work with it, correct me if I'm wrong, but if I am right, I feel that that should be justified to the people of this province and in particular to those that it's costing more, and that's our rural people in Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) Return No. 85 shown.

**Hon. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be asking to adjourn debate on this motion in just a moment. Before I do I would like to make just one or two points in passing in rebuttal to the remarks made by the member for Moosomin.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Moosomin made two points. One point, frankly, confuses me because I have a great deal of difficulty following his argument. I find this about the Conservative Party very often, Mr. Speaker. When they attack Crown corporations they attack the Crown corporations on the basis of the fact that we are not business-like. I remember the speeches of the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) talking about how we are politicizing the Crown corporations. His favourite speech is to identify Mr. Don Cody and identify a few others and how we are running this in an unbusiness-like way and all of these connections. He seems to be critical of us in this regard.

When the rates are set, which is the subject of the motion, when the rates are set on a business-like fashion, then we get the reverse of the Conservative argument. Then we are being criticized for being too business-like. Then we should be looking at whether or not the farms are subsidizing the cities. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information, but I do believe that it can be found out very easily and I think that the minister in charge of the Power Corporation would like to say a few words on this, and I think also the minister in charge of Power Corporation would like to say a few words in comparison to the rates charged to farm and city in this province as it relates to the province of Alberta, for example.

Now the hon. member says he doesn't want to talk about Alberta and he doesn't want to talk about Ontario. He doesn't want to talk about any of these other provinces. How else can you judge whether we are doing a good job or a bad job, how else can you judge whether or not we are charging too high a fee for the farms and for the cities unless you compare to what the power rates are in other provinces in other parts of the country? I am telling the hon. member for Moosomin that that's the kind of comparison you are going to get because if ever the day should come that the people of Saskatchewan should be unfortunate enough to have a Conservative government in power that's the kind of power rates they'd get if they were in power. There is no way that this is going to happen, there is no way that it is going to happen. We know that in the province of Saskatchewan they are not going to allow the power rates like Alberta or Alberta power rates for the farm or Alberta power for the city operation, absolutely no way. I tell the hon. member for Moosomin that he can make all the speeches that he wants about the unbusiness-like approach or the business-like approach depending on what horse he is riding on this particular day respecting Power corporations or Crown corporations. The one thing that is not going to happen is the people of Saskatchewan are not going to go for a Conservative philosophy of power rates which is making the farmers pay right through the nose in other provinces where the Conservatives are operating. Not a chance.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — There could be more of a chance when the minister in charge of the Power Corporation gives you the specific details.

I also find very interesting, Mr. Speaker, the position that the Conservatives and the Liberals are taking with respect to CPN and I am sorry to see this position because this is a part of the argument which is attached to these rates. The member for Moosomin says you know CPN, they are using Sask Tel to subsidize CPN.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're out of order!

**Mr. Romanow:** — No I'm not out of order. You weren't here. He talked about CPN. You have to be here to listen. He is the one who raised it as an aspect of rating costs and I am going to rebut this. You should listen to these speeches and I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and I am saying this, that I am interested in seeing the Liberals and the Conservatives take this position because I am going to have a great deal of fun going to rural Saskatchewan and telling the farmers and the people of rural Saskatchewan that the one mechanism of getting closed circuit television to them in the next relatively recent time — 18 months to 36 months — is being opposed by the Conservative and the Liberal parties because they don't think that's the role for a Crown corporation. They don't think that a Crown corporation should be subsidizing farmers and the farm



communities for the provision of services. They don't believe it in CPN and they don't believe it in the Power Corporation and that's the position that you have taken.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take some time to dig out exactly the details of the farm and city expenses in Saskatchewan over the years and how they compare to Alberta and I am also going to take a little time to consider in detail this business of CPN and Sask Tel because I am inviting the members to put motions on the order paper and we are going to carry this argument to the farmers and the rural people of the province of Saskatchewan and who stands for the provision of services for rural Saskatchewan and who doesn't.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 91**

**Mr. Birkbeck** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 91 showing:

The total amount of grants under all government grant programs including the homeowner grant paid out by the Province of Saskatchewan in: (a) 1970; (b) 1971; (c) 1972; (d) 1973; (e) 1974; (f) 1975; (g) 1976; (h) 1977 to date; (i) including a record of grants paid as per hamlet, village, town and city in the years 1974, 1975, 1976 to date of return.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago I might have been hesitant to rise after getting such a blast out of the Attorney General, but I can tell you that whenever I can get up and introduce a motion to this Assembly seeking information (that's all that was being asked of this government) and get that kind of a rise out of the Attorney General, in his usual way where he starts out calmly and quietly and he gets himself into such a jumble and mix-up about CPN and I never even mentioned CPN, so really I don't know why he even got into that. Clearly he is losing track with what reality is and again, Mr. Speaker, you might note that he is getting a little riled up again.

Mr. Speaker, with the risk of causing the Attorney General any more internal turmoil, I will proceed to say a few words about Item 10.

This motion is again seeking information that may or many not, depending upon the efficiency of the government, require some work on the part of their civil servants to go back a few years and look at the different grants that have been provided for the different towns and villages, cities and different projects. Certainly we have no criticism of the grants as they pertain to those interests in Saskatchewan that cannot provide or raise the necessary funds which they must have. But I only have to look back, Mr. Speaker, about 15 or 20 years ago to when a community wanted a new skating rink or curling rink and I was able to see those people rally and get together with these, raise their own money and provide those facilities and I think the people could still do it with the exception of one fact and that fact is this, that this government has destroyed the people's initiative, their incentive to do anything on their own. And you can laugh all

you like but I'm going to tell you that if you provide all the people want and that they don't have to do anything for it you can be sure they're not going to. Furthermore, you have taxed the people to such a level that that's maybe one of the reasons that they haven't got the funds to build those facilities for themselves. If you want an example you can take the homeowner's grant. Now if you can afford to give that money back then you can afford not to take it in the first place and if you must take it then take it at the municipal level or the town office level, now that's local government, now that's what you could do. If you're all for local government and local concern, local people running their own businesses then what would be wrong with that? But you don't do that because there is something about it when you give a homeowner grant and the people receive this cheque: — it has got province of Saskatchewan written across the top and they say oh isn't that wonderful, they've received something from the government and the fact is all they've received is their own money. You took it from them, you took their money from them through taxation you said very little about it and then you give it back to them in a big flare. Now then what we have is a great number of grants, a great host of grants for all kinds of programs and the government isn't going to be bale to get off. I don't care who stands up on that side of the House I know what you'll do, you'll stand up and say, oh, the Tories are against grants for the people of Saskatchewan, there you are. But you know and I know that that's not so, that I laid out clearly what our position would be and our position would be very simply to provide grants.

**An Hon. Member:** — Be careful.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — I don't have to be careful and I don't have to think as hard as you, you have to provide grants where people cannot provide for themselves and I know if the minister responsible for Municipal Affairs stands to say a few words on this he is going to know that what I'm saying is not far off the truth — that he is for local government whether he sits on that side of the House or where he sits he is concerned about local government. Regardless of all the heckling of all the backbenchers around him he knows that basically what I am striving for is to get control back into the hands of the people. You have taken that control away in any numbers of ways on the motion prior to this when I was talking about that motion and now I'm talking about grants. I'm talking about total government involvement into the lives of the people of Saskatchewan. Sure, in many forms it's good and we support it but when you look at a television ad and it shows this quiet Saskatchewan town and the Saskatchewan Transportation Company bus pulling in down that quiet main street and it shows him meeting the Sask Tel truck and they wave to each other and likely around the corner are the Sask Power boys ripping up a pole and then there is a little SGIO sign, it's a little house that's doing the business, you know government at every turn. Have any of you ever stopped for a moment to take a look at the amount of government that you've got involved in your own lives, you people sitting over there from the moment you get up in the morning until the moment you go to bed at night, you would realize.

**Mr. R. Nelson (Yorkton):** — Let's cut out hospitalization.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Now then, the member for Yorkton suggests cutting out hospitalization and let's make that clear, let's make sure that that's on the record that the member for Yorkton wants to cut out hospitalization. Mr. Speaker, the government clearly knows the information that I'm seeking. All I want to know is the forms of grants, the numbers of grants, how many dollars is involved so that maybe somebody, somebody involved in this government can start to get a hold of this situation, get track of the number of grants that are going up. Mr. Speaker, I would therefore move this motion.

**Hon. G. MacMurchy (Last Mountain-Touchwood):** — I have in mind moving a very simple amendment to the motion put forth by the hon. member for Moosomin and let it go at that. However, because I think we can answer the question, where the information is available, however, I don't think I can let it go at that in light of the comments put forward by the member for Moosomin. They had considerable comparison to some comments made by the member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party, earlier on sometime before, I think it was at their convention and I want to consider his remarks, the member for Moosomin, along with the remarks of the member for Nipawin and see if there is the comparison that I think there is and that I can perhaps direct some remarks to both the member for Moosomin and to the member for Nipawin and in fact all of the members of the Conservative caucus and in order to give myself some time to prepare such remarks I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 92**

**Mr. Birkbeck (Moosomin)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 92 showing:

The names and addresses of all persons, corporations and co-ops who have grazing leases from the Government: (a) The locations of the land leased; (b) The terms of the lease.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the information I seek in this motion is very straightforward; I don't think it requires any debate whatsoever or discussion.

**Hon. E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the member for Moosomin when he put this question on the order paper really realized what he was asking. If you look at the Lands branch in my department you have a land mass of 5,420,000 acres to deal with, all of which is dealt with by the Lands branch. There are almost 8,000 leases covering these lands and of those, 7,500 are held by individuals. There are 57 of which are under PFRA and 134 under grazing associations, and 17 under leases to municipalities. Now the dates of these leases expire anywhere from 1978 to 1998. They were entered in at various times and various stages and the terms would vary depending on when the leases were issued. So the compilation of that kind or that mass of material which he is requesting seems to me to be totally unrealistic. My department tells me that it would take at least a man's year of labour to assemble this kind of information and I am sure the member for Moosomin if he got that pile of information which would be an \$18,000 question at least, I think it is irresponsible to ask for that kind of detail. I am sure that if the member opposite is out on a witch hunt and he wants to find out who has got what kind of a lease and what rate he is being charged, I am sure that he can get that information by putting a question on the order paper which would specify what he wants to know. I don't think in any case that he should feel that there is anything incorrect happening in the department of the Lands branch with regard to allocation of leases. They are certainly open to appeal at any time. So I would suggest that the member for Moosomin reconsider the request that he is making here and that he would be more specific in requesting information in the future. I would suggest that if he has a problem, if he has something specific that he wants to know that he make it specific so we can give him an answer without putting the

whole department to work for a whole year. I would therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House that we defeat this motion and ask the member to bring in a more specific motion.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Mr. Speaker, could I just ask the member one question if he would permit it. I wonder then, Mr. Minister, in light of your comment, would you then consider proposing an amendment to my motion and provide me with that information which is economically feasible in your terms and which is accessible. I am sure that that would help a lot. I would prefer to get part of something than all of nothing.

**Mr. Kaeding:** — I think that the member should set down somewhere this specific information he wants and we would be prepared to reply to it providing he would realize that the kind of job that he is asking us to do here is unrealistic. If he wants to know the number of acres broken down into the different specifications he should state that and make that request and we will be prepared to supply that information.

**Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, to assist the minister and the member on this side, who are suggesting that there is some ground in between so that he could get some information, I would beg permission to adjourn debate.

Permission to adjourn debate denied.

**Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, when one looks at this question and at many others, there seems to be a general scenario in the questions that the Progressive Conservatives are placing on the order paper this year. I have noticed that they have asked questions about who is on social assistance, they want the names of individuals who are on social assistance, how many of those are Indian and how many are Metis, how many of other racial origin. Take a look at the question in the case of the public service, they are asking the names of students, where they were employed, their addresses, their salaries month by month and day by day, they are asking the number of employees who were given leave of absence for education purposes, their names, their addresses, where do they live. Now, I wonder why they are raising all these questions. Are they really on a witch hunt campaign that they want all the names of all these people in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, if it were not for that, Mr. Speaker, and they asked the questions about the gross total numbers, we are prepared to supply total numbers of people who are getting grazing leases, but when it comes down to individuals.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing to remember, if you look at the arguments that the Conservatives have presented during the budget speech of last year and during the Throne Speech this year they've had an attack on that there are too many public servants. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to answer all these questions, then we will have to hire hundreds of more public servants in order to be able to provide the answers. They can't have it both ways. They can't, on the one hand, say that we have too many public servants and then be demanding information from the government that takes months and years to answer it.

Now the other important thing, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives also argue about the handing down of reports, the annual reports that are provided by the Crown corporations and by the various departmental agencies and by the departments. Interestingly enough that while these reports are being provided obviously the Conservatives have not bothered even to look at them because much of the information that they are asking, without providing the detailed names, is provided in the annual

reports. Now why is it, haven't they learned the rules in here, haven't they bothered to take a look at what is provided.

Mr. Speaker, in the case of the previous question, the grants that are provided to the various communities, if they ever bothered to open the Public Accounts, that information is recorded there. Now why do they insist on repeatedly asking for this information so that our civil servants are put to more work, unnecessary work, to duplicate all of that. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, as an opposition they should be responsible but really what is happening in here, Mr. Speaker, when you take a look at their questions and the information they are seeking, that this is total irresponsibility they're asking the public to waste millions of dollars unnecessarily to provide this kind of information when it's already in many cases reprinted and printed in the annual reports except for the detailed names. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is totally unfair to be subjecting citizens of this province in providing lists of names and addresses so that the PCs can use it for their political purposes of sending out their political propaganda to these people. I think that's the only reason they're asking for the names and addresses. If it wasn't for that what's the purpose in them making these kinds of demands. Mr. Speaker, I shall be making a few other remarks after I've had a chance to further consider some of the other questions and tabulate more of their questions so that we can deal with them in further detail. Mr. Speaker, for that I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 13 — Ballot with Braille Markings**

**Mr. G.N. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake)** moved, seconded by the member for Estevan, Mr. R.A. Larter:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to adopt a suitable ballot with Braille markings to ensure that those with visual handicaps enjoy the right to secret ballot.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I expect that there will not be too many MLAs in the Assembly who will disapprove of this resolution and I, therefore, expect that all the debates will be in favour of the province of Saskatchewan designing a ballot in a manner that will allow people with visual handicaps a right to the secret ballot. This, I believe, would be a first in North America from what I can get. Mr. Speaker, after speaking with people who are blind and people who are elderly and with poor eyesight and many who are in a younger age group and have to rely on glasses in order to read, I've been told that if a ballot was designed with some distinct markings that can be identified by touch and if this was available that these people would actually have they'd feel they'd have the right to the secret ballot. There are instances where those with poor eyesight have left their glasses at home. They've told me and they feel that they may have spoiled their ballot by not marking an X on the right place. Those voters who are classed as blind do not have a secret ballot as they have someone help them mark it and with the properly designed ballot these people, approximately 1,300 in Saskatchewan, would enjoy this privilege. And that old man talking across the way there, he's going to be in that shape some day with those bad eyes of his and maybe a little marking on the ballot would help him. Mr. Speaker, in my resolution I've asked for a ballot with Braille markings but first let me assure you that the word in this does not mean Braille lettering, but more generally

speaking the idea of an embossed line or a raised line that divides the candidates names on the ballot would be more suitable. Each name would then be in its separate location s defined by the raised line and could be identified by touch. Each ballot could be the same for every voter. In fact, it would have to be the same for every voter in case you have a poll where only one blind voter or visually handicapped person, so all ballots would have to be the same. I also realize that there is probably an inventory of blank ballots on stock at this time and that they may have to be used up first. I don't know how they print ballots years ahead and get the names on them, but they may have to be used up first. However, I feel that this resolution will be taken seriously by every member of this Assembly and that we can be the first province in Canada to ensure as close as possible the concept of the secret ballot for all voters. Mr. Speaker, my request is a fairly simple one and with all our modern printing technology we have today, I feel that each member will endorse this, so I move this resolution seconded by the member for Estevan, Bob Larter.

**Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this and would like to feel that every member in the House would support this. I know this government is very conscious of the new buildings in doing things for the handicapped and making things easier for the handicapped. I would like to think that this is just one more thing that in this having the right of a secret ballot I would like to think that we are moving more towards helping the handicapped in almost every field and I'm thinking, of course, even in our own Legislative Buildings here when renovations take place that we are doing more to make them more at home in their working environment. I know that the government has done a fairly good job over the past few years in hiring handicapped people and I commend them for it but I do think we can go on further and push it a little bit further. But I would urge every member to support this right to a secret ballot by the blind in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just point out to the member that everyone I'm sure is aware, there is a mail-in provision now, a special ballot provision now which does exist for handicapped people. I think it has worked fairly well, one of the disadvantages to it is that it's not totally secret in the sense that you require somebody else to do the marking for you, but nevertheless, there have been to my knowledge no recorded or reported instances of abuse of the mail-in provision that I know of requiring, therefore, a change in the law but we would need to have or to see . . . well, the member for Rosthern shakes his head. I would be pleased if he would give me something in writing which indicates that the present mail-in provisions have worked for the handicapped or have been abused by somebody, necessitating a wholesale change. I am not speaking against this motion because I realize the intention with which it is made and the purpose of it which, certainly, I think everybody in this House would agree, is a very laudable purpose.

I should like to have some time to consider if this has been done elsewhere and if so, where, and whether it is possible to do it from a printing point of view, what cost implications there may be attached to it and also to consider some aspects respecting the present mail-in vote that exists, the handicapped vote.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 16 — Federal Liberal Government Ignores Needs of Veterans**

**Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan)** moved, seconded by Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern):

That this Assembly condemns the federal Liberal government for ignoring the needs of some 190,000 veterans in turning down monies agreed to on an all party agreement of two years ago, and that this Assembly further urges that this agreement, although not accepted by Cabinet, be now passed in order to restore dignity to a group that has given so much to our country.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on a subject that is very personally important to me and I believe should be important to every member of this Assembly. It is the subject of veterans' disability pensions.

The Minister of Veterans' Affairs, the Hon. Mr. MacDonald, just announced prior to observance of Remembrance Day in 1977, or reported on October 28th in the Regina Leader Post that the Government of Canada would not be able to live up to its promise to increase the disability veterans' pension because of the economy of the country.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago different veterans organizations across Canada met in committee with the government and it was agreed that the rate of pension for a 100 per cent disability pensioner would be equal to the pay of the lowest category in the federal civil service, which at that time was a caretaker. Mr. Speaker, this promise was not kept and the disability pensioner received some \$500 less than the lowest paid civil servant.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. MacDonald wants to advise the disabled that they could not keep the government promise because he, himself, I believe, is a double amputee. Mr. Speaker, he lost the battle when he took it to the federal Cabinet.

I would like to see this Assembly as going on record that we strongly oppose the action of the federal government in respect to the disability veterans' pension. In my opinion the federal government has not only broken faith with those who died in defence of this nation, but also they have broken faith with the living who are handicapped, because they volunteered to defend the freedoms we enjoy today. I would request that all members of the legislature support this motion.

**Mr. R.R. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words on this particular motion. I am a little concerned that the member who presented this resolution, being a veteran, would present a motion that would be out as far as his figures are in the resolution.

He said that there are 190,000 veterans being turned down, while the actual figure of veterans in the total of Canada that received pensions is 138,973. He is out some 50,000 people in number. He condemns the federal Liberal government for ignoring these veterans and I should like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that Canada gives the highest veteran benefits of any country in the entire world.

I have several other things that I would like to say on this. I would like to consider the remarks of the member and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 17 — Delaying of Marijuana Legislation**

**Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose)** moved, seconded by the member for Estevan:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to delay any legislation that would legalize the sale of marijuana until broader research has been conducted.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this particular time to discuss before this Assembly the resolution which appears. I know that the question of the legalization of marijuana is certainly not a new one and it is one which has been tossed around from time to time. I suppose that which has put me in interest in taking a look at the problem of the legalization of marijuana prompted me, this summer, to do some research on my own and write to various centres who are currently researching marijuana, as well as the other pharmacologists in Canada who are presently working and studying this topic of marijuana and its effect. So the question, Mr. Speaker, is by no means a new one. It is a question that has been around for a long time and the only people that you hear passing comments on the legalization of marijuana are those who are the least informed about the effects of the drug itself. I am referring to politicians of all political stripes, who from time to time, give lip service to the legalization of marijuana. Certainly theologians have. A very prominent church leader, not too long ago, gave tentative support to the legalization of marijuana. There are many lawyers in Canada who advocate the legalization of marijuana, sociologists and so on.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, to present to this Assembly, today, that there are far too many unknowns, far too many unknowns in this question of the legalization of marijuana to actually go out and legislate its use as some would have us do.

Mr. Speaker, I only need to draw the attention of this House back to something that took place in this decade. Three provinces, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba and Ontario eventually lowered the drinking age to 18 years of age. The question is very obvious, why? Why did we move in this direction? The question is there for everyone and the answer is obvious. They thought it was a vote getting piece of legislation. I want to ask the question, put forth the idea, what has happened to each one of these provinces since?

They have all had to fight their way back through legislation in bringing the age back to 19 and far too many people regret that move.

Mr. Speaker, all political parties in Canada, in looking this question over, have at one time or another given lip service to the legalization of marijuana. Certainly the federal Liberals have, the federal Conservatives have and many NDP members as well. You would think that more thought would be given by these people first. You would think the example of trying to sell more booze to young people would have prompted them to exercise more care. Some of Canada's leading church officials recently got on record and in September of last year, Mr. Speaker, police and medical officers were warning a meeting of the International Narcotics Enforcement Officers Association, that marijuana was a highly dangerous drug. And we in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, who represent the citizens of Saskatchewan, should listen very carefully to the warning of these people. We should be listening, not to the layman but rather to the people who are currently engaged in mammoth research on marijuana and its effect on the human body. And I want to quote. The drug abuse consultant to the government of Prince Edward Island told Canadians at this conference and I quote, "That marijuana is a menace to society." Mr. Speaker, that does not come from somebody who would just casually be drawing attention to marijuana but somebody who, in effect, had done many years of research. I suppose that one could say that there's an excellent reason that laymen, law enforcement officers, religious groups and government leaders as well as scientists are so divided. The fact is, that up to this point in time, not one



scientist, not one research has even intimated in any way, that this drug would be safe to legalize. Only laymen and politicians have come up with that idea.

Mr. Speaker, despite hundreds of published studies such as the Le Dain Commission Report, refers to 846 scientific documents on marijuana. And this Le Dain Commission I believe was published in 1972, and to this date there has yet been no solid answer to the question, "Is marijuana harmful?"

However, I want to refer you to Harold Cullen, the leading researcher at the University of Toronto in the field of pharmacology. He happens to be among the many scholars in the drug field who urge and continually urge caution in the legalization of marijuana. Cullen states this, that the real questions we should be asking are, "How much marijuana does it take to produce how much harm?" Another question he puts forth is this, "And how many people are likely to use enough to produce that harm?" In studying the works of this eminent scientist, I find that most, if not all, of his conclusions would lead anyone even without a scientific mind to want to stay away from the legalization of this drug.

The only thing that it has going are those who question largely the use of the drugs on the basis of individual rights. Every single person, Mr. Speaker, that I wrote to and every single research fact that I can find involved in the drug research tends to urge caution on a number of issues particularly health grounds. The director of biological studies both for the University of Toronto and the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario say this and I quote:

We still have years of data gathering ahead of us before anyone can say with certainty what problems the widespread use of marijuana will create.

Mr. Speaker, the history of pharmacology is full of cases of the so-called "safe drugs" whose hazards became apparent only after the substance was used on a wide scale for many years. And I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that it was only about 25 years ago, that the first scientific studies linking tobacco to lung cancer, emphysema, bronchitis and heart disease, started. Let us look at the drug heroin. This drug was first introduced as a non-addictive substitute for morphine. Demerol, a synthetic narcotic came on the market about 30 years ago and was acclaimed for its non-addictive qualities. And today, Mr. Speaker, thousands of people are hooked on it. The many barbiturates and tranquillizers initially were presented to us as being totally harmless and yet now, it is known that they can lead to addiction and of course, we all know the serious side effects. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying, in drawing these to the attention of this House, is the lesson is here for Canadians to be learned. And certainly the lesson from history is to be learned at this time. Our knowledge about the long-term effects of marijuana is still meagre at the least. The head of research at the University of Toronto said this:

The number of people using marijuana is relatively small. Most of them are young and healthy. Many have not been using it for a long period of time.

And yet many laymen will make the claim that alcohol is a more serious problem than pot. They say that marijuana is a substitute for alcohol and thus they will smoke pot and not consume alcohol. But researchers tell us, from all over Canada and the United States, that that prospect is most unlikely. The prospect of substituting the use of marijuana instead of consuming alcohol, researchers say that that prospect is most unlikely. Researchers agree that the widespread use of marijuana would add to the

health and economic problems caused by alcohol. Now this opinion is based on research conducted in metro Toronto by Dr. Reginald Smart and Diane Pheiffer of the Addiction Research Foundation. And in reading their report, Mr. Speaker, they indicated that marijuana users are more likely to be alcohol drinkers than non-users. They're also more likely to consume mood altering drugs as well as alcohol. Mr. Speaker, the other evening there was a one full hour program, and I forget which network it came on. It was devoted to, they called in 'The Genie in the Bottle' the drinking problems and the conditions around the world, comparing Canadian drinking habits and so on. But at the present time it is estimated that 13 million Canadians over the age of 15 are drinkers. I'd like to repeat that statistic. That 13 million Canadians over the age of 15 are drinkers and about 7 million are tobacco users. It was interesting to see the program the other night in which they stated that 10 years ago, one out of every three adults in Canada was a non-drinker. At the present time it's one out of ten, so we see that the widespread effect of alcohol has gone over many, many people. If marijuana say, was available from the Saskatchewan Marijuana Control Board or the Alberta Marijuana Control Board, it seems likely that in time the number of people who both drink alcohol and smoke marijuana regularly would be numbered in the thousands, and eventually in Canada it would soon reach the millions. An undisputed research finding is that a driver stoned on marijuana is a very dangerous driver. It has also been proven in the research labs in Toronto that a person whose blood test in alcohol would only measure .02, but having consumed what they call a jolt of marijuana, would be a far more dangerous driver on the highway than a person whose blood contents was .08. His perception of time and space as well as his co-ordination is impaired. And you can well imagine that if the driver drinks and smokes marijuana at the same time, as the researchers proved, that the research findings are indeed alarming. Research says that a person high on marijuana and then drinks alcohol, that portion of the alcohol that he consumed becomes seven times as potent as it would have been had he not smoked the marijuana at the same time, seven times as potent! Controlled studies of motorists in city traffic, intoxicated on marijuana alone, revealed that they completely missed traffic lights, flashing stop lights, drove recklessly, did very poorly in the handling of vehicles and were vaguely aware of pedestrians and parked cars and, Mr. Speaker, this was a controlled study. We can well imagine what would happen if it had not been a controlled study. Now if the Liberals want to make fun of this particular resolution I'm glad that they are because if they want to support the legalization of marijuana I'm quite sure that they'll have the opportunity when I am finished speaking. But I would ask them, Mr. Speaker, until I'm finished that they would save their comments for their own approach to the topic if they don't want to support the resolution that's their privilege but when I'm providing the rest of it I would ask them to behave in the same manner as they would want other people to behave when they are speaking. Convicting marijuana drunk drivers would be difficult if not impossible. At the present time there is no screening device for marijuana users as there is for alcohol, but most researchers agree that it would take years to have the full effect on the measurement of the drug not only in Canada but in the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, every research that is going on in the continent has agreed that much more time is needed for research. Every research in the continent says that it is indeed a very, very serious problem, there are far too many unanswered questions. Some of the questions I think that we need to ask ourselves at this time are these. Does marijuana cause pre-cancerous changes in the lung cells? Does it cause emotional disturbances and mental illness — some researchers are already pointing to that fact — does it cause emotional disturbances? What about the effect on the heart? What about the effect of smoking marijuana and the pregnant mother? Does it kill ambition or make a person apathetic? The most important question facing all of us is this, what have we got to gain

by the legalization of marijuana? The conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to listen carefully to the words of Olaf Benin, director of the United Nations Narcotic Laboratory and I quote, "In my opinion it seems that as progressively more scientific facts are being discovered about marijuana the more one becomes aware of the potential dangers." Mr. Speaker, I think that the work and the little bit of information that I could gather would point out that legislatures have a very, very serious commitment to make and that is not to make the mistake that they made with alcohol but rather to look upon this and as this motion says, Mr. Speaker, it is a federal matter but I think the federal government would be well advised to know how this Assembly stood on a very, very important question. Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution.

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this motion before I propose an amendment to it. I want to first of all say that the motion in my judgement is defective in some areas. First of all the motion seems to indicate or at least imply that the Government of Canada had some legislation about that would legalize the sale of marijuana, that may or may not be the case but I don't know of that being the case, in fact in my federal provincial dealings with the federal government, I know of no such intention by them to introduce legislation which would legalize the sale. I realize that there is a question of documentation done by Le Dain and others in this whole area but I don't know of any intent by the federal authorities to legalize the so-called sale of marijuana. There has been from time to time at the federal level discussion about decriminalizing the use of marijuana but still allowing and attaching to it penalties, namely of putting it in the category of perhaps provincial style kinds of offences, liquor act offences or vehicle act offences, that kind of a situation rather than putting it in the level of the Food and Drug and Narcotics Control Act. Either way it would not be a suggestion or an implication that there should be quote, "a legalization" of marijuana.

The other thing that I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the position of myself as Attorney General for the province has been one of opposition to the legalization of the sale of marijuana. I've been asked this question, I was asked in question periods a year or so ago and I indicated that I was opposed to its legalization and I still maintain that position, Mr. Speaker, the argument is raised that here we're dealing with a drug which is no more harmful than alcohol. The argument is on occasion raised that in fact it has less of an impact than alcohol. That may or may not be the case, I don't know, but to me it doesn't meet the main substance of the argument. The main substance of the argument as far as I'm concerned is that marijuana is a mood altering substance, it is a mood altering substance as alcohol is or any other kind of a drug or chemical might be. Whether it has more harmful or less harmful effects really begs the question, the question being mainly should we as legislators provide for or in some way legitimize or legalize mood altering substances and the distribution in our society and I for one feel that alcohol as a mood altering substance has proven to be a very costly medical and social problem as far as society is concerned.

I believe that marijuana has proven to be a very costly, social and perhaps even medical problem, certainly a social problem as far as our society is concerned. The point is it is a mood altering substance. I think some fundamental questions have to be asked about whether or not the provision of mood altering substances even if they are medically less harmful and perhaps not having any harm whatsoever, where the provision and the distribution of them is the kind of direction in which our society should be heading and from my point of view it's a direction that we should not be heading and to argue that is less harmful than alcohol or less harmful than some other substance or that we're making criminals out of young people begs the fundamental question in my view. The

fundamental question is the promotion or at least the distribution of what I consider to be the potentially dangerous aspect of a mood altering substance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that there may be some people who hold the individual views which are contrary to those outlying. But I tell you that those are my views, personally, and as Attorney General. And I also find that as a consequence the words of the motion that are before the House are inadequate, inadequate to express my concern in this matter. The words of the member for Rosetown-Elrose are as follows. "That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada (to do what?), to delay any legislation that would legalize the sale of marijuana (until when?) until broader research has been conducted," Mr. Speaker. And I believe that that question implies not an opposition because it would have stated an opposition, it implies a delay because that's the request that it wants, a delay until there is an opportunity to presumably analyze in a broader aspect the research that has been conducted. My point of view is, what if you did conduct broader research and if it did show that it was not harmful to one's health? As I've said in my earlier remarks the fundamental question still has to be answered. And that is whether or not a mood altering substance, notwithstanding the research, is the kind of a substance which we should allow for sale or allow for distribution in our society. I, for one, do not believe that that's the case. I believe that the motion is, therefore, defective, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of health, the hon. MLA for Humboldt, Mr. Tchorzewski, that this motion needs an amendments. I would, therefore, move that we amend Resolution No. 17 by deleting the word "delay" in the first sentence thereof and substituting, therefor:

The words 'oppose the introduction of' and further by deleting all the words after the word 'marijuana' in the second line thereof.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the Attorney General that perhaps as he has looked at the written motion he has taken a different viewpoint than I had intended in the motion. I don't think that I made any indication in my remarks in this particular resolution that I was in any way inferring, I suppose, if they want to read it that way, that in time that the drug should be legalized and if this Assembly will take a look at the resolution and I certainly agree with the amendment of the Attorney General and I will certainly be supporting it. I think it's incumbent upon every member of this Assembly to look seriously upon this resolution and the amendment that has been offered by the Attorney General and I certainly will be supporting it.

**Hon. E. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just say a few words on this because I have had a considerable amount of interest in the question of drug abuse and marijuana for a large number of years. From the days when I was a teacher back from 1965 and on and even before that. I cannot disagree with the general idea that's incorporated in the resolution, in fact, I would heartily support it. I believe that our society has been steered over several years, quite a large number of years by pressures and I think even by promoters of new drugs towards using all kinds of crutches to meet the pressures of society and to avoid responsibilities just to list two examples. I want to also say in my few remarks in this debate, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere in Canada, I believe sincerely has there been a more positive and concrete effort made to meet the problems of drug abuse and alcohol abuse than in the province of Saskatchewan. And the member for Rosetown, he smiles and grimaces, but he knows that that is true. In Saskatchewan I know it too, we don't allow the advertisement of alcohol, in other provinces they do. In Conservative Ontario they do. Member should try to persuade his colleagues over there that that's not a good idea. In Conservative Alberta they do. The member should talk to his colleagues in Conservative Alberta and

persuade them that they should not. And they still in Alberta, as far I know, Mr. Speaker, have the age of 18 as the age in which alcohol can be consumed in bars and beverage rooms. That was changed in Saskatchewan. So you have to wonder where the member for Rosetown really stands. We have had other efforts developed in Saskatchewan that have done a great deal in this area. One example is, and the member for Saskatoon will be quite interested, I'm sure, the alcohol treatment centres like they call the Rehab centres in Saskatoon which is doing an excellent job. And alcohol education programs in schools and throughout the public by the Alcohol Commission. But I want to say after saying that that all of those things when you talk about our young people are not going to be particularly effective if the adult community does not set up the appropriate example. Now my personal position on this, Mr. Speaker, is I oppose the introduction of legalization of marijuana, I always have and I do now. I was rather mystified listening to the member for Rosetown about his dancing around and attempting to ride both sides of the fence at the same time in his resolution, and he laughs again. Except that if he had really not wanted to ride on the both sides of the fence at the same time he would not have talked about 'delay the introduction of'. The delay the introduction of, which really means that he could go out to those people who oppose the legalization of marijuana and say to them, oh, we oppose it and go to those people who agree with the legalization of marijuana and say well, we don't really oppose it we just want to delay it while somebody studies it for awhile. And it's that kind of position that, I think, we cannot take in this House, and I certainly cannot. And, therefore, I'm very much in agreement with the amendment presented by the Attorney General. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have more that I want to say on this after giving some more consideration to the remarks from the member for Rosetown and, therefore, I at this time I would like to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 o'clock p.m.