

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

June 18, 1985

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

#### Non-Controversial Bills

##### Bill No. 112 — An Act respecting Liens in the Construction Industry

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills, I present the 12th report of the said committee which is as follows:

As chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report bill No. 112, An Act respecting Liens in the Construction Industry, as being non-controversial.

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said Bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 112 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to our Assembly, some 27 young people from Ruth Pawson Elementary School, a large, active school in Uplands area of my constituency in Regina North.

They are sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They're grade five students and are accompanied today by their teacher, June Heinrichs. There are a few chaperons with them as well. I'm sure that we won't disappoint them in the House today with our procedures, and that they will find their visit to our legislature both interesting and informative. And I look forward to joining them for pictures later, sharing a cool drink as we discuss what happened today in question period, and I ask all members to welcome them to our Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and to members of the House, a visitor from Great Britain who lives in London area, and her name is Emma Norton. She's in the Speaker's gallery, and I'll ask her to stand for a moment. She is the granddaughter of the former member for Biggar, the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, who was the member for Biggar for more than 25 years, and a former premier of this province. Emma Norton, the granddaughter of Woodrow Lloyd.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Trip to Bulgaria by Minister of Agriculture

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Premier, and my question deals with this government's total inadequate response to the most severe grasshopper infestation that we've had in Saskatchewan since the Great Depression. Will the Premier confirm that yesterday afternoon, as farmers throughout Saskatchewan continued to struggle to try and save their crops, his Minister of Agriculture, the man who is supposed to be in charge of the grasshopper control program, hopped a plane for Bulgaria for at least a week; and how can you justify this international junket at the height of an agricultural crisis in Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, it's true that the minister is on his way to Bulgaria. It is also true that we have a program for grasshoppers in the province of Saskatchewan. We have been in touch with several municipal council and reeves today to check on what they're doing in terms of dealing with grasshoppers.

And I am quite prepared to go through the list of R.M.s and describe, as each reeve described to us, what they're doing and how it's working. In some municipalities there's a great deal of co-operation between farmers and the R.M.s, and they have it under control. In some municipalities there are some problems with respect to R.M.s and farmers, and we're going to be talking to those R.M.s.

There are some regional meetings coming up. As a matter of fact, the Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture is in Swift Current as we speak, at an R.M. regional meeting, discussing the whole question and reviewing it with the R.M. councillors and the reeves.

**MR. ENGEL:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the Premier that R.M.s around Meadow Lake — maybe Nipawin, maybe Cumberland, some of those R.M.s — are doing quite nicely. Their grasshoppers aren't a problem there.

But can you tell this House today, and for all the farmers and ranchers of Saskatchewan and others who are fighting infestation, who's in charge? Who's in charge of the grasshopper control program in the minister's absence? If people have complaints about the program and are in need of immediate help, who do they call on? What minister is in charge while the Minister of Agriculture is booting around Bulgaria.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has a Legislative Secretary, and if they want somebody else to be in charge, I'll take responsibility. They can always get in touch with my office. Just as I said to the hon. member yesterday, if you want to come in and talk about a specific R.M. where you think that there's a unique problem that doesn't apply to some place else, I'd be glad to talk about it.

I can tell the public you haven't been to see me. You haven't given me the names of the farmers. You haven't even given me the name of the R.M. in which you think there's a particular unique problem. If you would bring it in, I'd be very glad to discuss it with you. But the Legislative Secretary is in Swift Current today meeting with the R.M.s that are meeting there. There's meetings coming up on the 26th. And there's another one later in June. We will be there as well, talking with the R.M.s and seeing which one of them are working, how the program's working.

I can give you some examples. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like . . . Well, I'll leave it up to him. I can go through all, or a large number of R.M.s right across southern Saskatchewan and describe, as they described to the Legislative Secretary today, exactly what is being done, the amount of money being spent and how they're handling it, how they're co-operating with the provincial government in paying for the portion of it, and, in fact, what they recommend that we do. And I'd be glad to elaborate if you want it.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you are aware, and you're deceiving

this House if you say there are no R.M.s that are in serious trouble and don't know what you've got in place for a program — that the program isn't working.

I'm sure you're aware of it, because the Minister of Agriculture is, because I've got copies of letters that he received from farmers, ranchers, and R.M.s that are suffering a severe outbreak. And the road allowance isn't 1 per cent of the area that affected — not one per cent of the area that's affected.

Those representatives call for a direct assistance program, similar to Alberta, where you'd help get the problem under control. In light of these representations, will you now admit that this program is not working, and will you announce a direct assistance program so that large areas of the province — large areas of the province that need to be controlled — will get some grasshopper control?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, as . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. As I said yesterday, we have the co-operation of the R.M. councils. And I'll give you some examples so that you can rest assured that the information is coming in as recent as this morning. The R.M. of Baildon, No. 131, budgeted \$20,000 for chemical and will pro rate if the expenses is larger.

The R.M. of Moose Jaw, 161, budgeting \$20,000 or half the cost of chemical. The R.M. of Enfield, 194, farmers submit their bills to the R.M.; R.M. of Chaplin, No. 164, they're spraying road allowances and they will apply for the grant; R.M. of Shamrock, spraying road allowances and will apply for the provincial grant; R.M. of Rodgers neat Coderre, that's No. 133 . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. The question was asked, and I'm sure that the Premier is able to answer it without the assistance of all those around him. I would ask for silence.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, just to carry on a little bit, the R.M. of Gravelbourg, contacting Vern Richmond, and he says drought is as much of the problem as grasshoppers. The R.M. have contacted and sprayed the CPR and highways and have had to initiate one action for one farmer who didn't spray. This is the R.M. of Gravelbourg. Now that takes in a big area that you were talking about yesterday.

The R.M. of Miry purchased spraying equipment; will begin spraying roadsides soon. Most people have only sprayed the edges. The R.M. of Swift Current have a few spots, but generally not serious. In some R.M.s, they have passed a by-law that says that the farmer must spray, and if they don't spray, they're going to go in and spray it for them, and then will charge him, or they will say they will bill them later. Okay.

Now we can say that the R.M. of Gull Lake, most farmers are spraying the edges in Gull Lake. The stubble fields are the worst. There's pockets where it's serious. Lighter land seems to be the worst. And where you have lighter land, the drought seems to be as much of a problem as the grasshoppers. The R.M. has sprayed 2,600 miles by air, 300 miles by ground. It will cost the R.M. about 6 mills, and the R.M. of Gull Lake says that 3 mills will be paid for by the provincial government and 3 mills will be paid for by the R.M.

The R.M. of Webb, some pockets are very severe. I've been . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order, please. I believe that the answer has been sufficient to lay out a broad spectrum, but I would ask that the minister be a little briefer in his answers.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier, and he is inferring that all the R.M.s are onside with this non-program he has in place. But I have here a letter, which a copy was sent to him on June 12th, and, in part, the letter from the Rural Municipality of Frontier says this, and I quote:

Please be advised that council is very disappointed with your announcement regarding grasshopper control. Council was expecting at least 50 per cent of the cost of controlling grasshoppers on fields, pastures, right of ways, or any other location being paid directly by your department to individuals spraying, similar to the program from Alberta.

Alberta was better assisted by their drought program and is again better assisted in this situation.

Now this is from the R.M. of Frontier, and this letter was sent to you.

What I would like to know is what your response is to these farmers and this council who say you don't have a program; who say that compared to Alberta, you're not doing a good job. And I don't know who did that report for you, whether it was the chicken man or Mr. Tkachuk, but it isn't accurate with what's going on out there, and what are you doing about it?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I would think it's fair to say that one R.M. in the Shaunavon riding does not represent all southern Saskatchewan. And what I said today is that there's meeting of R.M.s in Swift Current today, and the Legislative Secretary is there; there's a meeting in Carlyle on the 26th; and there's a meeting in Moose Jaw on the 27th. And all the R.M.s are going to be there, and we will have representation there. And the R.M.s as I've read it. . . I can go through the rest of the R.M.s, Mr. Speaker, but I won't.

I've gone through R.M. after R.M. that says that the project is working, the project is working. And the R.M.s are co-operating. And where they're co-operating, farmers are getting assistance. We're paying half the price in terms of the road allowances. And they know that that's going to amount to a great deal of money. It's going to be anywhere from, depending on how bad the grasshoppers are, from 5, 10, 15, or \$20 million.

I don't know what the bill will be. It depends on how many R.M.s . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order. Proceed.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — New question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In the letter that was sent from Frontier, and I quote again, they say:

Controlling grasshoppers on municipal road allowances only, which your program does, is like the killing flies at the dump with a fly swatter, hopeless at least in areas at this stage.

This is what the R.M. says to you about your program; it's useless. And I would like to say as well that two other R.M.s in one constituency. And I would say to you: what are you doing about the problem in south-west Saskatchewan? Where is your program, or when will it be announced?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the program is announced. The R.M.s are dealing with it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says he's got one letter from one R.M., and he says this represents all the rest. Well, I can show you R.M. where they say . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. It's impossible to hear answers with the amount of talking that's going on in the Chamber, and I'm going to ask members to restrain themselves.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I have one more supplement to the Premier dealing with this letter from Frontier. And I quote the final paragraph that outlines very clearly their position in regards to your grasshopper program. And it says:

The provincial government has helped out the province's depositors in Pioneer Trust, but what about sufficient help for their own farmers and ranchers?

And I would ask you: what is your response to that when you had \$6 million for out-of-province depositors? For the farmers in Frontier and Val Marie and Climax you have nothing. And how do you justify that at a time when you're increasing taxes on these very farmers? They simply don't understand it.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I hope that you noticed, Mr. Speaker, the preamble to the question. The preamble was: what are we doing for farmers? You said, you prepared money for Pioneer; you've got money for Pioneer, and you're raising taxes; what are you doing for farmers?

Well, I'll tell you what we're doing for farmers. I'll tell you what we're doing for farmers. Thirty-five million dollars a year on gas tax removal for farmers. Thirty-five million dollars in rural gas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order! I'm going to ask the members to be a little more under control throughout the answering. Now you've asked a broad question, and you're going to get a broad answer, I'm afraid.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, if I can continue . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I'm going to caution the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg today.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, if I can continue, we've offered a great deal of money and a cash advance to farmers. The Farm Purchase program is \$25 million; the ACC loan rate is \$4 million; flood assistance is 7.5; the livestock tax credit is 5; the tax removed on power is 1.3; irrigation is . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I'm going to caution the member from Shaunavon.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — That's over \$5,000 per farmer that this provincial government is offering agriculture. If you add that to what the federal government has done recently, and we've been bargaining for it, the removal of capital gains tax is \$50 million; the fuel tax rebate is \$40 million . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

#### **Expenditures of Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Forest Products, and it deal further with the extravagant expenses that senior management have been running up in the Saskatchewan Forest products in spite of a \$4.5 million loss last year.

I'd like to ask the minister: can the minister confirm that one Eldon Kerbes was hired during 1984 to serve as plant manager at the Saskatchewan Forest products treating plant in Prince Albert? And can he confirm that Mr. Kerbes is from British Columbia? And can he tell the Assembly what Mr. Kerbes is in fact receiving for his position?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take notice of the amount he's paid. I'm not sure what it is. It's whatever the going rate is for a manager. In regards to his duties, his duties is the responsibility of the treatment plant at Prince Albert and the mill at Big River.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A supplement, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can explain why Mr. Kerbes is allowed to travel back and forth from British Columbia every month, to visit his family at taxpayers' expense. I have here invoices indicating that he travels from Saskatoon to Smithers in March of '84 for 500 bucks; April of '84, 570; and it goes on: May '85, 489; and on and on. Can you tell the Saskatchewan taxpayers why, for after more than one year of employment here since you hired this man, that the taxpayers of this province are paying over \$500 a month to send him back to Smithers and back during his employment here in Saskatchewan? Five hundred dollars a month to travel back and forth to British Columbia.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm unaware of that. I'll check it out and report back.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I have a further supplemental. I wonder if . . . do I have the floor . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Minister, I ask you: what kind of a commitment does this management person have to the Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan taxpayers if, after 18 months in his job, he still maintains his home in Smithers, British Columbia, and travels back and forth at approximately \$500 a month at the taxpayers' expense?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I said I'd take notice. I'm unaware of it, and I ill report back here because I'm completely unaware of the situation.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Forest Products, and this concerns a senior management person, and we're going to D.B. Loyd, who was the general manager of forest products for a period after March of 1983.

Can the minister inform the Assembly when Mr. Loyd ceased to be the general manager of Saskatchewan Forest Products, and the circumstances surrounding his departure?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the circumstance around his departure was that it . . . he was only a consultant brought in on a temporary basis. And I stand to be corrected, but it was in November of '84 some time that he was no longer with the company.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm, as the documents which I have here suggest, that you were paying Mr. Loyd \$10,000 a month in addition to travel and other expenses during the time which he served as general manager of the forest products corporation?

Can you explain how \$120,000 a year in basic salary, plus many thousands in additional expenses as the documents indicate, were justified by a corporation which loses \$4.5 or \$5 million a year?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, in regards . . . Mr. Speaker, in regards to how much he was paid, I believe the amount is correct. He was paid approximately \$2,500 a week plus incurred expenses. He was brought in as a consulting person to do some reorganization within Sask Forest Products. All companies in the country, Mr. Speaker, lost money in the last few years, so I think that would be an unfair statement to make, that because he was there, they lost money.

I went back, Mr. Speaker, and looked over since the corporation was in effect in 1974, and has lost money basically every year except for the time when money was put into the company. So, Mr. Speaker, in answer to question, yes, he had \$2,500 a week plus expenses, and yes, he was brought in as a consultant.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you indicate that he got \$2,500 a week thereabout, plus expenses.

I have photocopies of monthly expense accounts submitted by a Mr. Loyd in 1984, many months after he had taken up his work at this \$120,000 a year or more. The documents indicate that the taxpayers were paying not only this \$120,000 a year, but his rent, his grocery bill, his cable and television payments, his laundry bills, his home telephone bills, his gas for his personal vehicle.

Can you explain why someone who is getting more than \$120,000 a year in base payment would also need to have the taxpayers paying his grocery bills, his laundry bills, his cable television payments, and gas for his personal vehicle?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm unaware of what the expenses were. I've never saw those reports that they even have.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Give the minister an opportunity to answer.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — In regards, Mr. Speaker, to his personal expenses, his car I'm sure was a company car they're referring to. He didn't have a personal car, to the best of my knowledge.

In regards to those other expenses, I don't know. I wasn't there. I don't have the internal workings as some of the members seem to have over there.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you, or the board of which you are a member, made the arrangement whereby you would pay this man more than \$120,000 a year, plus personal expenses. Are you not aware of the nature of the personal expenses which he was entitled to charge against you, and in the face of the losses of Saskatchewan Forest Products, and in the face of the fact that your government does not have money for a great number of other things, how can you justify paying not only \$120,000 a year, but all expenses down to grocery bills and cable television services, when your corporation is losing money and your government does not have money for essential services?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, remember he was a consultant brought in on a short-term basis.

Second of all is that in regards to the expenses — I'm unaware of them so, you know, and I don't . . . Mr. Speaker, I don't go and pull every management that's in there, every file, to see what their expenses are. I figure that's at management level, and that should be recognized and left at that level.

I could pull — I suppose I'd have the right as a minister to go in and look at them all. There is 450 employees work over there. Would I go down to the union employees and pull all their records and ask what they did, where they went to, or whatever? I don't think that's right, Mr. Speaker. I didn't do it with management; I didn't do it with anybody else there; nor do I intend to.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Supplementary to the minister. I have here a statement of grocery bills that Mr. Loyd was submitting to the government, and in fact the taxpayers paid for. But the grocery list includes mile and cheese and green onions and groceries and celery stalks and regular cucumbers and grapefruit and oranges and Mac apples and green peppers — paid for by the taxpayers of the province for someone earning over \$12,000 a year.

And what I would ask you, Mr. Minister, is: do you think it is appropriate that at a time when the Northerners in Saskatchewan are being asked to pay 100 per cent more for their vegetables and

June 18, 1985

---

produce, that you would take away that subsidy and pay someone who is earning over \$12,000 a year their grocery bill? Do you think that's fair?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I said I'd take notice of the question and get back. I don't have the information. If the hon. member would table the information so I could see it, would probably be of some assistance.

So I'll take notice and report . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For someone that's making \$25,000 a week and leaves his . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 2,500 a week, and leaves his family in B.C. Do you think it's fair to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for him to submit a bill for his wife on march 23rd, P.A.-Saskatoon, P.A.-Vancouver, Mrs. Loyd, air travel. Do you think that that is a fair submission of a bill? And then on the next sheet he submits a bill: moved to Emma Lake, so much money; rent, Emma Lake, \$400.

You know, the dates from April 14th, 15th, and 16th and 17th, and then on the 19th he goes back to Prince Albert, Saskatoon, and to Vancouver, \$218, air travel.

Do you feel that when somebody makes \$125,000 a year, we should be paying air expenses for his wife to come and see him and then rent a cabin at Emma Lake for \$400 a month, and travel and fly back and forth monthly to Vancouver?

And not a dollar for grasshopper spray for farmers when they want to spray their grasshoppers.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I said I'd take notice . . . If the member will table that . . . he's got the information. if he'd table it, I don't have that kind of information. I've never had it. so if he wants to table it I'll check it out and report back.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the Assembly to move that we stand private members' business.

Leave granted.

### **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

#### **Extension of House Hours**

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by my seat mate, the hon. member from Kindersley, that:

Notwithstanding rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Wednesday, June 19, 1985, and each sitting day thereafter, sit from 10 o'clock a.m. to 12 noon; from 2 o'clock p.m. to 5 p.m.; and 7 o'clock to 10 p.m.

Motion agreed to

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**



**Bill No. 86 — An Act respecting Mental Health Services**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his officials.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I would be pleased to, Mr. Chairman. Seated to my left here is John Elias, the associate executive director of the psych services branch. Directly behind me is Michael Littlewood, administrative co-ordinator in the Department of Health, and behind John is Gerald Tegart, solicitor for the Department of Health.

**Clause 1**

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, I have one little question on the naming of the Bill. You will know that there have been lobby groups who had proposed to you various names for the Bill.

This is not a major issue, and I'm not going to be making a long speech about it, but you will know that some of the groups here in Regina had asked you and had expressed a preference for the naming the Bill of psychiatric services Act.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can tell us why and the rationale behind the choosing of the name for the Bill. And I say again, it's not a big point, but I would like to ask you how you came about naming the Bill in light of the fact that some groups, at least, were advocating a different name for it.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, basically, when I took over the portfolio of Health over three years ago, and became knowledgeable of all the various branches there, I thought that perhaps the naming of psychiatric services, perhaps, had a bit of a negative type of connotation to it.

Basically, there are people in this province who are physically ill, and there are people who suffer from mental illness, and that branch, basically, deals with those types of people. I think it is far more positive and reflects the direction that we want to go, to discuss mental health services — services to the people who are having mental health problems, rather than the connotation of psychiatric services, which to me, and people in my department, indicates more of a sickness, more of a negative type of attitude. So that would be the rationale behind it — to put the emphasis on mental health rather than psych services.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, under section 10 of the Bill, it basically says:

The minister shall appoint one or more official representatives for each region to assist patients in understanding their rights and obligations pursuant to this Act.

At this time, Mr. Minister, have you chosen people to . . . Do you have a list of people in each of the regions that you will be setting in place, and what process will you follow? For example: if there is a group in my constituency, or in Prince Albert, who have someone they want to submit to you, to recommend or to be chosen as the representative, how does the process work? And here, again, I'm asking more for information as opposed to criticizing the idea.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — We haven't made any selections at this point in time. We're in discussions with Saskatchewan Mental Health Association, and what we will be looking at is that various groups could submit names. We want people with some expertise, or some close association with the whole treatment of mental health, and in most likelihood we would ask for names that would be submitted to me, and on that point I would make an appointment, one for each region. But there's been no appointment to this point in time.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — And under the section 10 is there remuneration for the work that these people will do, and what schedule have you set up? Is it like being on the board of an independent commission, or what will the pay be? Will they get travel allowance and that sort of thing?

June 18, 1985

---

I think if you were trying to attract people to be a part of it, there are two things that are important. One, that the individual would represent some group, legitimate group in the province; and secondly, and I think as important, that not only are they independent, but are seen to be independent from the minister and from the department.

Because if what you are attempting to do here is set up a smoke-screen that will put a buffer between your self and the groups, and there is that concern out there as there always is when ministers appoint people to an operation like this to represent various regions, you will understand why people are concerned I the initial stages about conflicts and whether or not they will be on the side of the individuals, or whether, having been appointed by the minister who belongs to a political party (and you understand all those arguments), that these people not only are, in fact, independent, but appear to be independent. I would ask you to be very careful and prudent in your appointments because if what you're trying to do here is set up a political mechanism in this area, then I can assure you that it's going to backfire in the very near future.

And therefore I would ask you, and we will be watching closely and scrutinizing your appointments to see whether or not these people are independent from you in every sense of the word and from the department. Because in order to do a correct and a proper job, they cannot be part of your political operation, or part of the department, or seem to be. And I think that's just as important.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well there's no attempt to have a buffer group. We will be careful I the selection of these people. Certainly we haven't come up with the remuneration as of this point in time. I'm sure it will be in line with some of the other boards that we have, but I take your points. Certainly it is in no way . . . means to be a buffer group. Certainly the various groups will submit names from which I will make a selection.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister — and here again I'm asking this on behalf of a group who have contacted me since the Bill has been tabled. It has to do with what they refer to as a psych will. This would be a statement that while a patient is in remission that — could be signed by treatment, various things that, while they are not be able to carry out what they refer to a psych will that would list out the things that a medical person or the people who are in your department cold be restrained from doing them. And I use the one example of shock treatment.

Is there any thought or attempt to look into this area, and possibly in the near future, to amend some section of this Bill to deal with that issue. Here I would like your opinion and the opinion of the department, as opposed to any kind of harangue on the issue, because it's not that kind of topic. But I would like you to explain whether any consultation has gone on with psych groups and whether there's consideration of that kind of an issue.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — In answer to your question to the member, no, we haven't included anything of a psychic will or living will as you indicated. What is provided for in the Act is that person himself can indicate the type of treatment. I think your question was: what if the person was so incapacitated they couldn't? The person can also have a member of the family give the permission for the treatment, and if that wouldn't take place, the person can appeal to the courts, and the courts will set an independent person.

(1445)

And you are speaking, I think, directing as an example, electroconvulsive therapy, and I would refer you to section 25, (4) of the printed Bill in which it states . . . and this has to do with shock treatment:

No physician or other person shall administer any treatment that is designated pursuant to clause 43(g) to any involuntary patient, except in accordance with special procedures prescribed for that treatment.

And we will be laying out those regulations. Basically, I think it's a second opinion that's pretty well required, a second medical opinion. And then, as I've gone through the situation, that the person himself can refuse, or he can have his next of kin, if that be the case, or someone appointed by the courts.

But to get back to your answer to a medical will or a psychic will, as you use that terminology, we haven't included that. My officials tell me that the only place they know of anything of that nature is in the United States. They don't know of that situation existing in Canada at this time.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I think you're accurate in that, but it is new ground that I think any progressive health department should be looking at, and it's only in the area of mental health, but, you will know, in the area of elderly people, for example, who, while they may be at 80, can still understand, and many of them are in excellent health at that age, but worry about and are concerned about at the time they're 85 and in a nursing home, certain life support systems and all of the arguments that go on.

But in this Bill, particular . . . I wanted to raise it. Possibly it's something that the department hasn't spent much time thinking about or dealing with, but I would urge you at least to continue reviewing the matter to see whether or not there is something that could be done, or should be done.

I'm not laying out any ground rules for how it should, or could, happen. But I think it's an area we should investigate, and possibly sending to those jurisdictions in the United States where they have legislation, seeing how it's working, and looking at it for some future day.

The other thing that I want to raise with you is in section 11, 12, 13. Basically we're dealing with what is covered and what kind of treatment that will be covered. What I would like to ask you here is whether or not you think, or whether or not, in fact, visits to clinical psychologists will be covered under these sections — the cost of — for individual patients.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — On your suggestion, I see some merit in that, and we would certainly be taking that under consideration, your last suggestion.

As far as clinical psychologists, if they are part of the department, certainly those services would be provided. And the same with psychiatrists, whoever, would be part of the psych services branch, as it is called yet, of the department would be covered.

If you're talking about private sector clinical psychologists, no, they wouldn't be. Psychiatrists would be, but what would be under MCIC. So I'm not sure whether you mean private sector clinical psychologists or a clinical psychologist within the department. If it's within the department, certainly those services will be provided.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I'll leave it at that, but I only close that section by saying that I would urge you that in all cases that those visits would, and should, be covered.

The one other topic I would like to bring up is under section 26. Under section 26, Mr. Minister:

A patient who desires to have a person other than his nearest relative authorized to consent on his behalf pursuant to subsection 25(1) may apply to a judge for an order appointing another person to act instead of the nearest relative for the purposes of that subsection.

I would just like to say that I'm pleased that the recommendation which I believe was put forward by a group here in the province, By Ourselves, which is a group of self-help individuals, that you took this into consideration and, I think, recognized the fact that not in all cases is the nearest relative the best person to make these decisions. And here we have by getting, applying to a judge, they can appoint another individual, and in many cases this is perfectly appropriate.

And I would just like to express on behalf of By Ourselves, that they recognize and are pleased with the fact that this is, in fact, in the Bill — more of a statement than a question.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, I could reply to that by saying that as I think when I give second reading on the Bill, that this Bill has been in the works for approximately 10 years. There's been a lot of discussion. And within the last six months, of course, when we get closer to the finalized version, Mr. Chairman, of the Bill, my officials have had a great deal of consultation with a number of groups, By Ourselves, being one of those groups.

And I'm very pleased to hear that they feel that they've had some input, that one of their recommendations is part and parcel of this Bill, because in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that's the way good legislation is brought about after a lot of consultation with the various interest groups affected. So I'm pleased to hear that.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, on section 38, basically this is confidentiality of records, and it says that all records maintained by a facility are the property of that facility. Mr. Minister, you will know that the workers' compensation legislation is presently being changed so that workers can, in fact, see their files. And in a number of areas within the jurisdiction of government and the whole push towards freedom of information we are moving in a different direction than what section 38 is indicating here.

And I wonder if you could explain why that move, and why individuals would not have access to their files. And possibly here it's that there is some reason. But I can't think of a good reason why you're moving in that direction. And maybe you could elaborate on that.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, in answer to your question, there may be situations . . . I don't think we can really equate — and I don't think you're meaning to do that, but I use it as an example — to equate situations under the workmen's compensation treatment and perhaps the mental health services Act.

I think there may be situations where release of the information could be detrimental to the patient, and certainly there are a couple of avenues that we can explore on this topic. We haven't written the regulations yet. There may be changes in the regulations that could facilitate this in some situations. But I'd like to refer you to section 43(i) which says:

without limiting the generally . . . respecting applications to a judge for orders for the release of information obtained pursuant to the Act;

So if there was a situation when someone really demanded that information, they could go through a judge and have that information released. But my best advice from officials who are working in the department is that they think for just a complete dispersal of this information it may be more detrimental than beneficial in some cases.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Yes, here again, Mr. Minister, I think that what the groups are not asking for is the dispersal of the information, but if they could go and review the file with some appropriate person, and it wouldn't be as you . . . I think you're suggesting that it would be sent out holus-bolus to whoever wanted it. What they're asking for is that they would . . . if they would be able to go in and review all the relevant documents. I think that's what they're asking for, and there may be reasons why that shouldn't happen.

But I would always lean towards the side of being more open, and err on the side of openness if I were in government, as opposed to on the side of being secretive, because I think sometimes governments get into the rut of worrying about every document and every statement, and then eventually they have a way of turning up anyway.

And I would lean to the other way, but I'm not going to make a big point of it. I would just say that under this section 38, I think when it's happening in other areas in government, and I look at workers' compensation where those records are now being opened up to individuals, I can't see why you aren't moving in that direction.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well certainly we're moving, I think this Bill moves a long way in that direction to more openness. I don't dispute that. There was no, and perhaps . . . there was no intent on my part to say that we were putting out holus-bolus. That is certainly not the case, but I think the member is well aware that once information is released that it has a way of spreading, and that type of thing could be detrimental.

Remember, were dealing with people who have had psychiatric problems and psychiatric treatment. I'm not trying to conceal anything, but on the other hand I don't want to bring into play a situation where people, because of some information that is very, very personal to their treatment would be scattered around the country, which would have a very detrimental effect upon that person and could perhaps bring them back into a period of institutionalization and treatment, where not having that our public may certainly help them on the main road to recovery and a normal life.

**MR. YOUNG:** — Mr. Minister, one of my constituents who is a professional in this area has some concerns with respect to experimental treatment. As I understand it, this sort of treatment in the past only came about when the conventional forms of treatment had failed on a patient. And our Act now, as I understand it, would differ from the present Ontario Act which allows some form of experimental treatment and, as I say, in practice I understand it's only conducted when conventional forms have failed.

I see section 43, the regulations portion of the Act, says in paragraph (g) that regulations can be made:

designating special treatments which are not to be administered to involuntary patients except in accordance with certain procedures, and prescribing those procedures.

I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, firstly why it is that our Act is different from the Ontario legislation, and if your officials have any idea of the special treatments right now that are probably envisaged by section 43 sub (g).

(1500)

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Basically, the only types of treatment that we're dealing with, or basic ones in the Act, are electroconvulsive therapy and aversive therapy, and the conditions under which those would be applied will be set out in the regulations.

You make some mention of experimental treatment. Certainly, there isn't a limitation to experimental treatment, but there are some safeguards for the person, so that it cannot be conducted against their will. There's more requirements for a second opinion — professional opinion — which I think is a safeguard of the rights of that person who's in that institution, and, as I say, experimental treatment can take place, but not against the will of the person that would be receiving it.

**MR. YOUNG:** — The section that was brought to my attention was section 30(3), and that deals

June 18, 1985

---

with a involuntary patient who has been — who leaves the patient facility without having been discharged and remains absent from the facility for a period of more than 21 days.

As I understand that section, Mr. Minister, the person will be out in the community or wherever he goes from the facility, and yet would be deemed to be not discharged. Now, if that patient were to come back in a period of 10 or 15 days, shall we say, at that time possibly there wouldn't be any bed facilities or nay facilities in the institution for him.

I am wondering if you department has considered at all the possibility of having the section read to the effect that the certificate of mental illness will continue in effect as if those days that he has escaped or whatever you would call it — had left the facility without being discharged — did they not exist, since, of course, he's leaving the facility and presumably not under treatment, and they would, only after the completion of his 21 days, would the certificate lapse.

I see a possible — I'm sure it wouldn't be very frequent, Mr. Minister — I see a possible problem with the door being closed behind him if he's away for 10 days and no place left to bring this person back to because of admittance of other patients, maybe, in the interim.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well certainly, in regards to the practicality, the practical aspects of your question, out of bed, there may well be in that existing institution that there mightn't be a bed, but we would have the person put somewhere else. We feel very confident that we could have a bed in another psych ward or something like this until . . . We feel confident we can provide for that.

As far as the certificate, we feel that would probably be morally wrong. We would have ways, again, of readmitting this person as they're set out in the Act. If his behaviour is peculiar, or things of this nature, they certainly he can be brought in.

But I think your . . . As I understood your question, your major concern was if someone got out and then you found him, and she's all plugged up and you don't have a bed for him, we have various places around the province that we could place a person, and then some time maybe transfer them back to where they were originally getting the treatment. We don't feel that a problem.

**MR. YOUNG:** — Obviously, Mr. Minister, my question sprung from the overview of my constituent that you would have difficulty trying to find a space for this person, and that the whole thing would be a procedural snarl because of that, and you'd have to go out and readmit this guy again with two doctors, and on and on, and cause yourselves a lot of grief as a result of the wording of this section.

But if you feel, and your officials feel, that you can find a place for these sorts of circumstances, then certainly that would be satisfactory. That's all my questions.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — A word of explanation is that my officials say that this provision has been there always, except now it's changed from 60 days to 21 days. That's the major change.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 9**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's a proposed House amendment moved by the Minister of Health to section 9 of the printed Bill:

Strike out section 9 of the printed Bill and substitute the following:

9 The minister shall designate a psychiatrist for each mental health centre, psychiatric ward, and mental health clinic to be responsible for clinical services in the facility.

Clause 9 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 14**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's a proposed House amendment moved by the Minister of Health:

Amend clause 14(b) of the printed Bill by striking out "20" in the second line and substituting "19".

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

Clause 15 agreed to.

#### **Clause 16**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's a proposed House amendment moved by the Minister of Health:

Amend subsection 16(2) of the printed Bill by striking out "20" in the second line.

Clause 16 as amended to.

Clauses 17 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 22**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's a proposed House amendment moved by the Minister of Health:

Amend section 22(7) of the printed Bill by striking out "except that he shall not be discharged without approval of the court" in the last three lines.

Clause 22 as amended agreed to.

#### **Clause 23**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's a proposed House amendment moved by the Minister of Health:

Amend clause 23(b) of the printed Bill by striking out "Chairman of the Penitentiary Commission" in the first and second lines and substituting "Commissioner of the Correctional Services of Canada."

Clause 23 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 42 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 43**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There's a proposed House amendment moved by the Minister of Health:

Amend clause 43(1) of the printed bill by:

striking out “clause 1” on the first line and substituting “clause h.”

Clause 43 amended agreed to.

Clauses 44 to 47 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I’d like to thank the minister and his officials.

**Bill No. 113 — An Act respecting Facilities that Provide Certain Residential Services**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his officials.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Beside me, deputy minister, Mr. Hnatiuk, and head of our — what’s that branch? — rehab services branch, Mr. Baxter.

**Clause 1**

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — A couple of short questions to the minister. First of all, I would like to ask you whether or not this covers the approved homes as defined in the Mental Health Act that we were just working on with the Minister of Health. I’m not clear on that — whether or not it covers those homes.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Yes.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — The minister . . . I would like to know which homes, then, are excluded. Are there any group of approved homes that will be excluded from the regulations and from . . . or the Act and regulations that will subsequently flow from the Act? Are there any homes in the province that will be excluded?

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — No group of approved homes is excluded.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — The minister will know, as well, that I mentioned last day that we were somewhat disappointed that the act is not very specific and leaves a great deal up to regulations. And this has been brought to our attention by, oh, a number of groups and people who are elected officials at the city level who are concerned about the lack of what is written in the Bill, and what is being left, basically, to the discretion of the minister and cabinet.

I just want to go on record as putting that to the minister and ask him why he wouldn’t have been more specific and write more into the Bill, as opposed to leaving it up to the closed doors, behind the closed doors of cabinet meeting.

(1515)

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — I just might say to the member that this particular legislation is essentially enabling legislation to clear up some difficulties that were there in previous legislation. We are looking to strike an appropriate balance between what government should be concerned about, and what individuals should have the freedom to choose for themselves. In addition, we haven’t had any significant representation over the past few years since I’ve been minister, with regards to the kinds of things that the member opposite was suggesting.

But to reiterate, it’s basically an enabling piece of legislation to more clearly define the legislative mandate for the Department of Social Services.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, I’m not going to spend a great deal of time on this Bill



today, because I think, as I mentioned earlier, it's a step in the right direction. I'm not quarrelling with you on that, but I think that it does not go far enough in defining many of the areas.

And I would like to express concern, as well, about section 19. Section 19 says:

The minister may, where he considers it to be in the public interest, exempt any residential service facility or private service home, in whole or part, from the operation of any provision of this Act or the regulations.

Now having written the Act, you then go onto say, however, that I, the minister, the member for Rosemont, can forego any of the regulations or any provisions in the Act, and there will be those, not only in the public but also within your caucus, who will say that here again is the Minister of Social Services going way beyond the powers that a minister should have.

And in section 19 you say that:

The minister may, where he considers it to be in the public interest, exempt any residential service, facility or private service home, in whole or part, from the operation of the Act or regulation.

So you write an Act; you go through the process of telling people you're going to write an Act to protect the residents of these homes. Then in section 19, buried in the back of the Bill, you say: However, I, the minister, have the power, regardless and beyond cabinet, to exclude any section of this Act or regulation. And I wonder why you see it necessary to put section 19 in, and I would wonder whether or not you shouldn't be taking that section out.

And I say again that not only, I'm sure, are the public concerned about it but I'm sure that if the members of your caucus have read the Bill, there would be a number of them who would express concern about it, because it gives the ultimate power to the minister to forgo any section of the Act or regulations that you will be in writing in the future. And I would just like you to explain why section 19.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — I notice the member is leaving who asked the question. Were there other issues that you wanted to be dealt with?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — The member was called away. I will either convey the item to him, or we can await his return, and I'm not sure how long he'll be away. I had one question only with respect to this, and I suspect I'm not the only one.

I'm sometimes confused about how many levels or grades of licensed accommodation we have for people who might be said to be in nursing homes, using the term very broadly. And we clearly have the levels 1, 2, and 3 and 4 facilities which are operated by non-profit organizations, what we ordinarily call special care homes, and then we have . . . and some of those, or most of them are publicly operated, and some are privately operated — the Extendicares and the like. Then we have approved homes and those under The Mental Health Act. Then we have a group of homes — a group of facilities, at least I'll call them — that this Act I suspect is aimed at. And I will ask a question.

Is there a limit to the number of beds that a facility dealt with by this Act could have? And does this Act deal with . . . Is there a minimum number and a maximum number? Thus are we talking about, is there registration for people who have, let us say three or less patients, and does this go from three to 15 or five to 15? Or are there no bed limits with respect to this type of registration?

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Just in response to the member's question, the Act is just referring to facilities that provide residential services for clients of the Department of Social Services, and we have the two categories: the private service home which would be five beds or less, and the

June 18, 1985

---

residential services facility which would be 10 beds or less . . . just clients of the Department of Social Services.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — With respect to homes that operate with under 15 beds, I think, who are not offering services of Social Services, are they supervised by your department, or are they supervised municipality, or both?

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — They could be a special home supervised by Health, or could they could be, they would come under the jurisdiction of the municipality and their by-laws.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 26 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

### **Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act**

#### **Clause 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I can ask a few questions as we move along. But with respect to this Bill, would the minister care to comment, in just broad terms, on what's in it? I note there are provisions with respect to repealing so-called discrimination with respect to age. And then there's section 10, which is kind of the guts of the Bill, and we'll get to that.

There are some other provisions which I regard as relatively minor, dealing with whether or not changing times of election and allowing people to make regular use of reciprocal arrangements. Is there any other major part of the Bill that the minister . . . any other part of the Bill which the minister thinks is particularly important?

(1530)

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, basically and very briefly addressing first of all repealing of the discrimination clause, it deals pretty well with the charter of rights issues. There's a clause that deals with the expansion of salary definitions. We are including the reciprocal arrangements now to deal with the private sector; in other words, reciprocal arrangements with private firms and private insurance companies.

You indicated indexing, I suppose you might say one form . . . a form of indexing. I could elaborate a little bit on that in the sense that this is now going to be taken away from having to bring it back to the legislature once a year, and to provide an increase in the pension plans to the superannuates with an order in council decided by cabinet, based on whatever the cost of living is for that year. And that particular clause would include up to 100 per cent.

In addition to that, in course in the Bill we have the one-time adjustment which hasn't been made for a number of years, and it brings them up to a more realistic increase under the pension plan for the superannuates, that perhaps has been dragging and been lagging behind for some time. And finally, it also includes the establishing of an annuity fund for the PESP so that it would be paid from a fund now, rather than from the general fund.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to that last comment, is that the one covered by section 13 and 14 of the Bill, as I didn't fully understand that and I'll ask when we come to it.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, the section 11 is the section that defines it, and

section 14 is the section that establishes it.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Clause 10**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to clause 10, which provides for two things: provides for the one-time adjustment and then provides for the Lieutenant Governor in Council having power to make ongoing adjustments — annual adjustment, perhaps, that's the better way to phrase it — I want to direct my attention to subsection (3), that's the annual adjustments. I'm not sure I understand it. It says the Lieutenant Governor in Council May in 1985, and in each subsequent year, increase the superannuation allowances by a proportion equal less than the consumer price index. That raises a number of questions in my mind.

First, with respect to 1985, this will authorize an increase in 1985. Has any increase been agreed to for 1985?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If, by the question from the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, does he mean that we made the decision, had we taken it to cabinet, and has it been passed by OC, the answer to that question is no. It is going to be done so at the next cabinet meeting.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, is the minister in a position to give any statement of policy with respect to the government's policy on increasing pensions to superannuates for this year, 1985 — that is from April 1, '85 to March 31, '86 — and if you are, I know superannuates would be glad to hear it; if you aren't, I'd understand.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, to the question posed, I think the member opposite knows full well that I can't divulge that information. I am aware of it, but I can't divulge it until such time as it's taken to cabinet. I think you can understand and appreciate that my duty would be to take it to cabinet first and then announce it after that point.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm not arguing with that. These things can be done in two ways. They can be agreed to by cabinet and then the order in council come a couple of weeks later, and there's a quarrel then with the minister announcing cabinet policy. But if the policy isn't firm until the OC goes through, then what you're proposing is understandable and I'm not going to raise it any more. Presumably we'll hear about it in due course.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, that's correct. And as I say, the decisions that we have made, that I have made, is made. It has to be taken to cabinet. I will tell you though that it will be retroactive to April 1st, as was the standard, and it has been for some time. And until such time as I have signed the OC and it has gone through, the . . .

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I want to raise another issue with respect to this, and that is whether or not you feel that this Act gives you only the power to raise superannuation allowances by a given percentage, thus whether you have the power only to raise all superannuation allowances by 3 per cent — I'll pick a figure out of the air — or whether it gives you power to use 3 per cent of the total superannuation allowances paid and distribute it differently. Thus \$12 per year per year plus 1 per cent, or something like that — some mixed formula.

And you will know, Mr. Minister, that percentage increases have not been the norm. The norm has been at least . . . the norm, I guess to say, would be X dollars per year per year, and

occasionally mixed up with a percentage. And this looked to me to confine you to straight percentage, but maybe not. And that's what I'm asking. Do you think that this confines you to increasing all pensions by a given percentage, or do you think you could still bring in, by OC, \$10 per year per year plus 1 per cent, or something like that?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — My officials tell me, Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, that the wording does not limit us to the percentage. In other words, it could be a percentage of the total amount, and then taken in amounts.

However, having said that, I want to inform you as well that it is my intention to increase on a percentage basis in the future. And the reason I say that is, I want to get away from the kinds of compression that's taken place over the past few years, when you give an allowance to every pensioner.

And it's something that the superannuates have asked for. That is something that the superannuates asked your government for. And I happen to agree with that, that the flat amount based on a percentage that's taken of the total and then broken down to a flat amount for all superannuates equally, is unfair and creates a compression. There is, therefore . . . My intention is to increase it on a percentage basis, based on the pension allowance, or the pension amount.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I don't want to get into a long argument over this, but I basically don't agree with the minister that a straight percentage is the way to go. I think a mixture is better, and the reasons, I think, are clear. If it's a cost of living allowance and someone is getting a pension of \$20,000 a year and someone is getting a pension of \$8,000 a year, the cost of living does not go up 10 per cent for the \$8,000-a-year person and 10 per cent gross for the \$20,000-a-year person.

If the groceries go up, they go up the same number of dollars. And I admit and I concede the validity of your argument that people adjust their standard of living, and to some extent, if someone is spending \$20,000 a year and the consumer price index goes up, then to some extent they have to adjust their standard of living. But I think that a mix is the best way to deal with our current situation, although admittedly the situation changes.

Short years ago, the Government of Saskatchewan had people on some pretty low pensions, people who retired in the '50s and '60s, and I well remember when there was a ceiling of \$3,000 on the amount that any pension could be, even to the general manager of Sask Tel. And I remember that particular incident. And that is 30 years ago, when some people lived 30 years after they superannuate. A great deal of adjusting had to be done; a great deal of building up the bottom.

Now much of that has been done over the years, and accordingly we don't have nearly the number of people on very low pensions that was previously the case because of all of those minimum amounts built in. We had a time when your argument has more validity, but I still don't believe that straight across the board, percentage increases in the fairest way to go. I think we should have a flat dollar increase, plus per cents. We don't need to argue that here under this Bill.

The question I ask you is: would your Bill allow that? Your answer was yes, and that satisfies me, and I have no further questions on this clause.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman . . . and I don't want to get into a debate because, as the hon. member has indicated, we probably agree to disagree on it. But I just want to point out for your information as well so that you're not misled on this, and that is that there is a flat adjustment being made this year to allow for what you're talking about. Now philosophically, if you like, I don't agree with you.

When I look at a person that we'll say, earning \$500 and received \$100 increase over a number of years, the person that was 1,500 received the same \$100 — you're looking 6.5 per cent over here; you're looking at 20 per cent over here. Now I don't think it's fair to be the person who earned the right to the higher pension to now subsidize on that basis. Now I know you can't have everything absolutely just, but this is where I'm saying that it doesn't limit us to that. As you've agreed, you will be allowed . . . the Bill allows for the other mix-ups. If it should happen, I won't be doing it that way.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12 agreed to.

### **Clause 13**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'll take 13 and 14 together. Do I understand that this means that you can transfer out credits to private sector insurance companies and the like? You make this deal so that the terminated employee can switch out his vested credits to any locked-in registered retirement vehicle, and that this could be . . . if someone worked for the Government of Saskatchewan and leaves, and has some vested credits, and goes to work for Ajax Widgets, and Ajax Widgets has a locked-in plan, he could move his money over to the Ajax Widgets plan.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, the answer to your question is yes, subject to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . these are my guys — subject to the terms and conditions being the same on the other side. In other words, as you transfer the pension fund to the private sector company or insurance, terms and conditions must be acceptable to our plan.

Employers . . . From an employee point of view, they're quite pleased because it is portable. And from an employer's point of view, I think is ideal as well, because it eliminates or removes dead files from our files.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

## **Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act**

### **Clause 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I am interested in the vehicles to which this Bill applies.

I want to be as clear as I can on it: “. . . any vehicle or snowmobile for which a certificate of registration may be issued . . .” And that will cover any trailer of any kind except the boat trailers; any motor home, any mobile home, because certainly a certificate of registration may be issued for a mobile home, as well as snowmobiles which are specifically covered, all-terrain vehicles. Will the minister concede second-hand mobile homes are now subject to this tax?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do you say that a mobile home is a vehicle for which a certificate of registration may not be issued?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I think we should clarify for the hon. member . . . I don't know whether you know that what a mobile home is. There's a mobile home and there's a motor home. A motor home is one you drive and you license, and you register it, and everything else. A mobile home is a home you tow to a parking stall, or wherever you park it there, you don't need a registration for it. So, no, you're wrong.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm not asking whether you need one. I'm just saying whether one can be issued.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Why would you register, issue . . . why would you issue a registration for a . . . unless it's a permit for moving it from one point to the other. I mean a licence is used for operating on our highways and roads and so on, in the province. It isn't used for parking in a parking lot.

Now you're asking me: can you license a mobile home to tow around with you? I suppose if anyone was silly enough to try it, I guess so. But, you know, a mobile home's a fairly big unit, and it's moved from spot to spot and left there. I've never heard of a mobile home being used for towing behind a vehicle for the purpose of using it for pleasure or for other purposes. So I . . . You're raising, I suggest to you, you're raising a very hypothetical situation. I can't understand where . . . all right, if you want to explain something different to me, and I'm not following you, why would you want to do that in a mobile home?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, it doesn't matter whether I want to do it. Maybe I don't want to do it, but it isn't up to the owner. The issue is whether it's a vehicle, and the answer is yes, it's a vehicle, if a trailer is a vehicle. And then the next question is: could a registration be issued? Maybe I don't want a registration issued, but it says, “. . . a vehicle for which a certificate of registration may be issued.”

Well the answer is yes. Yes, a certificate of registration may be issued for a mobile home. And if it may be, even though I don't want it to be, then it's a vehicle under this Act, and it's caught by your Act.

It's not a case of whether it's got a plate. It's not a question of whether I want to have a plate. It's a question of whether legally I could get a plate. The answer is yes. It's caught by your Act, and you're going to tax second-hand mobile homes, or you're in a position to.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Okay, I am told . . . The way you asked the question to begin with, I said I suppose it's possible that that could happen. But I am told that in fact you cannot register a mobile home for travel on our highways. And if it ever happened, well you'd have to talk to the minister responsible for the Highway Traffic Board . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well if you want to correct me, stand up and do so.

But I'm telling you that at this point in time I don't believe that there are any regulations allowing for the licensing, other than the permanent moving, licensing of a mobile home for continuous use of or highways. I'm not aware of it, and I don't believe that that's the case.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Let me do a supplement to the minister. I used to live in one, and I didn't register mine. But I can name three fellows that did, that had eight by 45 or eight by 46 crew rigs that they lived in in the summer-time when they worked for me, when we went from one town to another installing sewer and water system.

And these fellows had licence plates on them. They were eight feet wide. They were 46, 48 feet long. In those days the longest you could go and still pull it behind my gravel truck would be 46 feet long, because the overall length at that time was 55 feet.

Those rigs were licensed. They put plates on them, and you could tow them around the country, and you lived in them all summer long during the construction season. That is still the case. There are still those vehicles around that they use.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I would suggest to the hon. member, yes, there are units that you pull behind a truck for work crews and so on, which are in fact considered mobile homes. But let's get technical about it if you want to do that, but consider probably campers or work units for work crews.

However, to get down to the technicalities, if that's what you want to do — and you're being a little bit picky about an issue — and I might suggest to you that that particular kind of a unit then can be licensed, providing it meets all the regulations as laid down by the Highway Traffic Board: brakes and lights and all of the other things that are needed. If you're going to use it on the highways, my friend, I suggest to you that you better check your regulations, and in fact that's exactly what you would have to do.

Then in which case . . . that being the case, and you're taking that particular time as an item to argue this Bill, then I would suggest to you that yes, meeting all of the regulations of the Highway Traffic Board, used for the purpose as you are suggesting, yes, it would be taxable.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — This is an absolutely remarkable argument. He says that if the vehicle doesn't meet all the regulations of the Highway Traffic Board, then it can't be registered, and then no tax will apply.

Well just keep saying that to the young people. They can soon take a couple of lights off a car; then you won't be able to register it. then, according to you, it's not a vehicle. Then they can sell it, and it won't be a vehicle. Then they put the lights back on when the new guy owns it, and we're in business, and we're in business. And it never was taxable, according to you. Now that is sheer nonsense, that is sheer nonsense, if it is the sort of vehicle which can be registered even though it has a defect. Even though the tail light isn't working, it will still be taxed.

And second-hand cars will be taxed even though they don't meet the Highway Traffic Board standards. It is very easy to make them not meet the standards, momentarily. And so indeed will campers, and so indeed will be bunk houses, and so indeed will be whatever you care to call eight by 46 trailers, which are moved about. And that's the point I wanted to emphasize.

You propose to tax campers which are sold second hand; bunk houses which are sold second hand; eight by 46, whatever you care to call them — I would have called them mobile homes but you care to call them something else — they are going to be taxed. And that's all I wanted to make, that point which you have apparently not been prepared to concede, but is certainly true.

And I just wanted to make that point that these vehicles are taxed along with the trucks and the trailers and the motor cycles and the snowmobiles and the rest.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No. The kind of statement that you are making now is the kind of irresponsibility that I've been seeing in this place for the last little while . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I will tell you.

The fact of the matter is I said from the beginning that the mobile homes are non taxable. And not only that. As you well know, the tax that is charged on new mobile homes is refundable. 50 per cent of which is refundable to the purchaser. And you know that as well.

(1600)

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You don't. Where have you been? Well, so what? It isn't included in this Bill. That's so what.

June 18, 1985

---

Now we're not talking about mobile homes as we know mobile homes. You started out with the term "mobile homes," and the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, trying to make a cheap political ploy or point, is suggesting that yes, these are mobile homes. I'm telling you they're not. I'm telling you they're not.

A mobile home is one thing. If you want to talk about bunk houses, you want to talk about trailers, you want to talk about other units that are registered and licensed and are taxable — and that's what I said. I won't appreciate any comments that I have said something different. I don't expect you to understand, first of all, what this is all about. But if you can't understand it, then you had a problem, and you can do whatever you like with it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the minister seems to be of the view that the vehicles are taxable which he says are taxable. The vehicles are taxable which the Bill says are taxable, and that's the point I want to make.

I am asking you, Mr. Minister: do you now concede that the Bill covers campers, bunk houses, 8 by 46 — whatever those vehicles are, and I won't call them mobile homes, if you like, another name . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . bunk house, all right, whatever you care to call them. But will you concede, Mr. Minister, that they are covered by the Bill and that the sale of those at second hand will attract tax?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I said yes to that some time ago. But I will not concede that the mobile homes are part of that Bill.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. We will have the completion of the answer from the minister, and then I believe the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg wishes to rise. If you have a supplement, I'll let you go . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just a second, the minister is going to finish his answer first. The minister.

Order. I had recognized the minister. Is the answer complete? All right.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, we're trying to get some answers. You speak to your colleague and get him to answer some questions, and we've got no problems.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you said you had a description of what was a vehicle. What I am asking is: in what sense is it a description? Is that what your staff are working with, or is it what your lawyers say a vehicle is?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I can give you two definitions. I can give you the legal definition, and I can give you what we consider to be a vehicle for taxation purposes put out on the bulletin that's been issued. And if you don't have a copy of it, I'd be happy to send it to you.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, I resent the remarks the minister made in saying that we were trying to do something mysterious with this Bill. Mr. Minister, you've moved this Bill 76, An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act, to get more money. Period. Your intent was to tax and get some money into the treasury. You decided to hit young people that buy used vehicles and tax them. You think there's too many young people that have jobs. I say that's not so.

You tax the people that can least afford to pay the tax. You decided to slap this additional tax on that's going to affect the farmers. I maintain it's going to cost the average farmer 375 to \$400 a year. And now you're taxing the people that have summer employment. You're taxing people that are using these . . . a place to live in. I call it a mobile home because it's mobile and they make their home in the summer time. And they'll move from one job to the other following the contractor



around, be it a gravel crusher, be it a road builder, be it a construction site of any kind. There's an awful lot of people in Saskatchewan living in them.

To make it convenient, they put the \$15 registration fee and a licence plate on it. They had insurance coverage. They could move it when they wanted to. Under your terms, they have to not put a licence on so they can sell it, so it'd be registered, not register the thing. Then they could sell it without paying the education tax.

And I think you have devised a means here where you can get everybody you can. You don't try and tax those people and raise funds from people that can afford to. You've set this Bill up in such a way so you can raise the next education tax, against the promises and against the commitments you and all your colleagues made that you're going to take off the education tax.

I think this tax hits the people that can least afford it, and they're going to thank you accordingly when your Premier gets up the nerve to call an election.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to be ugly, as you put it. But let me tell you something: that I'm in no damn mood to get into an argument on this one with you any more.

I'm going to tell the hon. member sitting over there, from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, that all of this Bill from one day has been nothing but cheap grandstanding and political plays on your part.

Now what you're living in is in the past. You're living in the past, and you think that we still have a class system in Canada. Let me tell you something. We don't have a class system. We haven't had a class system since the Regina Manifesto was written.

Now we have finally come out with a Bill that is equitable and fair. You say that every farmer is going to pay \$375 a year more. That means every farmer's going to buy a used truck every year. Now how stupid can you be? How ridiculous can you get?

Let me tell you how many farmers buy new trucks. And what you're saying now is that every farmer who buys a new truck should pay the whole load — your farmers and the farmers that belong to the rest of these members and yours — they should pay the whole shot. That's what you want. You want a class system. I'm not prepared to agree with you on a class system in this country.

Young people buy new vehicles. Farmers buy new vehicles. Small-business men buy new vehicles. Teachers buy new vehicles. Senior citizens buy new vehicles. All kinds of people buy new vehicles, and it's about time you understood what you have not understood since day one. All you want is to grandstand and pull off your cheap political plays with this one. Well I'm not buying it any more, and I've had it with you.

Now this Bill is fair. This Bill distributes and shares that tax load, and it's equitable. And if you want to live with the class system, if you want to be the member to stand up and promote the idea of only certain people paying taxes, then you do it, and I'll put in my next householder that I send out to my constituents and I'll make sure Assiniboia-Gravelbourg gets the same thing. You're not even thinking clearly when you're making statements like you're making.

This Bill is right. It identified what they involved and it's fair. And you can stand up and argue and scream and raise your voice all day long. But I'm not going to get into it with you any longer than that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister can stand up in this House and he can use all the

colourful language he pleases. He could even say it in French if he wants, as far as I'm concerned. But he should stand up in his riding and tell me it's fair to reduce the tax on somebody that can afford to buy a new vehicle, and slap the tax onto somebody that can't afford to buy a new one.

And, Mr. Minister, if you want to continue helping those that have, and taking it from those that haven't, that's great; that's great. You stand up and tell the people of Saskatchewan that that's fair. We're going to make it easier for the person that buys a new vehicle. We're going to cut his tax by two-thirds, and we're going to slap it all, every cent, on the person that can't afford a new vehicle and that's buying a used one. That's great.

In your books that's fair; in my books that's typical Tory fairness. That's typical Tory fairness. You're fair to the guy that's buying a new vehicle because he's saving two-thirds of his tax. And the guy that's buying a used vehicle is getting it in the ear. And that to you is Tory fairness.

Well I want to tell you it's not fair. I want to tell you that this Act to amend the education and hospital tax Act shows the true colour of a Conservative, shows the true colour of a Conservative fairness. Make it easier for those that can afford the new vehicles. Stick it to the person that's got to buy a used one. That's fair in your book? I'll buy it. it's not fair in mine.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I said that I wouldn't lower myself to his level any more today, and I won't. What I would like to explain, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to explain is what this tax is.

The tax imposed by this tax in reality is a consumption tax. It is a direct tax on the person who purchases or leases — or leases — articles or taxable services, something that existed long before we became the government. It is not a tax on the article itself, because it is a tax . . . but rather it is a tax imposed on the consumption of a person, with the price of the article being the yardstick for tax purposes. It's on the difference. It's on the difference, and the member keeps forgetting about who those low-income earners are that buy new cars, whether they're senior citizens, and whoever they might be. They're all people in Saskatchewan, not just certain classes of people.

It's a basic principle of all consumption taxes. In fact, it has always been reflected in our tax system. We tax leases; we tax rentals, every time the item is leased. And we tax used goods purchased outside the province for use in Saskatchewan, even though tax may have been paid to another province. And so does every other taxing province. That was there long before we became the government.

(1615)

This practice was followed by the previous administration, as I said. We've extended this principle, Mr. Chairman, to used vehicles, and have also allowed a deduction. It's something they forget. We've allowed for a deduction for vehicle trade-ins to more accurately reflect consumption. The purchaser of a vehicle should not be required to pay tax on the unconsumed portion of his vehicle, and a trade-in represents that unconsumed portion.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, under this Bill, if I buy a \$14,000 boat, do I pay the tax on the \$14,000? And if I trade it in, is it the difference or is it, with respect to boats, a tax on the total new price?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, the answer to your question is yes. I presume . . . You didn't say this, but I presume you're talking about a new boat. And that is quite accurate, and again, you consider the reason being of course the licensing of that boat is a federal jurisdiction and not a provincial one.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I just wondered why all those arguments which you gave me with respect to vehicles don't apply to boats. Every single argument

you gave about taxing only the difference presumably applies to boats. The only problem is enforcement. And you are giving us the philosophic argument it applies to boats or applies to other hard goods as well as it does to vehicles. You've just decided you're going to do it with vehicles and not with other merchandise.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I think as a matter of fact the hon. member has touched on a point that maybe he should clarify for himself. The fact of the matter is that a boat, whether it be a 14,000 or a \$40,000 boat, is really a luxury item. A vehicle is not. And if you don't agree with me on that principle or that point, then I'd like to hear that argument. Because we're looking at the necessities of life versus the luxury items.

And when we look at a boat . . . And I think you would agree. And I know the hon. member probably has a very expensive boat in his boat dock . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I don't own one either. But the fact is that I think there is definitely a distinction there.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Minister, you just finished making my argument. There is a difference between having a vehicle as an essential means of transportation, and then having a vehicle that then becomes a luxury item. And where would you distinguish that? Would you say a car that cost \$20,000 is a vehicle for transportation, and a car that's worth \$80,000 is a luxury item? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

That's not the case. You say that's not the case because the \$80,000 car isn't a luxury item; that is an essential. That's something we need to get around. So that person that's buying the fancy Mercedes, or the guy that buys the Rolls Royce that's worth \$120,000, isn't a luxury item.

And those are the people, the very argument I was trying to make with you. And thanks for the help, Mr. Minister, because you're not taxing the luxury items. Those are the people that are getting the break. Those are the people that are getting the break, and they are the ones that you are saying to, no, they don't have to pay their tax, they don't have to pay their tax. We're going to charge a tax on the guy that has a used vehicle. We're going to charge a tax on a guy that spends \$5,000 for a used vehicle, and I know your ministers don't like it. I know the Minister of Health is yapping away there, and the minister in charge of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Make that point first, Mr. Minister, and tell me which car is then a luxury item.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm indeed quite surprised to hear the hon. member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg indicate that there's some Rolls-Royces being sold every year in the province of Saskatchewan. I think there might be one or two in the province for the last 20 years. Secondly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it only was a good rebuttal, frankly. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, he also forgets that there are used 40, 50, \$60,000 vehicles being sold. And thirdly, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, he's coming right back again to the class system, and let him live with that.

**MR. ENGEL:** — The minister made the point that the boats are a luxury item and they're going to tax the entire boat. If it's a \$40,000 boat it's a luxury item, he taxes it. Why not, why not do the same thing for a luxury car? Have you the records in there how many cars over \$40,000 were sold in Saskatchewan last year? Do you have those records? How many?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, we don't, as a matter of fact. Nor do we have the number of 40, \$50,000 used vehicles that were sold last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'll tell you what we could do is the next time you want to argue this Bill or debate it, we could go and do it over at Revenue where all the records are kept. Now this is being a little . . . you're getting a little silly.

**MR. ENGEL:** — No. How much money are you losing on your revenue from this Bill by taking off the tax on the entire new vehicle? How much is it going to cost the treasury?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, the question he's asking, I'm not sure I follow what his reasoning is, but I can reiterate once again that the increase in taxes collected will be 7 million, approximately. We estimate 7 million. It was in the budget, of which, because of the total losses of used vehicles by SGI will be paying probably somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2 million, maybe even a little bit more than \$2 million of that \$7 million. But that's not your question because I'm not sure that I understood what you were asking.

**MR. ENGEL:** — My question is simply this: you must know, as Minister of Revenue how much revenue you receive from the sale of automobiles. I'm saying: how much less are you going to receive because you're only taxing the difference rather than the whole amount?

My car is worth roughly \$20,000 when it was new. If I trade it in, I'd probably pay eight difference after two years. I'll only be paying on eight instead of 20 if I trade after two years.

How much revenue are you losing in the sale of new cars?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information. And even if we had some estimate of it, it would be strictly an estimate. The new-car volume of business is available. I could get that information. the used-car volume of business is available. I look around this Chamber and I see members here that have bought 20, \$25,000 used vehicles. You indicated yourself you have a \$20,000 vehicle. I don't know whether it's a new one or a used one, you know.

If you want to get down to a computer print-out of what the values are and what the losses and gains are going to be, some other time.

**MR. ENGEL:** — I think that clearly indicates the kind of minister we have piloting this Bill through here. He is changing the revenue system. He is responsible for the administration of this Bill and doesn't have a clue of what it's going to cost this Assembly. I think it indicates that the minister is on his way out. Next time around he'll be sitting up there in the gallery looking in. And I think that's where he belongs because anybody that is changing the rules on taxes and has an estimate in place what that's going to cost the taxpayer, because if you're saying that the increased revenue, the increased revenue is going to be between 7 and \$9 million — that's what you said — if that increased revenue is there, then there are an awful lot of used cars being sold that are taxed to pick up the amount we're losing on not collecting the tax on new vehicles.

And the point I'm making, Mr. Minister, you know that answer but you're afraid to admit it. You don't want to admit publicly what you're saving those people and how much of a benefit you're giving to the people that have it to take it from the people that don't have it.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I know we will agree, Mr. Chairman, we'll agree to disagree. I can tell the hon. member that if I'm on my way out, he's not going to be on his way in over here. That's for sure.

The amount of money is . . . I didn't say between 7 and \$9 million. I said 7 million of which \$2 million will be paid for by SGI, so it would be another \$5 million, roughly, being paid for by the used-car buyers.

Again you keep coming back to the same rhetoric. As I say, we'll agree to disagree, and you can argue your point till you're blue in the face and it won't make any difference.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Minister, I had the occasion yesterday to visit La Ronge, Stanley Mission, and Beaver Lake. Incidentally, I was attending commemorative services for one of the oldest buildings in this province, the Holy Trinity Church in Stanley Mission.

But on this occasion I had an opportunity to talk to trappers, fishermen, wild rice growers, etc. After attending the ceremonies in Stanley Mission, I drove over to Creighton and Beaver Lake

and attended a formal fishermen's meeting there, and questions were raised about your Bill that's being reviewed at the moment, Mr. Minister.

I wonder if I may ask you — if the minister is listening — I wonder if I may ask you or your officials what kind of implications this Bill may have with regards to snowmobiles, with regards to outboard motors, with regards to wild rice harvesters, if any.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, and I know you had a concern of your constituents at heart, and I think you should really think about what you're looking at because if you really do you'll find that your constituents should be quite pleased about the fact that henceforth those of your people who buy, for example, ski-doo's . . . And I know you have a lot of people buying used ski-doo's. They trade in.

Now in the past those people that bought those new ski-doo's had to pay the tax on. If it was a \$2,000 ski-doo, he paid tax on \$2,000. It didn't matter what he trade in, right? So it cost him \$100.

Now, with this Bill, those same constituents of yours will now, let's say, trade in an old ski-doo, will trade it in, and if they get \$1,000 for the trade-in, and if they pay \$2,000 for the new one, the difference is \$1,000. Now all he has to pay is \$50.

So really, really I think you'll probably find that more of your constituents probably buy new rather than used, and it's to their advantage if you think about it. If you think about it, you'll find that it's to their advantage.

So I know that the member from Cumberland is, you know, is concerned about his constituents. I think if you analyze it properly you'll find, and if your colleague in front of you will keep quiet, you'll be able to hear me . . . then those constituents of yours should be, in fact, quite pleased about the fact that their tax bill will be reduced.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, you may be partially right to the extent that some of the fishermen and trappers and possibly or wild rice growers, as well, do in fact buy trade-in vehicles — snowmobiles, pardon me. You could be partially right that they could take advantage of what you just elaborated on in terms of paying tax or the difference.

(1630)

But not all trappers and fishermen can afford new vehicles, new snowmobiles, etc. And I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, I think I've got that . . . I think I understand now that you will be charging this extra tax on used snowmobiles which will be a costly little item for people that are on minimum income — very minimum income.

I want to ask you further, Mr. Minister, are we also including outboard motors? Are we also including wild rice harvesters? Are we also including snow bugs in this? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . snow bugs are a passenger type of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. No. Snow bugs are the passenger . . . The type of a machine I'm trying to describe here is the type of machine that has . . . a snow bug, pardon me, enough room there for about a dozen passengers.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Bombardier.

**MR. YEW:** — Bombardier.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The hon. member may not be aware of the fact that on the . . . I know it's difficult for you to hear, but maybe you could ask your colleagues to just tone it down a bit.

June 18, 1985

---

Wild rice harvesters are considered agricultural equipment, and therefore are non-taxable. They're non-taxable. Okay?

On boats and motors, there's no change on boats and motors from the previous policy. It's the same as it was. Okay?

On snowmobiles, I believe if they are a registered vehicle, and I think they are, then the same rules will apply to those as this Bill calls for. So you're talking about the Bombardier snowmobile unit, but I didn't know that they were still selling them new around . . . mostly on the used. But, yes, that's included.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

### **Clause 5**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can you tell us what clause 5 does?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, it removes the exemption that existed in the old Bill where used vehicles were exempt.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, Mr. Minister, all the arguments with respect to taxing, consumption, and trade-ins, and just the difference, and how it's so much fairer to tax the difference, apply only to vehicles. And you're saying that's the only thing applies for; everything else you're going to tax as you did before. And all those arguments which are presumably equally valid with respect to television sets and consumption thereof, you're simply not going to apply it to anything but vehicles.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No. that's absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. Again for the simple reason of registration.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I also would like to thank my officials.

### **THIRD READINGS**

#### **Bill No. 86 — An Act respecting Mental Health Services**

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I move the amendments be now read a first time and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I move, with leave, the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

#### **Bill No. 113 — An Act respecting Facilities that Provide Certain Residential Services**

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of this Bill, and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time on division.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, would you tell us how many employees of the Executive council are on a personal service contracts — and it's the same question I've asked previous years. I'm not talking about someone who comes in to fix a typewriter on a personal service contract, but a personal service contract which would cover half-time or more.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, we have five people on a personal service contract. Mik Barabas in the planning bureau; David Black in administration; Jane Krupski, administration; Lynn Jane, administration; don Richardson in the Saskatoon office.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, would you give the daily rate of each of those for me please, on the assumption that they have what was a standard form of contract with a daily rate?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I have the daily rate for four. The fifth, I'll give it on a month. Mik Barabas is \$300; David Black, \$176; Jane Krupski, \$110; Lynn Jane — Lynn Jane, I'm sorry, pardon me — \$100; and Don Richardson is \$3,740 per month.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to your senior staff, and I'll pick some names among them, could you tell me what their salary is as of May, 1985, let us say? And I will ask about: Larry martin, John McKenzie, Sean Quinlan, Norman Riddel, Garf Spetz, Dave Tkachuk. I will just take, so that your staff may have a little advance warning, Martin, McKenzie, Quinlan.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, if I can, I would like the monthly salary, if I can, because that's the way it was given on previous occasions.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Martin is 5, 431 — 5,531 monthly; John McKenzie is 3,584; Sean Quinlan is 4,584. And there's Spetz — was it Spetz? — is 5,431; and Riddel is 6,661; and Tkachuk is 5,431.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, with respect to all of your staff, and I will take . . . there's a long list. I'll ask a few more. That's perhaps simpler than my trying to categorize them.

I will ask the same question with respect to: Bachiu; Cascadden; Chamberlin; Crosthwaite; Dutton; Emery; Jackson, that is Michael Jackson; Jon Jonsson; Lampard; Letilley, if I pronounce the name correctly; McWhirter; Shorvoyce; Smith-Windsor; Dave Warren. That will cover the ground.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — There are three people that are no longer there. I'll start with those. Mr. Jon Jonsson is moved to Rural Development, assistant deputy minister. Mr. Smith-Windsor and Mr. Warren are no longer in my employment.

I will try to cover those that you mentioned: Larry Bachiu, 4507. I'm just going down in alphabetical order. Cascadden, 4507. Chamberlin, 3445. Crosthwaite, 4801. Dutton, 3435. Emery, 5222. Jackson — that is Michael Jackson — 4240. Lampard, 4801. Letilley, 4917.

I've given you Martin. I believe I've given you McKenzie. McWhirter is 3641. Quinlan you have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . McWhirter, 3641; Quinlan you have; Ron Shorvoyce, 4273.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, with respect to Mr. Smith-Windsor, what duties has he undertaken? Was it connected with Wascana Hospital? Do I recall that as being his duties?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — yes.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to Dave Warren, planning analyst, you tell me he's no longer in the employ of the Executive Council. To your knowledge, is he in the employ of the Government of Saskatchewan, or has he left the government service?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Warren is now with the Department of Health.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, with respect to the staff of your department, could you tell me the names of staff members who may have incurred entertainment expenses exceeding \$500 a year? Would you have that information available?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I don't have that information with me, and I'm advised that it would take perhaps a couple of hours to get that information. We'll be glad to provide it to you, but it's going to take a little bit of time to get it to you.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Very well. I merely want to ask a question byway of facilitating — if a \$600 figure is easier to cut or something like that — but if you have to go through them all, let's leave it at \$500. I'm not looking for trivial entertainment expenses, which I know many people have, but if they're running up substantial bills I think it is a matter of interest. I take your comment that we will have that information when you have an opportunity to do so.

With respect, Mr. Premier, to the trip of your employee, Mr. Dave Tkachuk, to England a few months ago, I the company of Mr. Spence Bozak of Dome and Mr. Terry Leier of the Crown Management Board, apparently to study the privatization of British Telecom or some related subject, do you have available the costs of that trip, those costs at least which were paid for by the Government of Saskatchewan?



**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the government has not paid for the expenditures. We haven't received invoices from the individuals. When we do we'll be able to provide the information.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, does that apply also to Mr. Tkachuk's trip to meet with the member of the staff of the Republican National Committee, Mr. John Zagame? And firstly, you have received an invoice for that trip, and do you expect that the Government of Saskatchewan will likely receive an invoice for the consultation with the Republican Party?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — In the case of the travel of Mr. Tkachuk to Ottawa and Washington, yes the bill has been paid, and it was \$3,888.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — With respect to the Washington part of that, do you agree that the purpose of the trip was to consult with the officials of the Republican Party and not with any officials of the Government of the United States?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — No, sir. I would suggest that if I am going to be doing some lobbying with our American counterparts, it's a good idea to know who to lobby and who is the most influential senator or congressman or whatever, in the United States. And given the fact that a large number of them are Republican, and with a Republican president, in meeting with the liaison officer, that kind of information can be garnered and they can give us a very good idea on who to talk to, particularly with respect to trade. And I'm giving some serious consideration to doing just that in the near future.

So, it's a good idea for me to know who we think is the best person to talk to and who's the most influential senator, who has the ears of the most powerful politicians in the U.S. And that information can be received, and we got a good number.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Premier, are you suggesting that Mr. Tkachuk devoted his conversation with the representative of the Republican National Committee, confined his comments to ways in which to lobby the United States Congress, and no questions with respect to the conduct of the electoral process entered into the discussion in any way?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — No, Mr. Chairman. All I'm saying is that in discussions with the liaison officer, obviously information can be garnered with respect to who are the most powerful and influential politicians in the United States for the premier of a province to talk to when he's going there.

For example, if you're looking at trade it might be Mac Balbridge. And if that's the individual that has an ear to the President of the United States, then that's the kind of person perhaps I should be talking with. And that kind of information . . . and obviously Mr. Balbridge is a Republican, and various other people who have some influence in government are there, are important. And we can find that information out, and I like to know that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order. Being 5 o'clock the committee is recessed until 7 p.m.

The committee recessed until 7 p.m.