

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 30, 1978

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. N.H. MacAuley (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, a group of students from La Ronge who are here accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Eric Ham and Mr. Morvin Horwick.

I hope they will enjoy the proceedings here this afternoon and I hope to see them later on in the day in the rotunda.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.J. Thompson (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, 19 grade eleven and twelve students from Ile-a-la-Crosse School, seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by their counsellor, Lawrence Burnouf, and their chaperones, Christine Fovel and Sheila Durocher.

On behalf of myself and all assembled members, we hope your visit will be both enjoyable and educational and that you all have a safe journey home. I will be meeting you later for pictures and refreshments.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. K. Kwasnica (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to introduce some guests in the Speaker's Gallery this afternoon. I would like to introduce Gwen LaLonde from Leask. Although she is not from my constituency she is attending the STF Easter Council, and to Ron and Helena Pike from Waseca. That is a long way from Regina and they don't get here very often. Also my daughter and her friend from Lloydminster, Wendy Lyon and my daughter, Amanda. They are from Lloydminster Junior High School. They are visiting here today and I would like all members to make them welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Provincial Auditor's Report

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I know that you have been away at a conference in Banff and perhaps you may have had the opportunity to examine or at least have it reported to you, the report of the Provincial Auditor.

In this year's report, it would appear that the undercurrent of the Provincial Auditor is a

general concern of internal control and internal financing within the government. I would like to ask the Premier in light of the fact that the Provincial Auditor appears to be expressing this concern, perhaps a little more pointedly than usual, has the Premier held discussions with his Executive Council or with his Cabinet, and in what form is the Premier and these groups seriously considering typing up some of the procedures in light of some of the concerns that the provincial Auditor is expressing?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to read the Provincial Auditor's report in its entirety and I didn't gain the impression the member for Thunder Creek did, that the criticisms were any more stringent or any more severely praised than had been the case in the past. In fact, I got the other impression, that the nature of the problems raised were ones which indicated weaknesses in internal control in some agencies but he didn't indicate that any serious problems had arisen because of the internal control weaknesses. He was calling our attention to the advisability of strengthening the control procedures in given agencies. I have already had the opportunity to receive from the Minister of Finance a rather detailed report on the steps that have been taken in some cases and will be taken in others, to deal with the specific areas of weakness identified by the Provincial Auditor and I am satisfied that the staff of the Department of Finance and the minister are aware of the problems which, as I say, struck me as areas where problems might develop rather than, for the most part, areas where problems have developed and I am satisfied that these are being pursued, and pursued with vigor.

Mr. Thatcher: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, bringing up the subject of internal control or lack of internal control, I would therefore like to ask you what steps the Premier will be taking in light of an astonishing development yesterday when it was revealed in this Assembly, (bear in mind we are talking about internal control), when the Minister of Finance was totally unaware of his department taking out a loan from the Chemical Bank in New York to the tune of \$44.5 million. The minister denied that any loan had taken place; he made some very pointed comments which to this point in time he has not had enough class to withdraw. But speaking of the lack of control, is this the sort of lack of control that you referred to, and if so, why in goodness sake have you and your Executive Council not moved to rectify such a situation?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, as I advised the hon. member, I read the auditor's report in its entirety, which I suspect most hon. members have not, and I found nothing in there suggesting any lack of control on our borrowing procedures whatever, notwithstanding the fact that we borrow several hundred million dollars a year from many, many lenders, both long term and short term. The auditor in dealing with these many dozens and dozens of transactions, found not one worthy of a comment in a very long report. That strikes me as indicating that the procedures which we have are pretty good. The fact that the minister would not know, (if in fact this is the case), whether a particular amount of interim financing was being borrowed from bank A, or bank B, or bank C, strikes me as not relevant at all. When I was Minister of Finance, I did not know from which banks short term borrowing was taken, no sir, nor should I have. It is simply a misconstruction of the duties of the minister to suggest he should supervise every short term borrowing transaction. It is totally misconstruing the role; the minister's job is to set the policy, and there is not a shred of evidence to suggest that the transaction to which you referred was outside the policy laid down by the minister.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Potash Corporation

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, at the risk of offending the member for Thunder Creek, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation. The minister indicated today in Crown Corporation Committee that the Potash Corporation was running some risk of having to pay American taxes, either to the American federal authority or the American state authorities, either through the Potash Corporation itself or through its subsidiaries operating in the United States of America. The minister indicated that there were negotiations going on currently with the American tax authorities. My question to the minister is, at this time what position is the American government taking, what position are you taking, what is the situation at this point in time?

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Minister in Charge of Potash Corporation): — Mr. Speaker, on the advice of our American counsel, we have referred the matter for a ruling to the American tax authorities. Obviously the position we are taking is, we are selling a product produced in Saskatchewan and should not be taxable but they have not taken any position because they have not given us a ruling. We are approaching the American tax authorities for a ruling, (I am not sure whether it has been filed or not, I can check on that if the member wants me to), but there has been no ruling come down with respect to that.

Mr. Malone: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it from the answer that the American authorities have indicated to you that they feel the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan or a subsidiary of that corporation is liable to pay tax to the American authority, be it state or federal, and indeed, as a result of that advice from the American authorities, you have now instructed counsel in Washington, D.C. to then explain the position of your corporation, and in some way try to get out of paying any American taxes whatsoever?

Mr. Cowley: — Oh, I think the facts are that as far as I am aware, the American tax authorities have not approached us but the advice we have received from our counsel there is to approach them with our position and get a ruling from them now, rather than waiting for them to take action at some future date and then get a ruling. So we are on our own accord, if you like, on the advice of our counsel approaching American tax authorities.

Mr. Malone: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is the position of the government if the ruling should be to the effect that you are liable for taxation purposes in the United States either state or federal taxes? Will you pay those taxes or will you try and seek some device to get around the actual payment of them?

Mr. Cowley: — I think the position of the Government of Saskatchewan is that it will pay whatever taxes in whatever jurisdiction it operates that it is liable for. Obviously we will attempt to minimize the tax liability from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's point of view. We certainly will act in the best interests of the corporation in regard to that but if we are selling potash and it is ruled that we should pay a tax in a particular way, we will attempt to do that.

Seat Belt Law Enforcement

Mr. E. Anderson (Shaunavon): — I would like to address a question to the Minister of Highways. In view of the fact that the province's motorists are being stopped for not

wearing seat belts, has the minister any intentions of directing his department to erect signs at the border crossing stating that the wearing of seat belts is compulsory in Saskatchewan?

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — We are in the process now. The signs have been ordered. In the beginning we thought that — you know you don't for instance tell people that . . . (interjection) . . . We could get a proliferation of signs this way if we did. You mustn't do something or other — for instance, helmets on motorcycles which was passed by the former Liberal government to make those compulsory — we don't have a sign at the border saying to motorcyclists and there are many of them, it is compulsory to wear helmets in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: — Are you going to put up a sign saying . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Kramer: — I tell you what we're going to do though, on the Trans-Canada we're going to put up a sign, "We pay gas tax and we also build highways."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Anderson: — A supplementary to the Minister of Highways. In the interim period before the signs are erected have you directed or requested the Attorney General to not prosecute any motorists from out of the province who are stopped for the non wearing of seat belts?

Mr. Kramer: — No, but I would think that if the Attorney General got a request for a remission of fine from someone who was stopped, I believe the police would not, you know, fine someone that was coming in from outside the province.

Government Borrowing in the US

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier and I note the Premier has had an opportunity to confer with the Minister of Finance. I would like to question the premier about the lack of facts which he referred to and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to simply quote two lines from yesterday if I may, with your indulgence, on page 750, Mr. Premier, the Minister of Finance when questioned about the borrowing replied, "Mr. Speaker, first of all Sask Power Corporation did not borrow on the American market . . . We have borrowed on the American market in 1977 for a 30 year period, not a two year period." I would refer you to page 13 of the SPC Annual Report.

Mr. Minister, I asked you a few moments ago about internal control and asked you, if a situation were if the Department of Finance is borrowing some \$45 million from any place — never mind the bank as you pointed out — is not a gross example of a lack of control? In fact, perhaps, bordering on ministerial negligence? May I have your opinion on that, please, Sir?

Mr. Blakeney: — Although ordinarily, if I may say so, the question period is not designed to elicit opinions, that is not the purpose of question periods, but I am happy to offer an opinion to that effect.

The facts are that a line of credit was arranged and I venture to think, therefore, that the minister is technically correct since if money has not been advanced there is no loan.

But I won't take that technical point although it is one, since we are all being very technical. I make that point.

The second point is that if interim financing is being arranged – and this is very, very common – for the purchase of major equipment by the Power Corporation or any other corporation, where the interim financing is going to be paid out over a period of time and in due course the matter is going to be finalized by long-term borrowing. While this is a matter certainly of some interest, it would not be the type of borrowing concerning which the minister should have any personal knowledge other than to know that this policy was being pursued.

Mr. Thatcher: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I don't know why it has become a government practice in the last couple of days to deliberately mislead this House but you just did. You have tried to leave the impression that that was a roll-over line of credit, and it wasn't.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Premier has a point of privilege.

Mr. Blakeney: — On a point of privilege. I will take my advice from Mr. Speaker. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the suggestion that I am deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. Speaker: — I think it is incumbent upon the member to withdraw the statement for the simple reason that he made a direct charge, that the Premier or his government is misleading the House and I think the member should withdraw that charge.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I meant nothing personal towards the Premier. I wish to emphasize that, but the Premier, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry . . . (interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. I am afraid the member is going to have to withdraw the statement that he made.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I am not looking for a confrontation over that issue but on that particular one right there, believe me, you have put me in a terrible spot. I can't back down on that. I can't. I'm sorry. Do what you have to . . . (interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, if I have in any way offended the minister or any sort of a personal note, I wish to emphasize I did not intend to put any sort of a personal allegation to that. If he has taken it from a personal point of view, I did not intend it that way and I think I have said that and I want to make that emphatically clear . . . (interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Premier – I'm glad we are out of that one. It really wasn't worth it . . . (laughter) . . . Mr. Premier, in your comments I believe that you suggested that this was a roll-over line of credit and if I may respectfully point out, it does not say that. Therefore, Mr. Premier, since it was not the roll-over line of credit as you have suggested it was but was absolutely an outright borrowing, according to Sask Power Corporation, is it fair to say that you deliberately mislead this House about three

minutes ago?

Mr. Blakeney: — Obviously it is not fair to say that I deliberately mislead the House. I can assure the hon. members of that because if the facts are as the member for Thunder Creek says they are, which I doubt, I did not know those were the facts and accordingly when I transgressed his view of the facts I did not do it deliberately, so I think we are clear on that point. Whatever error I have made they have been innocent errors; that is my usual position of innocence and it continues. I am simply not aware of any long-term borrowing from the Chemical Bank as I think the hon. member suggested . . . page 13. A further \$44 million was borrowed from the Chemical Bank on the short-term arrangement extending into 1979. It may well be — my information is that there was no single draw down date — that was a limit of borrowing that was going to be paid out as progress payments were being made on a particular transaction. That may well indeed be phrased as a short-term arrangement. I would call it bridge financing or interim financing. I think our arguments are semantical and not factual. I believe it is interim financing. You may feel that it is a short-term loan with a series of different draw down dates.

Cost of Living Increases

Mr. G.H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I directed a question to the Minister of Finance regarding the cost of living increases during the past twelve months. In his reply, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said to me and to other members of the House, Saskatchewan has the lowest cost of living in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister if he is aware that the cost of living index, all items as shown by Statistics Canada at the end of January for the 14 largest cities in the country, show Regina to be the fourth highest in the nation and two of those cities that are above Regina, Vancouver and Winnipeg, are only eight-tenths of one per cent above the city of Regina. Is the minister aware of those facts?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we are talking perhaps about two different things. I am talking about overall cost of living; he is talking about the increase in the last 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, I still stand by the statement that I made on Tuesday, that based on the information that we have, based on information provided by the Canada Bureau of Statistics or whatever the new name is currently, that Saskatchewan continues to have the lowest cost of living as compared to all the other provinces in Canada. It is true in the last 12 months we have had larger increases. You have to look at the increase but you also have to look at the actual cost of living, things like housing, things like clothes, things like food, things like energy and all items put together. Saskatchewan, I am glad to say, has the lowest cost of living.

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Speaker, the minister ought to be aware that the figures I am quoting are exactly the figures that the minister is referring to, that is the cost of living index and it shows very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that Regina has the fourth highest of any city in the nation. Now is the minister prepared to admit that he has either inadvertently or purposely mislead the House with regard to Saskatchewan's cost of living as compared to other cities in Canada?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is, No. I am not prepared to admit because I am stating I believe, a fact.

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Speaker, since the cost of living in Saskatchewan is not the lowest in Canada, as the minister claims, since there are only three cities in the Dominion with higher cost of living indexes. I am not talking about increases, I am talking about the index, is the minister now prepared to accept the fact that he and his government have some serious obligation to the people of Saskatchewan to do the things that are within the government's control to relieve the burden that Saskatchewan residents face with regard to the cost of living?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I still believe my information is correct and, Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. member to the budget speech that was presented on March 7 that we have provided very significant relief. I do not propose to be restating all the things we are doing for the people of Saskatchewan. As the hon. member knows, the reduction in the personal income tax, property improvement grants and all the things including money to the municipal governments which are going to help keep the cost of living for the people of Saskatchewan down and provide a good standard of living for our citizens.

Franking Privileges

Mr. W.H. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — A question to the Minister of Finance. Yesterday in this House you brought to the attention of the hon. members that some of the members, you said in your words, it had been alleged that they were abusing the franking privileges of this House. Now since that casts a shadow on all hon. members would you please tell this House now who alleged to you that some hon. members were abusing the franking privileges of this House?

Mr. Smishek: — I have said what I had to say yesterday. I don't propose to deal with the matter again. I think the record speaks for itself; there was some inference that maybe somebody might have been offended by my statement in reply to the question and I did indicate that I would be prepared to withdraw — if there was anybody that was being offended.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier, just a few moments ago, you arose on a point of privilege and demanded a withdrawal. Your minister yesterday, one that has seemingly gotten you into a lot of trouble today, has made an allegation that he has heard of allegations that some hon. members were abusing their franking privileges. He still states at this time that he is only prepared — he might be prepared to withdraw. Now I say in light of the things that have happened here today . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order.

Normal Service Restored in Land Titles Office

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General.

The employees at the Land Titles Office were out on strike for some 18 days. Can the Attorney General tell us what his best estimate is of the time when normal service is

expected to be restored in the Land Titles Office in Regina?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the member. I don't have an up-to-date report on this.

Mr. Cameron: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I have a letter from your executive director of the Land Titles Office, on my desk, indicating that it is likely to be 10 weeks. I ask the Attorney General whether he is prepared, in view of the tremendous cost that is associated with people buying and selling homes, by having a 10 week delay and being able to complete the transaction, whether he is prepared to put additional employees to work in the Regina Land Titles Office so that it might remain open around the clock for the next three or four weeks?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, we are doing all that we can to try and catch up as quickly as we can on this issue. There is a problem of trained personnel, of course, and there is a problem as well of the amount of hours that anybody can put in in overtime.

Of course, as has pointed out to me here, the 10 week letter, I am sure, does not indicate that a documentation will take 10 weeks to process in the Land Titles. It simply means that it will be up to 10 weeks before the normal 48 hours, 24 hours, 72 hour turn around comes around.

Mr. Cameron: — Final supplementary. I am told that length, the time before the Land Titles Office will be back to normal service in Moose Jaw in eight weeks, Saskatoon five weeks, Prince Albert five weeks. Are you prepared to draw employees from land Titles Offices that weren't affected by the strike into some of these centres, particularly into Regina, so that people who are buying and selling homes aren't saddled with the extra cost and it runs from \$700 to \$800 per transaction by being delayed into mid-June and so they can have their transactions completed in the middle of April?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is, yes. This is being done now.

Revenue Sharing Grant Advertising

Mr. R.H. Bailey(Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Your department has now gone on an extensive advertising program — this happens to be out of the Leader-Post of yesterday — in which under the heading of Revenue Sharing Grants, you were listing the 1978 Revenue Sharing Grant, which is all inclusive and parallel to that you were listing the 1977 grant, but you did not include in the 1977 listing all of the auxiliary grants that were also received.

Why did you not include in the total grant in 1977 as you have in 1978?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 1977 figures as indicated in the advertisement, that is indicated in other releases that we have made with respect to revenue sharing. Those figures are a combination of equalization, police and per capita. The revenue sharing grant is the three previous grants rolled in plus new money. There is no miscellaneous or any other kind of grants indicated in either one of those columns, grants such as the Culture and Youth grants for recreation, grants that may have come from the Municipal Water Assistance Board

which are in many, many cases very significant or grants that may have come from the Department of Highways for urban transit which may have been very, very significant. They have only been the three plus the new money. The hon. member is suggesting that we should consider advertising figures relating to all of them and miscellaneous grants plus revenue sharing in 1978 as compared to the '77 figures. I certainly think we would be happy to take a look at it.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The point that I am making, Mr. Minister, is simply that you are comparing apples and oranges. My supplementary question is very simply this. What is the purpose of this very expensive advertising? What is gained? Is it saving anybody any money? What is the purpose of this expensive advertising?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is well aware that there has been a good deal of discussion about the revenue sharing program over the past year. A great deal of work has been done by SARM and SUMA and the government with respect to this program. I think it is legitimate to realize that there is a real public interest in this. The real interest always comes to what is the bottom line. What is the kind of money that is involved? How much money does my council receive in my town? I think the purpose of the advertising is therefore very, very legitimate to inform the public in the communities how much is involved in revenue sharing and the principles involved in arriving at those figures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — What is that?

Mr. Collver: — The other day in this Assembly the Minister of Finance yesterday in this Assembly made allegations and said that allegations had been made . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The member should have raised his point of privilege yesterday and not during ministerial statements . . . we are in the question period, we are on ministerial statements.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. In the question period today . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Perhaps the member could do that before orders of the day if he has a point of privilege.

Mr. Collver: — You mean you let the Premier do it but not me. Is that it?

Mr. Speaker: — I think we will deal with the member under orders of the day.

Point of Personal Privilege – Allegations

Mr. Collver: — On a matter of personal privilege before the orders of the day. In question period today, the Minister of Finance was asked, by the member from Saskatoon-Sutherland, who made allegations about two members of the Legislative Assembly. The minister refused to answer. This fact that

the minister stated twice yesterday, that allegations had been made, colors the reputation of every member of this Legislature. The minister refused to name any MLAs, and he refused to say who had made such allegations. That in turn is coloring the reputations of all of us. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the minister be required, first to name the person or persons who made allegations against two members, and second, to name which two members he was speaking about – or apologize to this Assembly and withdraw the remarks totally.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Are there any further comments on the Point of Privilege?

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, if I might just say a word. I brought this matter up and as I indicated during question period, the member has not withdrawn that comment as of today. He made indications that he might be prepared to withdraw, that is not the point. I think what we have to get at here, in order to get at each member's personal privileges, is who is the hon. member referring to, when he talks about abuse of franking privileges in this House, and who made the allegations. I think that either the member now gets up and says, I didn't tell the truth to the House and I am sorry, and apologizes, and unqualifiedly withdraws that, or, he names names and tells us who made the allegations.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, if I could comment on this from the point of view of those of us in the back benches. Mr. Speaker, you will note that, if I could use a bit of an analogy there. You asked me to withdraw something that I didn't think was nearly as pertinent as the incident yesterday but the word 'mislead' today apparently caused some consternation and we came very close to your having to name me and remove me from this Assembly. Now, the minister that we are discussing right now, this is not the first time that he has thrown an aspersion on everybody sitting on this side of the House. I recall, (I believe it was a year ago, it really isn't important), that he made some references to an attempted bribery, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this minister has gotten away with this far too often, and I think, for once, this member should be required to put up or shut up! Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: — The member is making a blanket accusation about a member in the House. Now, I am prepared to hear comments with regard to this specific instance, but the member is dragging in all kinds of extraneous material which he may think is legitimate but should have been handled at the time it occurred and not now. Now, as I understand the events of yesterday and I will attempt to reconstruct them as briefly as I can and then I will ask the minister if he has anything further to say on the subject.

The minister made the statement as follows:

It is also alleged that they may have even used MLA franking privileges to promote their own nominations or elections.

And as that point he was cut off from the debate. Now, I consider that the point of privilege raised by the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) was legitimate yesterday. And at that point after the member for Wascana had raised the point of privilege because I don't think a pale of doubt was cast over the entire Assembly as some members seem to think but it was apparently cast at two members and it was rather obvious who those members were from the comments that went on in this House. I said at that time after the member for Wascana had made his statement:

I think it is common practice of the Legislature that the member's word is taken as being acceptable to the House and any other member who wishes to challenge that word must produce the evidence forthwith. Unless the member is prepared to do that I think he has to take the word of the member for Wascana as he has stated in this point of privilege.

Now some other events intervened there and eventually the minister stood and said:

If it pleases the House, I said I hope it is not true and if it offends some people I am prepared to withdraw it.

Now, I didn't ask the minister to withdraw it at that point and I have had a chance to examine the record at this time and I would say that although the accusation is oblique in nature, it still has roughly the same effect as if it had been a direct charge against a member for misusing franking privileges. I would, therefore, ask the minister if he would be prepared to withdraw the comment without any qualifications whatsoever at this time.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I notice the wording that's in the transcript and I just say I withdraw it and I do withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: — I consider the matter closed.

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Speaker, I have a matter that I would like to raise with you that relates to the responsibility of a Cabinet minister to withdraw statements that are incorrect. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in the House expects a Cabinet minister to be able to answer every question that is put to him and know all of the information about everything there is to know. Mr. Speaker, there is clearly shown on Tuesday, March 28, the Minister of Finance said that Saskatchewan had the lowest cost of living in Canada. Mr. Speaker, that statement in light of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — May I caution the member first that for him to raise a point of order there must be some rule that has been abridged. If he can state what rule it was that was abridged . . . (interjection) . . . Well, that rule I believe has been abridged in this House before and hasn't necessitated an apology of any kind whatsoever. I would ask the member to get specifically to the point of order, in other words, what rule has been abridged?

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the rule of the House is but I think it's a rule called honesty and it's a rule called decency and it's a rule called not misleading . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I can't accept that as a legitimate point of order and the member is casting aspersions on other members at this time.

Point of Order on the Question Period

Mr. W.J.G. Allen (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, during the course of the question period you refused a supplementary question to the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher). The member in a fit of pique threw his papers on his desk and I heard him clearly state referring to you, Mr. Speaker, as 'you son of a bitch'. I think that this is highly unparliamentary language and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark and to apologize to the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the members of the House should all be old enough and mature enough to control their emotions in this House, as it is necessary to conduct the business of this House. I did not hear any comment of that nature since I was absorbed in my duties here and didn't hear what the member for Thunder Creek said. I was aware that he dropped his papers rather loudly and I am unaware of why that happened, whether it was a case of nervousness or something else. I am not aware of any comments that the member may have made. I don't know whether it is on the record or not.

Mr. Malone: — On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could clarify something in my mind and that's when points of privilege can be raised. It is my understanding that both points of privilege and points of order, arising through question period, cannot be raised until before orders of the day. I believe, yesterday, you did not allow the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) to proceed with a point of privilege, today did not allow the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) to proceed with a point of privilege, but you allowed the Premier to proceed with a point of privilege. Would you please tell us what the rule is, Mr. Speaker. If there are two rules please let us know whether there is one for the government and one for this side.

Mr. Speaker: — I accept the comment of the member for Lakeview at this point and wish to take an opportunity to examine the record. I assure the member for Lakeview there is only one rule that applies to privilege and if after studying the record I will bring in a statement which will make it, I think, apparent and clear to all members of the House, there is only one rule applying to privilege. I will bring in one after considering the matter.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I am rather a little bit shocked — on a point of privilege, I guess — on the allegation made by the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen). Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosemont or myself run in different circles when he hears language like this. Mr. Speaker, I can only suggest either he was hearing somebody referring to the Minister of Finance, or somebody else was talking about . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The member is obviously treating a very serious subject very lightly and I don't think we have time, in the Chamber, to waste the time of this Chamber doing that. Order, order! I would ask the member for Thunder Creek to check the record and decide for himself if he has approached this matter in a facetious manner. I judge it to be a serious manner. If the member wants to approach it, then he should approach it in a serious manner. I don't believe he has done that now and I don't intend to allow him to continue at this time.

Mr. Bailey: — It was raised by the member, Mr. Speaker, during the course of the question period today and during the course of the traditional debate that goes back and forth in the House, sitting where I do in the House I hear a good many comments. I hear a good many comments from my right and certainly I hear a good many comments opposite. I suspect that my hearing is such, Mr. Speaker, that when I hear the insults from opposite, sometimes I am amused with them and even laugh at them.

Sitting here today, one of the members of my caucus, the progressive Conservative caucus, has been accused of using blasphemy in this House and that is not true. Those words were not spoken in this House and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty to ask the member who made the accusation to categorically deny that he had . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I think we are pursuing something but I don't know what the solution to the problem is. The member said he heard it; it is a dispute as to what the facts are. One member says he heard it and the other member says that he didn't. I don't know how we intend to settle that one. I think we are wasting a lot of time and we should be going ahead with the business of the House.

Mr. H.W. Lane (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — What is the point of order?

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — Well, the member for Thunder Creek was asked to withdraw the word 'mislead'. Now there has been an allegation of a much more serious use of foul language in this House and the member for Thunder Creek is quite serious about this matter. He has asked the member for Rosemont to withdraw . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Department of Health

Vote 32

Item 1

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Chairman, when we were in the last stages of yesterday's discussion on the estimates of this department, I had a few words to say at that particular time when the Minister of Municipal Affairs was rising in defense of the Minister of Health. I want to pursue that a little further, Mr. Chairman, because I think there was a misleading statement made.

What was said at that particular time was this, that grants are estimates only, and I heard that statement very clearly. I'm sure that I was not the only one, Mr. Chairman, who heard that statement, that grants are estimates only. I want to say to the government opposite in making a statement like that to this Assembly, some people on this side of the House including the member for Maple Creek and myself this very week, spent a great deal of time examining the grant structure and setting up a very complicated budget. We have done that every year for a number of years and in no way, in no way has the department, any department, ever suggested when the allocation of funds are made about this time of the year, to any local government board, 'remember that these figures which we are giving you are only estimates.' We base a budget right down to dollars and cents, Mr. Chairman, on those grants and the members opposite know it. They know very well when a grant goes out to a local government that right down to the very dollar is accounted for.

The statements made yesterday in defence of a very, very inadequate showing of the Department of Health is a mere cover-up. I want to suggest something else, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest something else. In the question period today I asked the minister this question about this and I got rather a facetious answer. I suggest that there is a lot of covering up. I suggest that this advertising is not for the purpose for which the minister raised the question yesterday at all.

This advertising is for sheer political purposes and he knows it. Now let's set the matter straight, government grants which are allocated to school boards, RMs, to town councils, are not estimates, not to them. They may be considered estimates to this government but they are not to the recipients of the grant and let's make that clear before we proceed in Health Estimates.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I won't take a great deal of time in replying to those comments because it seems to me that if I was listening correctly not once did the member opposite make one word of comment about the Estimates of the Department of Health. I would almost think that maybe he should have been called out of order but I know that debate in estimates in subvote 1 is wide-ranging and therefore it is very probable that he was not out of order.

One of the comments he made I found amusing. I somehow would think that members opposite in their comments and their questioning would not go to the extent of saying things that have indeed not happened. He indicated that the Minister of Municipal Affairs rose in this House. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, as far as I can recall yesterday, never rose in this House once except at the end of the debate at 5:00 o'clock when he said that we should report progress and rise to sit again. The member should not make that kind of insinuation because indeed he did not rise.

School grants as he knows as a superintendent of schools in his school jurisdiction have adjustments to them made throughout the year and if his unit has never had an adjustment made, I would be immensely surprised. His straight categorized comments that they are precise to the last dollar and to the last penny, I am afraid are a little off base, because in my experience as the Minister of Education, there were clearly situations in many cases where there were adjustments made depending on mileage, depending on enrolment changes and so on and so forth.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, the comments of the minister in defence of his statements made yesterday, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, from the position he is in at this very time, at least three times told the members of this opposition that grants are estimates. Now, if that doesn't make any difference to you in your defence of him at that particular time, because he was not rising in his chair, the accusation brought from your colleague immediately behind you against one of the members of this House was also while he was in his seat. It seems to me that you people over there have all of a sudden taken upon yourselves a particular halo around your heads that you are God himself, and you can't have any criticisms coming your way.

I want to suggest, too, an analogy that you made in most incorrect. If there is an adjustment in the grants — and you are referring to the schools — is because of changing situations at the school level, at the recipient level, and not change in situation at this level and make sure that that is understood.

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Just before we proceed, I would like to remind members on both sides that we are dealing with Health Estimates, we are not dealing with schools or other departments. We are dealing with Health Estimates and I would ask you to adhere as closely as possible to this, because I think its efficiency depends on you people and that is the way I want to conduct it.

Mr. Bailey: — I've got to ask the minister some questions which I raised previously. I have had the question raised to me and I am sure that he has too. That's an account of rural ambulances.

As I understand from an earlier question, Mr. Minister, that you had, that the grants to the rural ambulances were included in the revenue sharing grants to the RMs, to the towns and villages. Is that correct, that the rural municipalities will receive a portion, a part of the revenue sharing grant, within that is locked up the grants to the ambulances. Is that correct?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It is correct that the appropriation and the funding for their ambulance program provided by the Government of Saskatchewan, in this year, is included as part of the revenue sharing package in the Department of Municipal Affairs. If the member for Rosetown wants to seek specific information on that I would suggest that the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs would be the appropriate place to ask them.

Mr. Bailey: — It is handled under the Department of Municipal Affairs but the grants to the ambulance was previously handled by your department. Am I not correct there?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The answer to that question is 'yes' and 'no' because there have not been grants to ambulances in the past. The department has been involved because the department administered the standards that are applied to the ambulance services.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Health then, the grants that are being made to the road ambulances as we call them are now totally out of the Department of Health and are now in the Department of Municipal Affairs. That is what the minister just said; is that correct, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, that's correct. The grants from the Department of Municipal Affairs are not out of the Department of Health because they were never there but yes, they are totally in the Department of Municipal Affairs. You are correct.

Mr. Bailey: — Well, Mr. Minister, the question I have is this. As Minister of Health you are going to get a large number of questions and though you have now determined that the total operation of the grant structure to the rural ambulance and ambulance grants are totally outside of the Department of Health and I find that very strange, but the question I have is this. Can you tell me how the appropriation of the moneys are available to the various ambulances that exist in rural Saskatchewan and how do they go about getting their share of the total grant which is granted to the local government boards.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well I must restate my earlier comment. If the member wants specific answers to the allocation of grants then he should be asking that under the consideration of the Estimates of Municipal Affairs. The money is being provided to municipalities, both rural and urban. There is I believe, some \$2.2 million allocated in the appropriation of the Department of Municipal Affairs under revenue sharing for that purpose. The way that municipalities will utilize that, they will have to work out at the local level. That is what local autonomy is all about. I know that the members opposite speak of local autonomy and so do we. We happen to believe in it and we are doing all that we can in order to determine that it is able to operate adequately and with the appropriate amount of funding so that the kind of decisions that local people need to make, they are able to make. The standards part, the Department of Health and

Municipal Affairs will be working very closely together because the standards that obviously must be there in order that certain requirements are met will be developed by the Department of Health but there will be a close tie-in and I am convinced, as my colleagues are, that that is going to be a great asset to providing ambulance services in the province of Saskatchewan, even to the extent that I anticipate that we are going to see a considerable reduction in the rates that are being charged by ambulance operators and indeed will be of great benefit to people who have to use it.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, I was going to bring this up under ambulance services but I guess I might as well bring it up now since you have got into it. On December 22, 1977 you issued a press release — a statement on ambulance service negotiations. “Health Minister Ed Tchorzewski said today that agreement in principle is reached between ambulance operators and the Department of Health for a plan to improve ambulance services in Saskatchewan.”

Ambulance operators, as the minister is probably aware, have been complaining very vigorously for the last number of years about the fees that they have been paid and the increase in costs that they have been incurring. Many of them have complained that unless something was done they would be going out of business. I wonder if the minister, in this particular statement, gave no details of facts in relation to what the plans were to improve the ambulance service, no relationship to whether or not the fee for service was being increases, or anything of that — can he bring the House up to date on exactly what these negotiations are, what the plans are, whether there has been any changes in the fees or the payments made for ambulance services in Saskatchewan?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Perhaps I can respond to both the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley and the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose with respect to their support of the ambulance service in the province. While discussions were going on and did go on and arrive at some kind of a tentative agreement involving an amount of money with the ambulance association and the Department of Health, a decision was made after discussion with SARM and SUMA and so on to fund the ambulance people through the revenue sharing program. Those of you who have been following the revenue sharing development will have noted that in addition to basic large funding we talked about a services component starting with ambulance, of fire and recreation, funding municipalities who in fact got involved in those programs in an operational way. You will know also that something over \$2 million was allocated in the budget of Municipal Affairs for ambulance service. What is happening now is that negotiations are going on with the government, with SARM, with SUMA and with the ambulance association in order to work out a funding formula for the ambulance people through the municipalities in one way or another to the ambulance service. Those discussions aren't wrapped up. I know that we will be talking with the ambulance association people at their meeting. I think it's coming up this weekend, on some of the principles that are being considered. This will be followed by a further nailing down of the program. It's just not possible as yet to give any kind of detail on how the ambulance association will be funded. We can only say that they will be funded and that there is a budget of something over \$2 million for the funding. We'll have to work out the details of that and as soon as those have been worked out with the key parties involved we will be announcing it. We've decided that so far as that component of revenue sharing is concerned we will deal with the ambulance one first, put it to rest, and then move to the fire and the recreation one.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the minister is saying. He indicates that back to December two parties have not yet exchanged a letter of understanding

although staff officers are in the process of documenting all parts of the agreement. In other words, it would appear that the agreement, at least they have reached some sort of tentative agreement.

Can the minister tell me and I appreciate that negotiations may be going on and I'm interested in that ambulance operators have had of difficult time. I know I have had discussions with some of them and some of the officers of the association over the past couple of years. Can the minister tell me is the funding a specific grant or is it related to a fee for service, will there be an additional charge to patients using ambulances in the past or can you get into that kind of discussion at this stage?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Chairman, that's our problem, how the funding is going to be delivered. I think for the most part it is getting narrowed down at a per capita kind of an amount but I wouldn't say that that's it. I think there has to be further discussion on the funding way. The hon. member will know that there are a lot of areas that do not have ambulance service at all who will be seeking to get involved in this program. You've got the large ambulance people in, say, the city of Regina who I think feel a pressure right now and that has to be met almost immediately and it may well be that we'll find almost immediately and it may well be that we will find the structure or formula to deal with the pressure points and then continue to work on the areas where there isn't pressure. But it is still up in the air and I hope that within the month of April we can get it resolved so that everybody knows where he stands.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by the minister and I also appreciate your indulgence because we have a crossing over here of departments which is very difficult. With your permission and the permission of the minister I just want to pursue one question in light of the explanation, which I appreciate being given. I suppose to clarify and to try to make the question as simple as possible — is it possible that a local government board could, in fact, receive in the total revenue sharing grant, the portion which is built in for ambulance, would it not be of necessity then that they spend it on ambulance services. The reason I ask that question, Mr. Minister, and I want to give you a picture of the rural areas and certainly the Minister of Health should be interested in this. Let us take a town that has gone ahead, through a community organization like the Kiwanis, and purchased an ambulance. They would serve say three RMs (rural municipalities) and a portion of another RM. By giving service to that area, and even more, let us say the RM down here wishes not to contribute to the ambulance service, would they be in receipt of that small portion of grant if they did not? That is the question.

Mr. MacMurchy: — No, I think that portion of revenue sharing is what you could call a sort of a semi-conditional portion. If they are involved in providing a service as you indicated, three or four municipalities getting together with the town to provide the service, they will get support. If they say 'no, we are not involved', they would not get support. It is sort of a semi-conditional thing, and without getting into the earlier argument, that portion of revenue sharing is to come yet. It is not part of those figures at all. I think there is something like \$3 million for those three areas which have yet to be allocated. The big chunk of it, of course, is the ambulance program.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order please. If there is something further in regard to ambulance and is in regard to the Minister of Municipal Affairs department, I would like to remind you that we have the Health Estimates on review here, and we have the personnel here for the Department of Health who are ready to answer from that

department, I would remind you that I would like to follow this out as close as I can, and you will have your opportunity when the Department of Municipal Affairs comes up to ask those other questions at that time.

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley): — You can count on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Well then, let's count on you.

Mr. McMillan: — I would like to put you in a better position to do so — you could move your desk over here, that would be appreciated. Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister of Health with respect to the funding for treatment of drug abuse in Saskatchewan, particularly the Alcoholism Commission funding. The minister is aware that it has been a concern of mine before. I note that your funding works out to about \$3.50 per capita in Saskatchewan, roughly. Yet the provincial government net revenue from the sale of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan this year will approach \$75 per capita. Now the minister is well aware of the kind of medical problems that are created by drug abuse, particularly with alcohol. No society to date has been able to accurately assess the social damage that is done as a result of alcohol abuse. The Department of Government Insurance is only just beginning to be able to assess the kind of physical damage and cost associated strictly with damage to property alone, as a result of alcohol abuse. I would like to ask the minister if he is not prepared, in one way or another, to increase this government's commitment to the funding of alcohol abuse study centres, particularly the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan, which has an excellent record in dealing with drug abuse problems and particularly alcoholism. Are you prepared to increase your commitment, in one way or another, to these projects?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member could look at the increase in commitment and increase in money that has been provided for this effort, this kind of effort, which we mutually recognize as an area of some considerable need. Over the last several years, he would find by taking that look, that there, indeed, has been a considerable amount of an increase. The increase in 1976-77 was 8.4 per cent over the year before for the Alcoholism Commission. The increase in 1977-78 was 9.9 per cent, the increase in 1978-79 is 10.6 per cent. So not only has there been a continuing increase of funding, there is a continuing increase in the increase of the funding.

We have also been innovative in that we have attempted to take some other approaches besides what is provided in the Alcoholism Commission with the co-operation and the assistance of the Alcoholism Commission, which we should not lose sight of. We are introducing, as the Minister of Education could well tell you, in the school curriculum, in the health curriculum, very up-to-date and very effective portions of the curriculum dealing with alcohol and alcohol abuse. The member for Rosetown might be aware of some of that. There is a continuing plan to accelerate that over the years and that is one of the areas where we have to begin, at the school age level and at the level of our young people. We have provided a program which was commended, even by the members opposite, on Wednesday night, called Aware in an attempt to change the attitudes towards alcohol. So you see there are two aspects of the thing, as I keep saying and have been saying now for two days. There is the curative aspect, which you mentioned, which is important and there has been some increase in that capacity. I am not saying that there does not need to be more. I happen to believe that there needs to be more. We are developing plans to try to establish that, but at the same time we have been increasing funds on the preventative side. We are trying to, again, in the area of alcoholism as we are trying to do in the whole range of health care, provide a balanced approach.

Mr. McMillan: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as the minister might well be aware, I am disappointed to hear that he is satisfied with the approach that they are taking at this time. It is not so much the direction in which you are headed, but rather the speed at which you are prepared to move.

I say it is a poor investment for the Department of Health and the province of Saskatchewan to take \$75 million in net profit out of the province for the sale of alcoholic beverages and only put \$3.50 per capita back in for the treatment of the problems that drug abuse creates.

You suggested to me that you are quite satisfied with the commitment that your government has made. I tell you, today, your work with respect to educating the public is an improvement over what we have had in this province before. I say, good, obviously the long-range solution to the problem is education. We tried the most serious one, prohibition, at one time and it didn't work. But you are in a position, today, to do much more than you are and you are not prepared to. You are prepared to spend millions of dollars on government advertising in Saskatchewan. You lost \$30 million in revenue as a result of your investment in the potash industry, close to it, in the last twelve months, yet you are not prepared to make that good sound fiscal and human investment in the province and give those agencies that are prepared to deal with alcoholism and drug abuse, in a general sense, the tools by which to do it.

I will give you an example. I said to you in question period the other day that the Calder Detox Centre in Saskatoon was suffering from a lack of funding and you said that was not true. I'm not surprised if you are not aware of it but you might have pointed out that that was your problem rather than the fact that it wasn't true. The Calder Centre has had seriously long line-ups for the past year or two years, extensive waiting lists to get in. Their problem to date is that one of their staff members has had to leave for surgery. They don't have the funding to replace that member and have consequently had to close some of their beds, I am told. Now if that is the case that is a sad testimony to your commitment to alcohol treatment in Saskatchewan. It would be one thing for you to stand up and say I am sorry but we don't have the tools by which to extend ourselves any further; that would be understandable. The problem here is not a lack of the tools but a lack of the commitment and I say you should be shamed for that.

As well as that, there are other institutions in Saskatchewan which are prepared, on behalf of all people in Saskatchewan, to get into the field of drug abuse, do some educational work as well as some immediate medical treatment work. I have one specific case for you here and that's the new Danny Fisher centre that has opened in Kindersley. The purposes of that institution are for treatment of people who are suffering from drug abuse problems, counselling those people. They are currently handling the DWI program for the Safety '77 or the Department of Highways or the Attorney General, whoever sponsors it. They are also doing a great deal of work in the field of education for young people particularly. Your funding to them to date is, to the best of my knowledge, non-existent. They have been operating on an EST grant on a temporary basis from hand to mouth from the Department of Social Services, which I hope will be extended for an additional 32 weeks. They are going to the non-medical use of drugs on the federal level to try and get more permanent funding so that they will be able to assist the Department of Health in the work that you hope to gain in the treatment of alcoholism and other drug-related diseases and yet the Department of Health, all you people are prepared to say to them is go to the Alcoholism Commission for funding. The Alcoholism Commission has given \$3.50 per capita, a 9.9 per cent

increase in a Budget that wasn't significantly even close to being enough in the first instance.

I would like to know if you are prepared, either through the Alcoholism Commission or through a separate program, to provide additional funding for drug abuse treatment centres in Saskatchewan or educational centres, above and beyond which you have indicated to me you are prepared to do at this time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, first of all let me make a correction. I read one of the figures here that wasn't quite correct for the increase in grants for 1978-79 over 1977-78 was something in the area of 20 per cent, I believe, was it not? I'm sorry. Previously, last year the increase was somewhere in the order of 30 per cent for the Alcoholism Commission funding. The increase this year is correct as I indicated. I said 10.6; it's not 10.6, it's 10.9 per cent which is a very substantial increase.

Now, the member makes the argument that as a percentage of the revenues in the liquor profits, that that is not a considerable amount. I can recall very vividly, the Liberal members of this House arguing several years ago, (and not too many) that 10 per cent of the liquor profits ought to go into treatment of alcoholism. Well I'm very pleased to inform the member that we have surpassed that this year, and that 10.6 per cent of them are going towards the treatment of alcoholism and that proportion, that percentage has been continuously increasing in the last several years. So we are really actually on the same chain of thought. We both agree that we need to be increasing the funding that is provided there and we are endeavoring to do that. But let me tell the member because he wasn't in the House during the time when there was a Liberal government in this province and neither was I. Let me just tell him and give him some comparisons so that he will know that maybe he is sitting on the wrong side of the House.

Let me give you the example of the last years of Liberal government in Saskatchewan where in 1969-70, \$445,490 was provided from the consolidated fund by the Liberal government. In 1970-71, \$531,000 – a very meager increase. In 1971-72, \$635,190. These were Liberal increases, but I am pleased to say, Mr. Chairman, that this year we are increasing it by 10.9 per cent or by an amount of some \$3,539,000 – a very substantial increase. That is not to say as I have said before, that we say that that is the total solution. It is not. There is more that needs to be done and we will continue to do what we can within the parameters – acting within the parameters that restrict us, be they revenues and so on – we will do what we can to increase our commitment and to meet the need that is there.

We have funds in the budget of the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan this year. They are appropriated; they are provided for your information in the blues and that is the allocation we are prepared to provide this year.

Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I am just doing this to remind the hon. members on both sides of the House that we have been very lenient with you and you certainly have the right to cover almost any item within the Health Estimates on subvote 1 or Item 1, but if you look at Item 23 there is a special item for what you are dealing with now and I would hope that we don't go through this all again at that time.

Mr. McMillan: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I don't really know where to

begin. I'm reluctant to get involved in your old, old, old political arguments. I am not here to live the sins of my political ancestors, and you might be interested to know if you had enough insight into the entire situation to know that it was probably the Liberal government that set up the Alcoholism Commission as a result of the fact that your government would only provide \$50,000 a year, and the increase was 300 to 400 per cent when that was set up.

I would fault myself for getting involved in that argument with you because it is small. You said in this House that you would do everything in your power to see that the need of the drug abuse problem in Saskatchewan would be met and if you stand by that argument that's fallacious. I said to you, you have the tools; \$75 million this year in net profit from the sale of liquor in Saskatchewan. You're prepared to give \$3.5 million back to the treatment of the disease and medical problems that are caused by that abuse of alcohol in Saskatchewan. You increase your budget by 10 per cent — stand pat — that not an increase in commitment; if you are prepared as you say you are to do what you can then get up here in this House like a man and make some thorough commitment to those members in Saskatchewan who have the honest desire to do something about this problem. The Alcoholism Commission has been crying to you for years for an increase in funds. You've got the ability to do that now. I say be man enough to stand up and live by your word and give them the increase in funding.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the member makes a great and pretending to be emotional speech about the thing. He makes the comment about the set-up of the Alcoholism Commission by the former Liberal government, agreed? Who is going to deny that? I certainly am not. But the difference is this and that is the difference between the Liberal and Conservative approach to developing programs and the approaches that we take. It's one thing to establish an Alcoholism Commission and it is another thing to give it sufficient increases in funding so it can do something. When the Liberals were in power sure they established an Alcoholism Commission, there were nice headlines and it was a good thing. I supported it then when I was a teacher and I support it now and I was on record, as a matter of fact, in my constituency even though I was not yet a candidate, by running for a nomination, saying that it was a good thing. But I just finished quoting some statistics to show you, member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan), that the members of your own former caucus who used to sit on this side of the House, after they established the Commission really provided very minimal increases for the funding that it had.

Now let me give you some other information which may be of assistance. It is true that there is an increase of the grant the Alcoholism Commission of 10.9 per cent, as I have indicated, of \$3.5 million. But that is not the only effort that is being made and I would hope that that would not be the only effort that the government would make because we are funding also through the Aware Program, of \$360 thousand, an increase of 8.5 per cent. We are funding through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan; we are funding through the Department of Education programs; through the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan; through the Medical Care Insurance Commission in the Department of Social Services, to use one example, and that is a considerable amount of funding.

Now, if we had the ideal level, it's true, we would be able to do the kinds of things that probably eventually we will be doing but you don't do that over night. You phase things in if you are responsible and that's what we have been doing. We have been phasing

things in and we have been expanding the delivery of services and we have been improving the programs that this province has had on alcoholism. If the member wants to compare to provinces that have a Liberal government or used to have Liberal government, I am prepared to do that too. I am prepared to make that comparison of what we are doing here to what is happening in Manitoba where there was a recent article in the Leader-Post that says that the Manitoba government has now read a recommendation from a secret committee or secret recommendations from a committee. You know these Tories have these secret committees that make secret recommendations saying that the funding for their Alcoholism Commission ought to be seriously reduced because it meddles in a lot of things, that they are not to be meddled in and that there should be no funding unless first there are an awful lot of complaints from somebody. That's not the approach that we are prepared to take as New Democrats, we are prepared to act and the record will show that we are acting.

Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chairman, one final set of comments. I'll tell you what your problem is, my sanctimonious friend and you had better go home and give it some sober second thought. This Alcoholism Commission and the problem of drug abuse in Saskatchewan is not a political football and for you to stand on your feet and try and make a political argument out of it is a shameful thing for you to do. My point to you was not political. I didn't bring up any political arguments to you. I said you had the tools to do a better job than you are doing today as the Minister of Health and I asked you if you were prepared to do more. Your answer to me has been, no. I fault you for that, not as a politician but as a Minister of Health. You have a serious health problem in Saskatchewan that you should be coping with in a more thorough manner than you are I say if you're not prepared to do that then you are at fault.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, it would appear that we are going to cover all of the Department of Health Estimates on Item 1 but I've got one problem that does circumvent maybe 1 or 2 and I would like to do a couple of short questions. First of all it has come to my attention that there is a serious morale problem in the Cancer Clinic or the Blair Institution or do you call it the Cancer Clinic in the city of Regina. And when I say a very serious problem I mean a serious problem, in other words, a complete deterioration it would appear of the morale of the staff which has resulted in firings and almost mass resignations when you consider that over 50 per cent of the staff has resigned in a very short period.

All of us are aware that the Alcohol Commission in Saskatchewan is a complete government monopoly unlike other provinces in Canada. When I say government monopoly I don't say it in a derogatory sense. I merely point out that what has happened that if somebody requires cancer treatment they don't go to a medical specialist or a medical clinic that is privately operated. They go to government cancer clinics and there they receive free treatment. The operation of the Cancer Clinic in Saskatchewan of course is done by the Cancer Commission which is not necessarily made up of medical people. In fact the medical advisors, as I understand it, are permitted very little input into the decisions of the Saskatchewan Cancer Clinic. Over the years this has worked very well and very successfully for the province of Saskatchewan and I think most Saskatchewan citizens are rather proud of the history and the background of the cancer treatment in the Cancer Clinic in the province of Saskatchewan.

It has come to my attention and first of all I am going to ask you some questions and before you get into your long harangue again would you give me some specific yes or no's and then I'll let you sit down and go into your normal harangue. I would like to point

out when you talk about the Alcohol Commission, when we became the government in 1963 you were given about \$35,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 with the most shameful and disgraceful item in the entire Department of Health estimates. If you would like to ask your friends there, your fellows at the background they'll verify those figures for you. So don't talk about the political arguments of how much money was given.

I want to ask you first of all, what was the reason that Dr. Peter Weldon, who was brought in here only a year ago, was asked to resign, or was fired I guess if you want to call it that, by the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission? From what I understand Dr. Weldon, I believe, from the United Kingdom, was here less than one year. He was brought in to head up this department and now has been dismissed. Can the minister give me the reasons why?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wouldn't want the statements of the member to go unclarified in some extent. I won't get into a political argument because I don't always do that. But he says that there have been firings at the Cancer Clinic and I am saying to him and to this House, there have not been firings at the Cancer Clinic. He says there have been mass resignations or there are about to be mass resignation . . . I'm not sure which he said. I want to assure him and the members of this House that as he said, yes, and my colleague, the Minister of Highways said he says, yes, that there have been. An unfortunate use of words because there have not been mass resignations at the Cancer Clinic in Regina. We are doing some considerable amount of work in this area. There is a new radio therapy building that is being built and I understand will be open this fall, a fairly significant expansion. We'll get around to your question but I think the information the public should know and you should know as well is there is also a complete renovation of the Cancer Clinic as part of the total Regina General Hospital regeneration which I think can be recognized as a very major commitment. I indicated the other day in the 1978-79 budget for the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission, there's approximately \$5.7 million. This represents an increase of 11.2 per cent over last year's figure. This budget also, for the interest of the member opposite has made provision for the purchase of a very important piece of equipment. That is \$170 has been provided to purchase a cobalt simulator. This device simulates the radio therapy which a patient will receive before a dosage is given and the cobalt simulator provides an exact reading of the tumour and body confirmation of individual patients. The cobalt simulator is considered valuable in treating tumours for safety and therapeutic reasons. I think I said \$170. I meant to say \$170,000.

Now, I just wanted to give that background because I don't want the impression left that the member tried to leave, or if he didn't mean to leave, or at least that's the impression I got that there is a neglect of cancer treatment. There is not and as the indications I have given, I think is a clear indication that that is the case. As I've said there have been no firings. The person the member talks about has been on probation as Director of the Cancer Clinic in Regina. In the wisdom of the board and the executive director of the Cancer Commission and the executive director, they have had discussions with him about whether he should continue as director. In their view, I understand, there is some question as to whether he should. That has not been a firing because those discussions are still continuing. I understand his clinical capability has never been questioned and continues not to be questioned and that is another thing that is part of the discussions that are being carried on between the Cancer Commission and the person that the member opposite speaks of.

Mr. MacDonald: — If you don't call that a firing, I don't know what it is . . . maybe you call it whatever you want. Could you answer me these questions. Now, first of all, am I

March 30, 1978

correct, is there 10 or is it 9 doctors in the Cancer Clinic in Regina? How many? How many? Without the speech . . . let's give . . .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Nine positions.

Mr. MacDonald: — Nine positions. Good. And we just talked about Peter Weldon, the acting director. Now is it true that Dr. Maddock has resigned and is leaving on April 14th? Is that true? Yes or no.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, it is true. He has resigned.

Mr. MacDonald: — Make your speech after.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No. I will make the speech because there has to be reasons. Dr. Maddock has resigned because he has taken on a new position, I understand in the United States, and that is considered to be in his view, and I think will be recognized by anybody in the field as a promotion. And so has chosen to take the new position that he has located.

Mr. MacDonald: — Now, tell me this, did Dr. Johnson leave at Christmas time, and did you pay her a \$10,000 settlement?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, that's correct, and there was a settlement in the area of \$10,000.

Mr. MacDonald: — Well, we got nine doctors and we have talked about three. Is it also true that Dr. Malyk is in the process of going to Australia and is now in the process of resigning. Is that true?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am told, to the best knowledge of the executive director, he has not resigned.

Mr. MacDonald: — But he is in the process of — maybe I will give you some news. What about Dr. Katakhar? I understand that he resigned and he is now gone.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, he took up a position in the United States.

Mr. MacDonald: — Maybe I should have used the words “more than mass resignations”. We talk of a clinic of nine people, all of a sudden we find that five of them, that's what, five-ninths. I would say that if I ran a business and I had five people out of nine resign or be removed from position, I would call that a ‘mass’. In fact, I would be very frightened that my business would be going straight down hill. I think that anyone in any kind of business, or department, if five out of nine of the officials of the Department of Health resigned tomorrow, I think that would be considered pretty ‘mass’ resignations. If I was also in the position where I had lost five out of nine, I would think it is incumbent upon me as a minister of a department, to try and find out why — to try and find out why. I think that there is some serious problem because I have talked to some of these people and they have indicated to me (and indicated to others), that all is not well and they were not very happy. They are not very happy simply because of the fact that for some reason or other, there would appear to be a conflict between the commission and the medical profession. I don't know what that problem is and I am not going to start rumours, but I am saying to you that when you have lost that many people, there has got to be a reason for it. I would suggest to the minister and the department

that they had better have a look at it. Saskatchewan over the years and traditionally, has done an excellent job in relation to cancer treatment for the citizens in the province, and the Blair Clinic has had a very high reputation and has done an excellent job. All of a sudden we find that there is a lot of people going. It would be very interesting to me and I think the minister should give us some kind of reason or explanation as to why these people are resigning, why they are moving on. Why, all of a sudden at this time and in a brief period (I know there is always movement within medical staff and within a department there is an annual turnover I suppose), but not a five-ninths. Whether the minister wants to admit it not, that is a pretty serious indication that there are some problems there. I would suggest that the minister immediately look into that, because if there is any deterioration in morale, or if there is unhappiness in that clinic, there is only one group of people who are going to suffer in Saskatchewan and those are the people who go there for treatment. That is why it is incumbent on the minister that he better have a look at it and see if he cannot find out what is wrong in that particular cancer clinic.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Last Mountain-Touchwood): — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might interrupt the proceedings of the House to introduce some students.

We have with us, from Williston, North Dakota, ten students of the science club there, visiting here in Saskatchewan and visiting us here in the House. I certainly think all members would want to welcome these students, both to our country and to our province and to our Legislature. I point out to the students and to their teacher, Mr. Larsen, that we are involved in debate on health estimates, and the speaker opposite is the member for the constituency of Indian Head-Wolseley, the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, and he is in debate with the Minister of Health, the member for the Humboldt constituency. We welcome you to Saskatchewan; we welcome you to this Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Health (continued)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, may I extend my welcome to the students as well. Directly now to the comments made by the member opposite, I want to, first of all, make it very clear that I have every confidence in the Cancer Commission of Saskatchewan and the work it is doing, and the capability of that commission and the staff to provide the highest quality of service in this field for this province, as it has a reputation of having done, since Saskatchewan pioneered some very significant work in the field of cancer, many years ago. It is a priority of the commission to recruit and recruitment is taking place to replace those people who have either resigned or are considering resigning because they have other interests that are attracting them and that is a very high priority. I might also point out that this problem is not unique to Saskatchewan (the problem of recruitment). There is some difficulty in recruitment but that same kind of difficulty exists in every other province of Saskatchewan because the expertise that is required and the specialization of highly qualified people that is required to do the work as required with the Cancer Commission is not that large in number. There is a tightness that way. It is not unusual to have a staff turnover in a place of employment and it should not be considered to be unusual to have a staff turnover in a place like the Cancer Commission. It is recognized, as I have said, there needs to be recruitment to fill those positions and that is taking place right now. In fact, I am informed there are two

doctors who are very soon being interviewed, who seem to show some very considerable talent.

Now, let me say also, in conclusion, that there is a continuing commitment to care for the cancer in the cancer field. The position established since 1977 was provided for 45; it was provided for 45 again in this particular Budget, so there is the continuing commitment. I might say that in February of 1977 there was a vacancy of three physicians, and in February of 1978 there was a vacancy of six physicians – not a very great increase. I think that there is no great problem. The commitment is there and we will see to it and I know the Cancer Commission will see to it that the reputation that the Cancer Commission of Saskatchewan has established in the provision of its services will be maintained.

Mr. MacDonald: — You do not think six out of nine is a very big turnover or a very big vacancy.

An Hon. Member: — Six out of 45.

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh, six out of 45. I wonder if the minister can tell me this. He still didn't tell me the reason why they resigned or why they left. Has the minister considered, in light of the resignations and the demotion of Dr. Weldon, and my information is that Dr. Weldon will not be with you for very long (I do not know if that is a fact or not) – I would like to ask the minister, has he considered a shake-up in the commission itself? When you consider the doctors who are providing the service – and after all that is the specific objective of the Cancer Commission, is to provide service and treatment for patients who have cancer – if the medical profession who provide that treatment are unhappy and are resigning as a result of it, has the minister considered a change or a shake-up in the Cancer Commission, or the director or any of the personnel in there to see if they can get at the root of the problem and see if they can't bring back a little better relationship, and assure and guarantee top quality cancer treatment for the citizens of Regina and southern Saskatchewan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, I want to remind the member that in 1971-72 I believe it was, the Johnston Study was done of the Cancer Commission and after that work and on the recommendation of the study there were some major changes in the Cancer Commission of Saskatchewan which are resulting in some changes now in the operation and in making sure the Cancer Commission is doing a good job.

I said earlier in reply directly to the member's question that I have confidence in the Cancer Commission and in spite of the allegations that the member opposite may make because there are some people who have resigned to go somewhere else, I don't agree with him.

Mr. G.N. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — I would like to go back to the Alcoholism Commission. You stated that over the last few years the grant for the Alcoholism Commission was raised 8.4 per cent, 9.9 per cent, 10.6 per cent. That is just the grant over the year before. Can you tell me what percentage of the liquor profit in 1977 was put forward to the Alcoholism Commission? In light of the study that was done by your government under Dr. Don Faris at that time when I think they recommended that 10 per cent of the liquor profits should be put towards the Alcoholism Commission or for the treatment of alcoholism in Saskatchewan, can you relate to me the percentage that the Alcoholism Commission gets in relation to the profit from the sale of booze, from Schenley?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, I can. First of all I think the member should make sure that he is clear in what he is imputing to others as having said. First of all the comment of the . . . the recommendation of the committee said as I recall it and I might be corrected on it, that there should be something like 10 per cent of the profits that come from the sale of liquor in Saskatchewan which should be directed towards alcohol treatment, not necessarily the commission. I am pleased to inform the member that we not only — I'm sorry that he wasn't listening before — we not only have achieved that but we have surpassed it in that 10.9 per cent — 10.6 per cent (I'm sorry, I wouldn't want to overstate it) of the profits from alcohol, the Liquor Board and so on, indeed are directed towards alcoholism and alcoholism treatment and the prevention of alcoholism in the province of Saskatchewan. As I indicated, with the patterns that have been established over the last several years, that percentage has indeed been increasing, because in 1977-78 that was only 8.4 per cent. Don't say, only, because compared to other years that was very significant. In 1977-78 it was 9.9 per cent. We are budgeting this year for 10.6 per cent so there is a continuing pattern of increase and I think the significance of that should not be lost sight of.

Mr. Wipf: — Well, it is obvious, Mr. Minister, that you weren't listening to the last question because I asked you what percentage over the last three years has the Alcoholism Commission got in relation to the percentage of the amount of profit that was brought in from the sale of alcohol in Saskatchewan, not how much money was spent in every other area.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, once again, I have the gross figures and we could work them out, but I think it is more appropriate if that kind of specific question was asked under the subvote. When we get to the subvote by that time we will have it worked out. We are on subvote 1 and although I don't mind getting into debate on subvote 1, because there are a few things I might want to say yet, I think if we want to effectively deal with this it is better dealt with under the subvote. We will get the information. We can work it out.

Mr. Wipf: — You are talking about your 10.6 per cent this year. That is the 10.6 per cent of the profits from the sales of alcohol, gross of the Alcoholism Commission, the Aware Program, DNS, Social Services, Health and Education and all that. When we get to that subvote I would like a breakdown for each department and who is handling it and how it is handled.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes.

Mr. Wipf: — The other question that I wanted to bring up on this, and I will get into more in the subvote, is in your Alcoholism Commission annual report are the directors the same today as they were in this report where you had 13?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, they are.

Mr. Wipf: — Why do you have directors from Alberta on the Alcoholism Commission in Saskatchewan then? I do agree that it is a very good idea to get somebody in there with some common sense but you do have somebody in here from Alberta, that lives in Alberta now. Is this the new direction that the Alcoholism Commission is taking, is to bring people in from Alberta to sit on your commission?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Who?

Mr. Wipf: — Carruthers.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Dvernichuk here assures me that to the best of our knowledge Mr. Carruthers is a resident of Saskatchewan. He happens to be a contractor. He still maintains his home as being in Saskatoon. He is a contractor. The fact that he happens to have the kind of occupation that takes him to Alberta from time to time, because he has a contract there, should not, as a citizen of this province, negate the opportunity for him to serve on the Alcoholism Commission. So I want to assure the member that as far as I am aware, Mr. Carruthers is a citizen of Saskatchewan and maintains his place of residence in this province. And, further, having known Mr. Carruthers to some extent, having got to know him since I became the minister, I know that he happens to make a very major contribution to the Alcoholism Commission and if the member thinks otherwise, I wish he would say so.

Mr. Wipf: — You are right, Mr. Minister. It is a shame to lose him to Alberta because he is one in there that does have a lot of common sense and a lot of know-how. But I believe that you are a little mixed up there, that he may have contracts in Saskatchewan, living in Alberta.

I received a letter the other day, Mr. Minister, and I am just wondering if you have any more on it, over the problem that has arisen up in the Prince Albert area with the Picada and the council on alcohol and drug abuse and the Metis Society in the Max Centre up there? I was under the impression that this was going on pretty good and we ran into a big of a snag. Maybe this isn't the place to discuss this. It has been a little premature on it. Have you had any contact with the Max Centre in the last couple of days, or have your people had any contact to sort of settle this out?

Mr. Chairman: — I should like to caution members that basically we are dealing with the areas including the Alcoholism Commission vote, which is Item 23. I would caution members to limit their discussion to that when that item comes up. We are setting a bad precedent here by dealing under subvote 1, a lot of items that are dealt with later in the estimates.

Mr. Wipf: — O.K. Mr. Chairman, I respect that. Mr. Minister, last summer we had some problems in the Prince Albert area and I am wondering today how far along the Department of Health is with the prenatal monitoring equipment that was requested for the Holy Family Hospital in Prince Albert?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, that's an SHSP subvote and the kind of thing that I think is more appropriately asked under that subvote.

Mr. Wipf: — Well, I understand you're the minister in charge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order! I'm going to rule that question out of order. I think that question would be more properly put under that subvote. Although we have set some precedent in terms of allowing discussions or individual items I think that we should limit our remarks to the general estimates of health and when we have specific questions that are applied to a specific subvote then I think we should address our questions at that time to the minister.

Mr. McMillan: — A question to the Minister of Health with respect to a problem that

has arisen in the Loon Lake area with regard to the consumption of Lysol as an intoxicant by some of the local people there and the kind of pressure that local medical staff had hoped that the Department of Health could bring on someone to correct that problem. I'm wondering if you have washed your hands of the problem or if you are quite convinced that you are in a position now where you can't do anything about it, or what your situation is with respect to that particular problem?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, I just wanted to see if there was anything more recent from what I had had prior to this to the question. I want the member to know as we have made it clear in interviews that I have had with press people in Saskatoon and in Meadow Lake, when I was there recently to visit with the hospital and even more precisely to ask about this particular problem, that we have had a concern about it and we have been meeting and speaking to our regional health people there and medical people involved. My staff has met with Mr. Hodges from Sterling Drugs who has had consultations with the wholesalers, who have agreed to restrict the supply of Lysol products to some extent. But I suppose even more important than that we have approved as a government some significant amendments to the liquor legislation. I forget precisely which act it is which will go further in trying to meet this problem that exists there from the point of view of enforcement. So we have not been sitting idly by, we have been trying to deal with what is a very difficult problem and I'm pleased to say that we are implementing certain things, with the co-operation of other people, that hopefully will have some significant impact.

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — I realize I may get ruled out of order and I hope I don't but tuberculosis has a special heading but my questions are rather general and affect the general administration. You announced that you were closing the last sanatorium in the province.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, we did not announce that.

Mr. Katzman: — What did you announce re Saskatoon sanatorium and that you are closing it down and moving the patients elsewhere?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, that's precisely what I said, Mr. Chairman. We have not announced the closing of the sanatorium. We have announced and I believe I have some information here that the member may find useful to him but we have indicated that we are going to be from this year on providing treatment of tuberculosis patients in general hospitals. The Saskatchewan Sanatorium for the treatment of TB which is the last one will cease to operate in 1978 as treatment for TB. It will not cease to operate as a facility because as the member knows there is a substantial number of level IV patients there. That's the word 'close' that I sometimes argue with because it leaves the wrong interpretation. The history of TB in Saskatchewan and the efforts made by the TB League have brought around a situation now where there is a very low incidence of numbers of people who contact and get TB in the province now. There are only nine beds that are available for TB at the Saskatoon Sanatorium and the actual number of patients has been even lower in recent months. I was there about a month and a half ago and spoke to the patients who were there and at the time, I believe there were only three. And so we can provide an adequate service, maybe even a better service, through our hospitals and that's what the announcement was.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: — Any other further questions dealing specifically with tuberculosis sanatoria should be dealt with under Item 2.

Mr. Katzman: — You're going to move these into hospitals now, you said. Could you tell me any hospital specifically or all hospitals?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: — We'll ask the member for Rosthern to put that question under Item 2.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, I'm asking about hospitals that are going to accept them, not about tuberculosis sanatoria any more. I'm asking, he said, they are going to move them into hospitals, I'm saying what hospitals and where? We're onto a different vote on a general item, I believe.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If it will help, Mr. Chairman, I'll answer that. We are negotiating with hospitals to determine which hospitals this will take place at the present item, so I cannot indicate which ones.

Mr. Katzman: — Could it be . . . are you negotiating with one of them being the University Hospital in Saskatoon? And how many beds are you negotiating for? How many beds are trying to negotiate for? Nine? Or more or less?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Once again, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to co-operate but you know, I wish the Conservative member would learn the procedures of this House. That is once again a question that should be better asked under the particular subvote that concerns it and I can provide that answer but I think we could cover the whole Department of Health and all the subvotes under subvote 1. Now, if the Conservative members want to delay this House for whatever motives they have, or may have, for wanting to delay it, I think the Attorney General outlined a couple of weeks ago, very lucidly and very well. That's their business but I think that's not a good use of taxpayers' money and it's not a good use of this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: — I caution members, once again, if they . . . order, order. I'm going to caution members once again, that when they are dealing with the Health Estimates and the question pertains to a specific item, I'm going to ask them to put that question under that item.

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to you in reference to a point of order, I've never known that it be a rule before and I don't think it is a rule and I believe it's obvious the rather silly reason that the Conservatives are delaying the House and asking the stupid questions they ask but nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that because of the rather curious logic of the Conservative members that you should now lay or attempt to lay down a rule that has never been a rule. The opposition is entitled to ask any question they like on subvote 1 and that's what the opposition is seeking to do. And to try and limit it that way, I suggest to you is unfair and there's no precedent for trying to limit questioning in the manner that you're trying to limit it now and the minister is trying to limit it and dictate to the House.

Mr. Romanow: — Point of order.

Mr. Chairman: — Point of order raised by the Attorney General.

Mr. Romanow: — I'd like to speak on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps it's not worth speaking to it if you are already prepared to make your ruling but, Mr. Chairman, I think that the member for Indian Head will support me in this. Perhaps that's calling a wrong ally but for the time that I've been in this House, vote number one on estimates is

designed to deal with the general policy of the department. Number one has never been used as the mechanism to ask for specific detailed questions which can be covered under the specific subvotes and I think that's the clear ruling and they can have vote one for as long as they want, I don't care about that, personally I don't think the minister cares about that but it does make a mockery out of estimates, if you start going for example, Alcoholism Commission. All right, that's perhaps a bad example but there's a vote for Alcoholism Commission, you can raise all the questions for five days under Alcoholism Commission, you got something on a sanatorium, that's a vote for five days but you can't do it on vote number 1, so I would respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that that's the ruling you should make and respectfully urge the members of the House to try and follow the rules as best as they can otherwise this thing is going to deteriorate into a shambles.

Mr. Chairman: — The rules are fairly clear in this regard. Any general questions that you have can be placed under Item 1 and there's no intention of the Chair to limit debate on Item 1. However, questions dealing with a specific item, specific subvote must be placed under that subvote and that rule has clear for a number of years in this Legislature. And I would ask members co-operation once again and if they have specific vote under a certain item that they should direct that question to the minister under that item. And it's not the intention of the Chair at any time to limit debate on subvote 1.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments that I would like to make and some questions on a different topic to the Minister of Health. From time to time members reminisce a bit about the amount of time that they have been in the House; certainly being a member in the House for three years I've heard a great deal of discussion on Item 1 of the bill, some rather awkward questions and be that as it may, I want to enter into a different topic with the minister, something which I have been doing some research on and was hoping that by the time that the Health Budget Estimates were up I would have some more information. It is in an area which I don't know whether the Department of Health in Saskatchewan has done any studies and that is in the whole area of sound and how the sound is affecting the health of the individual and so on. It is very interesting looking at a study conducted by some research people in the state of Texas and some of the information they have, trying to piece it together and get some information out of Saskatchewan as well.

I notice that out of the PMI, the Prairie Machinery Institute at Humboldt, they have ascertained that there was a safety level for sound measured in decibels within say the cab of a combine or the cab of a tractor. I just can't remember offhand just what that decibel level is. However, in looking at some of the studies which are currently being conducted under the various departments of health on this continent we find a growing concern about this as a health problem. We find a growing concern in our factories, in our machine plants and in our public places as well. Do we have any surveys, any research going on within the department in this one factor of health in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the member raises a very valid issue and concern and I want to deviate from the particular question for just a second to say that I am most pleased that he compliments the tremendous work that is being done by the Agricultural Machinery Institute at Humboldt. I consider it a very valuable facility for the farmers of Saskatchewan and also a facility whose employees have made a very major contribution to the community of Humboldt.

Now on the question of the sound and whether there has been any research done, I

understand that there has been and continues to be some work in that field. It is being done under the occupational health area which is in the Department of Labour and I understand from the Blues here that under subvotes 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the Department of Labour that is where the funding is allocated and although I would not be able to give you specific answers to questions because it is over there, I am quite confident, from what I understand, that there indeed has been some work that's done in that field.

Mr. Bailey: — Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Department of Health in itself . . . now we have the problem when we get into this by cross-over departments that we have already seen happen in the House today under the Health Occupation Act and so on. Is the Department of Health at the present time conducting any studies in this particular field? Is it of extreme importance and it is of growing importance to the general public.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, the Department of Health is not continuing any studies in this field because — I suppose if I just give you a personal thought — for the same reasons exactly that you have mentioned, that we have consolidated and put that effort into the Department of Labour so that there is not the overlapping and the duplication. That is where it is being done, in the Department of Labour under occupational health.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, is it because the Department of Labour — and I am not criticizing the studies that they make — after it reaches a certain decibel there must be certain protective devices for their ears and so on but the Department of Labour does not enter into the picture when it comes to such public places as theatres, other areas of entertainment, where there is no control in Saskatchewan whatsoever on the decibel level of the sound in a public place. That belongs to the Department of Health and not the Department of Labour and I would like to have a comment from the minister on that before I proceed with further questions.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Most of the risks that the member speaks of are in work-related situations, although there are certainly other cases. I suppose in certain dance situations you would find a considerable amount of that risk around, but the research that may be done through the occupational health in the Department of Labour can extend itself beyond the occupation-related situations because the statistics and the information would apply. If there are certain levels that can be harmful and are harmful, those levels would apply here as well as they would apply in some other situations.

Mr. Bailey: — I'm glad to hear the minister say that because that is exactly what the findings in a number of areas in the United States has found — that the levels which apply, say to the factory situation which we consider to be a danger level, and here in Saskatchewan we do nothing about it as it relates to a public place. The minister kind of . . . I know what he was alluding to. He was referring to some dance situations and so on which has become an increasing problem with me. We get a great deal of complaints. The fact is in one of the findings which I didn't realize we were going to be in today. It should be pointed out that in a number of public places where the decibel level of sound exceeded that of the factory by four times, and yet no restrictions in public safety or public health is being placed. It is of a growing concern, Mr. Minister, that we have no controls in Saskatchewan; none whatsoever. The amount of the decibel level within a private place, a theatre or a dance hall can go as high as it likes but there is no legal limit; there is no control by your department or any other department to control it. What I am suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, let's not evade the issue. If it is for the health or safety of the man or woman who is working in a factory that they can exceed a certain decibel for health reasons, then surely it must apply to public places of entertainment

as well. I would like your comment on that. If under the Health Occupation Act if we are so concerned and rightly so — I'm not criticizing it — that a man or woman who is working in a factory and say the level (I'll use the figure of 90 decibels) beyond that is a health hazard to the individual, well then surely that same type of legislation should be applied to public places such as theatres and dance halls. If it is a hazard here to one's hearing, then it obviously has to be a hazard in another public place. What I'm saying, in Saskatchewan as in most of Canada (I don't know of any place in Canada that has it) there are certainly places on the North American continent that do in fact have controls, and I'm wondering if you would not agree with that, that if it is a hazard in one place it has to be a hazard in another place.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If it is discerned that is a significant enough hazard, certainly I am prepared as one individual member of the government (and I know the government would be prepared to take a pretty good look at it). Once again . . . you know, maybe there is a difference. I'm not saying that a hazard isn't a hazard no matter where it is; indeed it is. But maybe there is a difference between a 'half' situation where Mr. Bailey can go by choice, and the situation in a work place where you don't have a choice — you're there; that's your job and therefore there is a responsibility on the part of employees and employers — the employer, to see that certain occupational hazards are not there.

We have situations in the past where I think it indicated that we needed the kind of occupational health legislation which this government passed just a few short years ago. I agree with you; I think it is good legislation and it is doing an adequate job. All kinds of questions related to these things obviously are under constant review and if it is thought that some other action needs to be taken either to increase its scope or to meet a particular problem, we are certainly prepared to look at it.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, does your department or has your department any mechanism, any decibel reading machines for which they have taken a reading other than the readings which the Department of Labour take? Has the Department of Health ever looked at the decibel reading in a public building where, say a dance is going on, to get the level?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to know, the reason I am a little late in answering the question. I wanted to know where the department in the knowledge of the people here has ever received a complaint or request to do this kind of a test in a particular place. I am informed that to the best of their knowledge we have never had a request, which I was kind of interested in. Certainly, the Department of Health is a part of the same government as the Department of Labour and the equipment of the Department of Labour occupational health might have, would be available either to the Department of Labour or that they would, on request, be prepared to do the kind of work that is necessary.

In the Hearing Aid Plan there is testing equipment, I am informed, that is available. If a request was made to us we would be, I believe, in fact would be prepared to pursue the request.

Mr. Bailey: — Just in summing up, I appreciate the answers of the minister. Mr. Minister, I am not questioning the fact that you say you haven't had a request, but I can assure you that this is becoming a very serious problem because of the number of questions and the number of controversies that we get into, and it is not just in my area, it is all

over the province.

I want to leave this suggestion with the minister and hope that he would provide me with some assurance that the Department of Health, in the coming year, would perform certain exploratory work.

First of all would it be possible for the Department of Health to ascertain that sometime in the next year, that they could, together with other governments across North America, issue a statement as to what is considered by the various Department of Health as being a safe decibel sound level for the safety of the individuals. I think that is becoming more and more important and at the same time. I think that they should take some spot readings, spot readings within factories, spot readings within public places, spot readings within theatres and so on. I do think that you do have a responsibility to people of all ages. I ask the minister if he can give some commitment, at this time, that during this coming year that we can take a look at a very serious problem in this aspect of health. Go to a factory and get the level there; go to a machine shop and get the level there; take a reading at various public places and get together with other ministers and other departments of Health across North America and see if we can not, in fact, establish a safe sound level for the safety of all people, young and old.

I am convinced that damage has been done; I am convinced that damage is being done. I think it is incumbent upon the Department of Health to make that commitment this time, not for myself, but rather for the people of the province. I would like to hear the minister make that commitment. I have no further questions on that topic.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I will take that under consideration.

Mr. Collver: — Yesterday, in this Assembly, I requested that the Minister of Health provide to this Assembly the report for SHSP for the current year under review and he informed me that somehow the year end had been changed. We discovered that, of course, it had been changed by Order in Council, the year end of SHSP. The reason, of course, that the year end had been changed has not been made clear to this Assembly. Now, the minister, yesterday, made some allusion to the fact that it was necessary to bring the SHSP report into line with the budgetary normal fiscal year end of hospital boards in the province of Saskatchewan. That sounds like a fairly reasonable reason on the surface.

I would, however, like to ask the minister, if he has done the change of year end of SHSP, why then would he not change the year end of the MCIC?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, to answer the member's question is quite simple. It was done for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to bring hospitals in line with the budgeting period of the government. It was done with the complete co-operation and in fact encouragement, of the hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan. It was done in complete co-operation with the ten provinces of Canada, so that it is a uniform practice across this country, which I think is also good. It was done in order to do away with some difficulties that used to exist under the old procedure. Under the old system, where the year was a calendar year, hospitals had to wait from January 1 for several months (while they were trying to establish their budgets), until the provincial budget was passed through this Legislature. They won't have to do that any more. They will be able to receive, as I indicated yesterday, all that information and be ready within a very short period after the fiscal year of the province begins, because their fiscal year will be the same. So, the reasons are really quite simple and it seems to

me that the only people who seemed to be concerned about it, as the member of the Conservative party across the way, and I am sorry, the member from Indian Head-Wolseley – I shouldn't leave him out here.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, the minister has outlined with some dexterity and validity, the fact that he has attempted to bring the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan into line with other provinces in Canada as to their year end, and to bring the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan into line with the year end of the Saskatchewan Hospitals. I don't quite follow the minister's line of reasoning however, in suggesting that hospital boards would be better able to determine the position from last year, in so far as the budget for next year is concerned, when we are reporting on SHSP. I would remind the minister that, generally speaking, it takes something in the order of three months to receive the reports from the minister and from his department, for the previous year end. I would think that it would be of some advantage to the Saskatchewan hospital boards, to be able to take a look at the SHSP results from last year, which report they will receive approximately the first week in April, if they had a December 31 year end. Now it is right then that the Saskatchewan hospital boards have their year end, March 31 – so they have the results now from the previous year of the SHSP, and they can examine their own results at the same time. What the minister is now saying is that, both SHSP and the hospital boards, are going to have year ends at precisely the same date. So that it is going to take the hospital boards (because, generally speaking, they are a little more efficient than the Government of Saskatchewan), it is going to take them maybe a month, maybe six weeks, to get their results known. They are going to be able to have their financial statements for their board members within six weeks or so. Their statements are for the hospital boards, SHSP will have to wait until June to get that report. Of what possible advantage is that to the local hospital boards, I ask the minister? Now certainly, certainly it would be of some interest, I would think, for the hospital boards to govern their year ends and their requirements the same as that of the Government of Saskatchewan. I wasn't asking the question of the minister as to why he changed the year end of SHSP to March 31. But it makes one wonder, Mr. Chairman, when they do not change the year end of MCIC; because MCIC also makes substantial payments and grants to hospitals and associations in the province of Saskatchewan. They also do it. And they expend some \$70 million of the people of Saskatchewan's money – a very substantial portion of which goes to employees of hospitals, such as pathologists, such as radiologists, such as other medical personnel who are employed by hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan. It would be handy, I would think, for the local hospital boards to be able to determine using the minister's own logic, what portion of their revenue is going to come from MCIC on the same year end basis and what it makes one wonder, Mr. Chairman, is this – does the new Minister of health who just took over his portfolio a short time ago have something to hide from the minister before or conversely has he fouled up so badly that he has something to hide for himself?

Mr. Chairman, all we are asking for in this Assembly is the necessary information for all of us to do our jobs. Now the member for Saskatoon Centre, he does not want to do his job as it refers to health care. He wants to take a brand new minister's word, been in the department less than a year, take his word on faith, Mr. Chairman. He is prepared to go back to his constituents, the member for Humboldt, go back to his constituents and say to them, now look here, we have expended some \$420 million of your money. We haven't seen any results of the major item of expenditure in that health care budget. There have been questions, Mr. Chairman, raised in the constituency of Humboldt. There have been questions raised in the Assembly as to whether or not the allocation for health care, whether or not the allocation is sufficient to meet the needs. This

sufficiency has been questioned. Now the member for Humboldt may say that because we are in the same party, I can believe this fellow, but if he is to do his job as an individual MLA, surely he must expect his ministers within his caucus the same as anyone on this side of the House expects the minister to present statistical information as it relates to results of last year in relation to an examination of the expenditures for next year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the suggestion or ask the minister this question. Presumably the next report that is to be filed for SHSP will be for a 15-month period. I would like to ask the minister why it is not possible for his officials to produce an interim statement for his year for the period ended December 31st, 1977?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never said that it was not possible to produce any interim statement that has never been raised and I never knew because the minister opposite has never suggested that that is what he was looking for. Now, I'm sure that with some putting together of information, we can give a statement up to December 31st, 1977. Keep in mind it will be a rough statement, keep in mind it will not have any auditor's statement attached, keep in mind it will not have the audited statements that we require from the hospitals in Saskatchewan before we can put together the final report and that's why it takes some time after the end of the fiscal year to provide that information. Certainly we will pursue the member's request and endeavour and I'm quite confident that we can provide some of that interim statement that he asks about.

Now, let me also while I'm on my feet, make some other comments. He made some comment about why SHSP and not, MCIC and I'm really quite amazed at that total lack of understanding. A complete and total lack of understanding by the member for Nipawin about the health system in Saskatchewan and the funding of it.

I'm sure that most people in Saskatchewan who didn't sit in this Legislature as we all do and the member has in 1975 could tell you that the Medical Care Insurance Commission does not provide funding to hospitals as the member just finished saying; and the member said that the Medical Care Insurance Commission provides payments to physicians, it provides payments to chiropractors and the funding of our hospitals comes through the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. The two are unrelated when it comes to the fiscal year and the calendar year. I want the member to know that whether the annual report is tabled now or is tabled in June doesn't make any difference on the allocation of funding for our hospitals, as the member also insinuated. Now, he should take those facts into consideration. I also want to point out that during the time before this year when hospitals were on the calendar year, they had to have their budgets ready for that calendar year as of January 1, but they could not get an allocation of the funding until after April of that year. They had to wait several months. On their request and with their co-operation we have changed that so that their fiscal year is our fiscal year in the province of Saskatchewan and so that their waiting period is not several months. I indicated yesterday that the allocations will be determined by about the middle of April, two weeks from the beginning of this fiscal year instead of several months, as it used to be. So there is a benefit to the hospitals and it is not related, as I said, to the Medical Care Insurance Commission. Now I know that the member knows that; I suspect he does, Mr. Chairman, I really do. I think he does, as he has done in this House on so many occasions, tries to take up time talking about irrelevancies and pretending he does not understand, because he wants to portray something that is not the case to the public. That's a technique the Conservatives have been known to use in this House ever since they came here. There is all kinds of

evidence as far back as 1975 to indicate that. Let me just give you some examples of the misleading kind of approach the Conservatives have taken in this Legislature.

You know, for the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) to say, as he did yesterday, and to move a resolution, that estimates of Health should not be considered until the annual report was tabled, was almost, almost, Mr. Chairman, I am not an expert on the rules, but it was almost an indication of contempt for this Legislature – almost, because he knew that legislation was passed last year changing the fiscal year . . .

Mr. Collver: — No . . .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, you did, you voted on it and if you didn't, your members of the caucus who were here should have informed you that they voted on it and on the records there is no indication of any opposition from those members on the vote to that change. Now, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Collver: — A point of order . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Point of order.

Mr. Collver: — The minister is not now telling the facts as they exist, as they are. The fact is that the change in the year end for the Department of Health was changed by an Order in Council and the change in the ability of the department to change its year end was a bill that was acted against very vociferously by the Progressive Conservative caucus.

Mr. Chairman: — I don't think that the Chair can be expected to rule on a question of fact and I think it is a point of debate.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell the member once again and he uses the same technique as he just used, that the amendments to the legislation that are involved here were passed on November 14, 1977 right in this Legislature and the other act. The Union Hospital Act in April of 1977. I might mention to the member opposite that on the Union Hospital Act there wasn't one word of opposition expressed by the members opposite on those changes. I am not talking about the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) because I know what he said. I am talking about the gentleman over there. It is rather strange for the member to get up and make the statement that he has just made because it was legislation and in the speeches on the legislation it was pointed out what was going to happen. Don't say it was just Order in Council. Indeed there was an Order in Council was passed, exactly three of them. But don't say there was no legislation because there was. Mr. Chairman, if the member opposite does not pay enough attention to this House to know what a certain legislation does, then I suggest he is not carrying out the responsibilities as the leader of a caucus and I notice that some of the members opposite in the press seem to be making that expression already anyway, so I am not alone in that assumption.

Let me give you some other examples about the techniques that the Conservative caucus has been trying to use in this legislature which are exactly the same as the member opposite is doing right now. That was only one. But what about the debate last year during Health estimates on allegations by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) about the filthy hospitals in Saskatchewan? That was a very interesting debate because not only were those allegations made on the basis of no truth at all,

even though he got up in this House and said that he would provide to us tons of evidence. He was challenged to provide those reams of evidence and you know, Mr. Chairman, this is now March 30, 1978 and we are still waiting. We are still waiting. He made these insinuations, he got the headlines, he cast a reflection on hospital and hospital workers in Saskatchewan which was wrong and then he thought that that was all. But there was a hearing in this session, in this House, and there was a witness brought in here and there was a resolution and I forget whether it was moved by the Attorney General or the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please! I think we are straying far from the estimates we are dealing with right at the present and I cannot see where last year's estimates enter into it at all. I think we are dealing with the present estimates and that's what I want you to keep to.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm prepared to accept your ruling, of course. If I have strayed and if in your decision I have strayed, I'm prepared to accept that, except I want to say all I was trying to do is give some examples related to the comments that the member has been making yesterday and again today about the past which indicates that the techniques that they have been using are no different. They are not interested in the facts because they are only interested in leaving an impression. Well I'm prepared to give them the facts. I've explained why we have changed the fiscal year for the Saskatchewan hospitals which resulted in the changing of the timing of the tabling of the annual report and because it will now be tabled or it will now be put together after the end of the fiscal year. We have to wait for the hospitals to provide their audited statements after the end of March and as soon as they are there we will provide it. In the meantime as the member has requested whether we can provide an interim statement much similar to an annual report to the end of 1977, I can tell the member I'm quite confident we can provide that and we will put it together for him.

Mr. Bailey: — For the past 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman, the minister has been discussing techniques which is somewhat unrelated to the topic. I would like to discuss with him and I can assure you it's not going to take me 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman, the relationship of some of the techniques that he and his colleagues use. I think it has to be perfectly in order for me to do so, if it was perfectly in order for him to do so. Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! I asked the hon. members and I drew to his attention and I called him to order on it. Certainly you, as hon. members, at least I consider you hon. members or you wouldn't be in the positions you are in, sometimes I wonder what your constituencies would think. But I ask you to try and co-operate with the House, to do the best we can and I am calling both sides to order as I see them. I've been lenient with both sides and I ask you — I've been lenient with both sides. I will repeat it and I ask you to try and work to the betterment of this House and the betterment of legislation and the better for legislation for the people of the province. Again, if you have something to speak on, O.K., otherwise Item 1 agreed.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Chairman, we were discussing the techniques as related to the Health budget and I suggest to you that when your Minister of Health talks about techniques used he was making reference to this particular caucus of which I am a member. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, in all respect that I also have a responsibility in the area of techniques not only to defend the caucus but to make some statements of my own. Certainly, a good example for the minister and not only the minister but other members and colleagues related to health. The Minister of Health, along with other

members opposite, have gone about this province related to health stating definitely, no ifs and buts about it, stating definitely that a member of this caucus, namely myself, advocated in this House a \$10 deterrent fee on entering into the hospital. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the techniques which he is using. I never . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! I have let you have a few words the same as I did the gentleman from the other side, the hon. member and now I ask you to return to Item 1 and deal with Item 1. If you are through with it let's go on to the next one.

Mr. Collver: — I would like to suggest to the Minister of Health, when it comes to the presentation of information, that it is not only in this Assembly that information is presented, but in ads and advertisements. We certainly would be happy to table advertisements by the party of the members opposite, which stated categorically, which misquoted our member for Rosetown-Elrose totally as it related to \$10 deterrent fees. I think this is particularly apropos on Item 1 of the Health estimates, because at no time did our member for Rosetown-Elrose advocate a \$10 deterrent fee. At no time! Mr. Chairman, may I continue . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Then continue on Item 1 . . . not on something that happened last year in estimates.

Mr. Collver: — I can continue on Item 1 with reference to the Health Plan in Saskatchewan. I can categorically state, for the members opposite, that my caucus and the progressive Conservatives in the province of Saskatchewan at no time have advocated deterrent fees. Furthermore, at no time have advocated deterrent fees and any suggestion to the contrary is quite simply untrue. I can also state, categorically, Mr. Chairman, that it is the policy of our party that we are not in favor of deterrent fees; we do not support deterrent fees or premiums as do the NDP, Mr. Chairman. They wish to retain deterrent fees in . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! You have had your chance at it now. I will take the next speaker.

Mr. Collver: — I would like to question the minister.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, but not a continuation on in the same vein as you have.

Mr. Collver: — Oh, I am not allowed to talk about deterrent fees in Item 1, Mr. Chairman? May I talk about deterrent fees in Item 1?

Mr. Chairman: — You can talk about deterrent fees, but not of last year.

Mr. Collver: — May I outline the policy of my party in Item 1?

Mr. Chairman: — Item 1 is estimates that you are dealing with in general terms. There are no policies in it here.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that in Item 1 that the Health Care Estimates, it is the opportunity for the opposition to present their policies; that the policies of the Department of Health in the province of Saskatchewan as it relates to the Pharmacare program, as it relates to the cutback in hospital allocation this year, which is going to necessitate, Mr. Chairman, local hospital boards having to increase their

assessments. Local hospital boards are going to have to increase their assessment on property, and that is a deterrent fee, for those local hospital boards such as the Nipawin Union Hospital, that is going to be caught in the box because of this budget, that is going to have to increase, unfortunately, to their members, to the people who use that hospital. User pay, is what the NDP say.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest in the Department of Health, that's the policy of the Department of Health, it is not our policy. We do not believe in those deterrent fees, not in the kind of deterrent fees that negates the sick from seeking a reasonable kind of system that they have ready access to.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to you that in June of 1973, I suggested the removal of the hospital care premium in Saskatchewan, the medicare premium and Mr. Smishek the then Minister of Health said it couldn't be done. It was impossible he said and six months later, six months later, Mr. Chairman, in exchange for a by-election which they didn't win, but in exchange for that he removed the hospital care premium.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just comment on a few of the answers provided by the minister pertaining to MCIC. He said that no one on this side of the House knew anything about it. Well we have trouble reading, I know, but here is a statement of receipts and payments – this is typical of the minister, Mr. Chairman, statement of receipts and payments of the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission annual report 1977.

I direct the minister's to page 18, if he can read 18. And, Mr. Chairman, I direct him to an item approximately four inches down which says – the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance fund paid to the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan some \$2,249,690. Now the minister might say - \$2 million is nothing to his government, but \$2 million I say for the benefit of the Attorney General, \$2 million is a great deal. He scoffed once before when we talked about \$2 million for the Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan paid by MCIC, then I would like to direct the minister's attention to page 90 of that same report and at the top it says – registration services paid by MCIC, who to – Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, some \$320,000. My goodness, another \$300,000 – why that's peanuts the minister said. Well, who cares, in \$255,000,000, who care about \$300,000 the minister says. Who cares about 2.2 million the minister says.

Mr. Chairman, on the same page, Data Processing Services, Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, another \$81,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are those in the province of Saskatchewan who are – and I'm coming around now to exactly why we raised this matter yesterday and today. There are those in the province of Saskatchewan, I say to the minister, who are very interested in the allocation by the present government to the community clinics in Saskatchewan. Now, the community clinics receive their money from two sources. They receive their money, as the Minister of Health said last year, the member for Saskatoon Nutana stated, from two sources, I recall him saying. It comes from MCIC and it comes from SHSP. And last year when we were going through the estimates, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure you will, that in attempting to put together how much money was paid by the Government of Saskatchewan to the community clinics in Saskatchewan and how much was allocated on a per doctor basis. Mr. Chairman, what we found out

last year was that for the community clinics, it was over \$100,000 per doctor but for the doctors on fee-for-service it was something over \$50,000 per doctor. Oh, the minister's going to recall now, that he stated during those questions that physiotherapy was paid by the community clinics and other such. So we deducted from those payments that amount, and the minister was finally able to agree that somewhere around \$90,000 per doctor, well, we can look at the record, Mr. Minister, \$90,000 per doctor was paid to the community clinics and some \$48,000 or thereabouts, for the doctors who worked on fee-for-service. And I notice that the Deputy Minister of Health is smiling. He remembers that conversation as well. Now, this year in estimates, I'd like to know, from the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista, I think I got it right this time, which are you doing now, crying or smiling? We can never tell from looking at you, what you're doing. It's always the same. It's always the same. Mr. Chairman, this year, it is impossible for the members on this side of the House . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order!

Mr. Collver: — Is this the leniency for both sides, Mr. Chairman? Thank you very much. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, impossible for the members in the opposition to determine what has been paid to the community clinics in the previous year. It's not possible. And here's why, Mr. Chairman. Here's why. On page 18 of the statement of receipts and disbursements for Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission, it states that in the year ended December 31, 1977, MCIC paid to the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan on behalf of the community clinics some \$2,249,000 but that, Mr. Chairman, is not all that the community clinics received from the Department of Health. Community clinics receive a substantial amount from the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. Is it the minister's intention to hide this information from the questioning of this House? When the minister presents this information in the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan report they don't divide it up on a per doctor basis; they don't deduct those items that might be covered under the Department of Social Services in other areas or by other departments in other areas; they don't deduct the physiotherapy and so on to get a true number of what is being paid to the community clinics by the present government, Department of Health, and to the fee-for-service doctors of the Department of Health. They don't do that. So in estimates it is the opportunity then of the opposition to help the minister make these calculations, to help the minister make these deductions. He has to come up with a number that is paid by the Department of Health to the community clinics in our province and then to help them learn how to divide by the number of doctors who are associated with that group and the number of doctors that are associated with the fee-for-service basis and we come up with a number.

Now this year we don't have the opportunity to examine that statistics, that's only one of the items that is incapable of being examined because the minister refuses to file the financial statement for SHSP for the current year end.

Now another thing, Mr. Chairman, the minister stated today that he was prepared and as soon as I am finished my remarks I intend to make a motion that the minister provide the interim financial statement for SHSP as he agreed he would before we proceed with these estimates. And the reason for that, Mr. Chairman, I have outlined at least as it relates to community clinics. I think it's important as well to have comparative numbers for the year under the review. What's going to happen in June is that the Minister of Health is going to present the report for SHSP up to March 31, 1978 and that report is going to be for a period of 15 months so the information will be not comparable to the previous year end. And that, of course, when you present financial statements, is

extremely important in an examination of those financial statements. More importantly, Mr. Chairman, it is just as important, if not more so, in the determination of the amount of allocation by the minister to his department for the use by the people of Saskatchewan in their health care system.

Now we can look at the past as the minister has done a great deal and talk about previous gains by the then CCF and I can assure the people of Saskatchewan that the NDP is not the CCF. We can look at those gains and say they have been a positive step forward and I think everyone in Saskatchewan would agree with that. But, Mr. Chairman, we can't stop here. We can't say that because of some battle that occurred or fight that occurred in the past that everything is going to be rosy for the future. If you in your constituency, Mr. Chairman, hear reports and there are many reports in Weyburn of individuals who are our senior citizens who can't get in the hospital, who are having difficulty in going on waiting lists of 12, 14 or 15 months, which I know, Mr. Chairman, you are receiving, then you must say to yourself, are we going to be able to provide for those individuals or is some magic name good enough. Is it good enough, Mr. Chairman, that twenty years ago the right steps were taken? Is it good enough that fifteen years ago the right steps were taken? Isn't it more important what's going to happen in 1978-79? What's going to happen as, is obvious as the minister obviously had to state last night, was simply this. You can't provide for 2,000 more senior citizens, add more level IV beds, increase your employees payments 11 to 12 per cent, increase the allocations for power, lights and other expenditures at least 15 per cent, allocate only 9½ per cent to your department and expect to do the job; the figures just don't balance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is important – it is extremely important that the opposition and every member on the government benches receive the information as it relates to SHSP for the year ended December 31, 1977 together with comparative statistics for the year ended December 31, 1976. Without that information, Mr. Chairman, it is extremely difficult to do the job at hand and that is to provide the best possible health care system without deterrent fees for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Without deterrent fees in the realm of hidden taxes, without deterrent fees in Pharmacare, without deterrent fees period. It is very important. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose:

That the Estimates for the Department of Health be not now proceeded with, but stand until an interim financial statement for the year ended December 31, 1977 with comparative figures for the year ended December 31, 1976 are tabled in this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: — Order.

Debate continues on the motion.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, can I ask you to repeat the last line of that motion. I missed something there.

Mr. Chairman: — I will read the motion again.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I missed the part about the interim financial statement.

You know, I will call it 5:30 in a minute or so because I have a great deal that I want to say

about the remarks that the member opposite struggled through so desperately in the last 15 minutes. One of the reasons that I wanted a clarification of that resolution, Mr. Chairman, was because I find, now that I know what the wording is, that in the member's haste to take up the time of this House, and in his own strange way present some kind of a filibuster for whatever motivation as I said earlier the Conservatives have, he didn't even refer to what kind of statement he was looking for. Now he asks for a statement, I agreed earlier, Mr. Chairman, I agreed earlier and as you well know and the Liberal caucus well knows and the members of this House well know, that I will provide, because the member finally indicated what it is he was looking for, an interim statement of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. That is what the issue seems to have been all about because of the change in the fiscal year for Saskatchewan hospitals. I am prepared to do that and therefore, the member knows that and therefore he knows he did not need that resolution. The only reason that he has the resolution is because in the last one minute he has not been able to provide enough remarks that he had to fill it in with some kind of a resolution in his attempt to filibuster during estimates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not 5:00 o'clock and I would like to suggest that we call it 5:00 o'clock and return at 7:00 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.