

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 13, 1980**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of 38 or 40 Grade 7 to Grade 9 students from St. Michael's Junior High School in Weyburn. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by Mr. Jim Parsons, Mrs. Barb Charette and their bus driver, Mr. Michael Young. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it is our wish that their visit here to their provincial capital and their visit here to the Legislative Building proves very knowledgeable and pleasant for them. I say again, Mr. Speaker, it is just another way to celebrate Saskatchewan's 75th anniversary. I look forward to meeting with them when they leave the Chamber. I am sure all members will join with me in wishing them a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce to the Assembly a group of 40 Grade 4 students (I join with Mr. Kowalchuk) from Lebret School. They are accompanied by Terry Kovacs and Frank Kovacs. They are seated in the west gallery. I am sure all hon. members will join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly. Many of the students are from Fort Qu'Appelle and area. I hope they find their day interesting and informative.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, Sir, and to members of the House, a group of students from St. Mary's School in Saskatoon, Grades 6 and 8. They are 46 in number. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ray, Gale Weenies, Mr. Henderson (I hope these names are accurate) and parents, Mrs. Penson and Mrs. Steiner. They are visiting Regina and some of its highlights, including the Chamber. I welcome them to the House on behalf of you, Sir, and all the members of the legislature. I look forward to meeting with them for a few minutes later this afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Shane Industries**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for SEDCO. Yu raised the matter last week of Shane Industries. I understand the minister had a recent meeting with at least one official of Shane Industries, Mr. Chuck Shane, with a view to extending the terms of repayment of the loan and perhaps keeping Shane Industries out of receivership. Are you prepared to report on your meeting?

**HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce):** — No, Mr. Speaker, Shane Industries, as I indicated the other day, is in charge of the receiver-manager. The receiver-manager is handling the operation at this point in time and until his report comes down, I have no further comments.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary to the minister. Mr. Reg Parker, who may be familiar to most of you, issued a press statement to the effect that he was no longer associated with Shane Industries and had given his resignation on the date I had first raised the matter in the Assembly. A check with the company's office indicated that Mr. Reg Parker was in fact a shareholder. A check at the company's office, as recently as yesterday, indicates further that Mr. Parker is still a shareholder of Shane Industries. Would you kindly advise if Mr. Parker gave his resignation and what day he gave his resignation?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no verification that he did or did not. If he resigned, he resigned from the company. I am not concerned at this time. I am waiting for the receiver- manager's report.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary to the minister. Did SEDCO have any personal guarantees from Reg Parker on the SEDCO loan? A second part of that question is, what was your equity position and re that equity position, were the share voting shares?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, with response to the first part of the question, the answer is no. Concerning the second part, I am not prepared to divulge any information until I have a definite statement from the receiver-manager to know what is involved.

**MR. LANE:** — Would the minister not admit that it is a rather strange situation and a very unique situation that you did not take personal guarantees from Reg Parker in this particular case? Can that be attributed to nothing other than blatant political patronage?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, that may be the opinion of the hon. member, but when SEDCO made the arrangements with Shane Industries, they probably thought a little differently.

**MR. LANE:** — Final supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Premier, this is the third, either defeated NDP candidate or former NDP candidate who has gone into business. I am referring to the member for Moose Jaw North, the problems with Mossbank Foods, involving David Lange and now Reg Parker, three time defeated NDP candidate, all getting SEDCO loans. Would the Premier now be prepared to commit to the province of Saskatchewan that as long as he is in office, no former or defeated NDP candidates will be eligible for SEDCO loans given the track record to date?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no. It seems to me that a person who stand for public office, whether he is elected or defeated, should not thereby be barred from carrying on his business activities in the same way as any other citizen. Until some impropriety is proven rather than alleged, there seems no reason why we would pursue a policy of barring former candidates of any party from applying to SEDCO for loans.

May I point out for the information of the hon. member, as he well know, that the member for Moose Jaw to whom he referred, was not a member of this House when he obtained the loan. He is attempting to suggest that loans are being made to members of this House. He well knows that is not the fact.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Supplementary question to the minister of SEDCO. In the reply to the question from the member for Qu'Appelle a few minutes ago, I understand you to reply that you were not prepared to reveal the equity position of Shane Industries. Yet this morning in Crown corporations, Mr. Minister, you indicated to us that SEDCO has put up \$100,000 and that Shane had in fact not put up any money other than patents and services rendered prior to the corporation going in. Are you now saying that was not correct information? Were there, in fact, any other values? I think you placed a value of \$50,000 on their patents and services. Were there any other equity positions taken or investments made for that equity position besides the services and patents? Has that position changed since this morning?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in Crown corporations this morning (and I think that is the proper place to get the information), SEDCO accepted the patents as part of the equity of Shane Industries. At this time I am not prepared to make any further comment until such time as the receiver-manager has handed down his report so I can get some complete details to give to the hon. members.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary to the minister. Let's state succinctly the issue. The issue is, that for no money up front, a defeated NDP candidate through a . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. Does the member have a supplementary? I wonder if the member could get to it.

**MR. LANE:** — . . . was given SEDCO moneys with no personal guarantees. AS recently as January, press reports were indicating the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Next question. Order. I'll take the next question from the member for Thunder Creek.

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Minister would you tell this Assembly how common a practice it is for SEDCO to advance money to any industry, whether it be Shane or anyone else, without any equity money (cash or land or some other very tangible thing) put up as collateral? Is this a common practice in SEDCO?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, yes, I don't say it's a fairly common practice but it does happen. SEDCO's mandate is to develop industries in Saskatchewan and to promote them. If we feel that the product in the industry has merit, therefore we will look at it in that light; if we feel that it does not require any upfront money and we are to put the total amount in, we are prepared to do that.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it common practice for SEDCO to put up all the upfront money and take a minority position, and not require personal guarantees from any of the investors? Is that common practice in SEDCO?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, as I said, it was not a common practice but we do do that occasionally because of the product involved. Nobody can tell me that the product we are referring to in this particular case in Shane Industries does not have merit. The product has been accepted by the Regina Firefighters, by every firefighter organization in Canada, as well as the United States. They have orders on hand and the markets are there.

**MR. LANE:** — A new question to the minister. This particular company, Shane, wherein Reg Parker (defeated candidate) was a major shareholder, seemingly in a very short period of time when through a lot of money and had very few sales. Your phrase was that they didn't market it. In reality what we've seen over the last year and a half in Shane is money going out for rent and salaries, and really what the government has done is to pay for two campaigns for Reg Parker through this SEDCO loan.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, you indicated that the markets were there and that the company had orders and yet the company has been placed into the hands of a receiver-manager. Mr. Minister, isn't it true that when the receiver-manager makes his report the participants involved have stripped that company and that is why the receiver-manager has taken over?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question. That's an assumption the hon. member is making. I will know better when the receiver-manager brings his report in.

**MR. LANE:** — Would the minister not admit that the assumption is made on a pretty good statement of facts?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I'll take the member for Regina South.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well as a supplementary to the minister, will the minister advise this Assembly in that case, what cash (if any) is left I that company at the present time? What volume of business has been done by Shane and how many orders do you have on hand for the business that you supposedly say is there?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, the information that the hon. members are looking for will be handed to us when the receiver-manager hands in a report. I am not going to jeopardize the company in any shape or form to make any statements in reply to that particular question.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister has just indicated that he had order, that the company had order on hand and the inventory was there. Now you are changing your answers. Are you now saying you don't want to tell us what business is available, what inventories are there, what cash is on hand?

**MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that I will not disclose any information within the company proper because I don't have it until the receiver-manager gives me his report.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, would you concede to this Assembly today that this practice or SEDCO advancing money, when there is no equity money up front on the part of a participant and only some intangible such as a vague notion (in this case a patent) is encouraging participants and companies like Shane Industries (and probably Shane Industries) to simply strip that SEDCO money, the taxpayers' money, and run? That procedure will become more and more common when you do not require people to put up-front equity money in before you advance it.

**MR. VICKAR:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not.

### **Consumer Ownership of Earth Stations for Television**

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — A question to the minister in charge of Sask Tel. I am advised, Mr. Minister, by people in the communication industry (and I am sure you are aware of the same thing) that ground station discs will be made available for consumer use in the North American market probably within a year, or at least two years. In view of Sask Tel's decisions with regard to the cable network in Saskatoon, what position would you take with regard to consumer use of a ground station?

**HON. MR. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones):** — Mr. Speaker, we haven't really made any final decision with regard to home-owners owning earth stations. Our big concern today is with regard to the ownership of earth stations by people who will vend that service to large communities such as Saskatoon and Regina, Moose Jaw, North Battleford and Prince Albert. It is common knowledge that the revenues which are derived most easily are derived from those cities. If you don't have those revenues to put into the pool, you obviously won't have the revenue necessary to rate-average throughout the provinces. As a result of that, little communities such as Kindersley will not get cable television at a reasonable rate. So we say (and this is our firm belief) that the ownership of earth stations should be with the people who are in the communications business. And that means Sask Tel.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. I understand that Japanese are now manufacturing these earth stations and the price to the consumer is as low as between \$200 and \$500. Now I think you have indicated by your answer that you in Sask Tel are not concerned — I'm not sure whether you did or not — about the consumer owning the earth station. Now my question to you, Mr. Minister, is if this technology as developed is not control at the household? And do you, in fact, not intend to effect control at the household level where the person has his own earth station?

**MR. CODY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, once again, no I don't because we have to look at the complete system. You can't look at a system which will take in one or two households for the sake of getting a few programs from a satellite. You have to look at all of the services which are going to be available. I am sure the member for Kindersley would be the first one to say to Sask Tel that we didn't have very much foresight if a few people put up an earth station in his area and then along came the technology which allowed one to have fire alarms, home banking and so on, and that community was not able to have it because we didn't have the revenues in the pool to put into fibre optics. I am sure he would be the first one to say, you didn't have the foresight to go ahead and put in the system which we now can enjoy the same as Saskatoon, Regina and the other cities. That's simply what we are saying.

What we are doing in Sask Tel is trying to protect all of the people of Saskatchewan so any new services which come on stream can be given to them at a reasonable rate.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Minister, when you start to control (you're advocating the control of your station at the consumer level and basically you know as well as I do that control means the controlling or programming), is it also the intention of Sask Tel in the future to control the programming of cable television to the people of Saskatchewan?

**MR. CODY:** — Most certainly not. We know and you know, as does anyone who knows anything about the way programming is allowed in this country, that it's allowed by the CRTC. They will say what kinds of programs can be on a satellite, or what programs cannot be on a satellite. It is quite obvious that we don't control programming and we have no intention of controlling programming, but we will control, or want to control

the way the program gets to you. That's where we have to get our revenues from so that we can rate-average throughout the province, so all of the people can have the kind of service enjoyed by the people in the larger areas.

**MR. LANE:** — Will the minister not admit that he is controlling programming by jamming the signals in Saskatoon; is not his whole policy in jeopardy if the receiving earth stations are reduced in price to approximately \$200, where they are accessible to the average consumer? The need for the fibre optics for reception is no longer there. Would you not admit that your agency has in fact some definite policies to stop the consumers of Saskatchewan from buying the earth station?

**MR. CODY:** — No, definitely not . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I couldn't care what Morton Shulman had. Let us have a look at the situation in Saskatoon. The member for Qu'Appelle says that we are stopping the people in Saskatoon from receiving a certain program. That is not true. The case is that there is an earth station in place owned by Telesat (Canada) which could be plugged in in one minute and the program could be shown. It is the cable television operator in Saskatoon who has seen fit not to allow the people in Saskatoon to get the House of Commons' debates live.

### **Emergency Fire Plans for Provincial Parks**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — I would direct a question to the minister responsible for tourism and renewable resources. Mr. Minister, due to the ongoing drought and of course the extreme fire hazard in northern Saskatchewan (which has cut off attendance in tourism and people travelling in northern Saskatchewan, subsequently placing a higher attendance in our parks in the South), there is a fair concern being registered right now from southern people. We want to know, Mr. Minister, what measures your government is taking to assure the people in the South that no major fires will be breaking out in our parks in southern Saskatchewan, particularly since the fires in northern Saskatchewan were started by man?

**HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resource):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the department has a number of fire plans for all provincial parks. To give you an example, at Cypress Hills in the Southwest there is a very active and alive fire plan and in the big park in the Southeast at Moose Mountain as well.

In regard to a fire that might break out in those areas, it's a fire plan that takes into consideration local input and local involvement by providing local equipment, etc., as well as the additional departmental equipment available there now. So the fire plan is in place, there is a fire plan for all parts and points in the province where provincial parks are in existence. We are very concerned about the situation, as the member opposite is.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary for my part at least on that particular question. Can you give the House and consequently the people of Saskatchewan the assurance that adequate manpower is available, that adequate machinery is in place to fight fires, and possibly that consultation with the local airstrips in the area (and mine of course would be Carlyle) and Kennedy where aircraft of course could be landed for providing equipment. Thirdly, are the fire watchtowers being manned on a 24-hour basis? Those are three areas of concern that I express here. I'd appreciate your comments and reply on that, Mr. Minister.

**MR. GROSS:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can give the assurance to the member opposite that

all available equipment and men are made available to the department from the local people. We feel that in terms of what could be considered a normal fire, we have adequate equipment and could handle a fairly drastic situation.

In terms of giving him an assurance that nothing would ever burn down, I don't think anybody can give that assurance because we can't predict what might happen in regard to fire.

He asked us about the fire towers that are in the parks — the parks that have fire towers are equipped with fire towers, have them in place. If the member would want an exact breakdown, I could provide him with a copy of the number of fire towers, when they're manned, how they're manned, and who mans them. I don't have that handy but I could certainly provide him with a copy.

**MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek):** — Supplementary to the Minister of Tourism. Mr. Minister, is there a possibility that the present travel ban in the west block of the Cypress Hills will be extended to Cypress Hills Provincial Park per se because of the extreme fire conditions out there?

**MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Speaker, in the case of Cypress Hills, there is a travel ban to all areas in the park, not only the west block but areas outside of the paved areas in the park. Roads that lead off into the back bushes if you like, are being restricted, have been restructured for some time, and will continue to be restricted in the future until conditions improve or until we have some rain or moisture of some concern. Right now, we do have a ban in effect off the main travelled areas which are not actively policed by the departmental officials.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — You didn't answer my question, Mr. Minister. Supplementary. Are you considering extending a complete ban in Cypress Hills this long weekend coming up? Is there a possibility that the park will be closed or will not open for the season as scheduled because of the fire hazard?

**MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Speaker, there's no plan at the present time to shut the entire park down. The core areas will remain open. As I said earlier, the area outside of the core area, the area outside paved roads or roads that are standardly maintained, will be shut off, have been shut off, and will be shut off in the future. In terms of the core area of Cypress Hills, it's not planned at this time to shut it down.

### **Grain Car Co-ordinator**

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. The Premier will probably know the question I'm going to ask him, he's had ample opportunity to consider it. I'll repeat just in case you don't remember. The question yesterday arises from a usually reliable source, the Regina Leader-Post, quoting the Premier as endorsing the communique of the four western premiers extending the powers of the grain car co-ordinator. I wonder if you could square that with the House as it related to what the Minister of Agriculture said during the grain car debate?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What was the date?

**MR. BERNTSON:** — May 1. We do not agree with the terms of the co-ordinator. We didn't agree with him when he was appointed. And he goes on to say, 'a czar, we don't

need.' I wonder if the Premier could explain that little contradiction?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, our agricultural policy is not set at meetings of four western premiers. However, we do issue communiques which are obviously compromise communiques, I invite all hon. members to look at the wording of that with some care. You will find that it squares a lot more carefully than the hon. members will think, provided they don't read into the communique a great deal that isn't there.

There is in fact a statement there saying that we would like to see the grain car co-ordinator have additional powers. My argument there and I make it here is that the grain car commissioner should exercise the powers conference on the western arm of the CTC (Canadian Transportation Commission). That is how I would like to see the grain commissioner exercise additional powers, through the CTC. Others may not agree with that. They may wish to see the co-ordinator exercise powers under some other head. But the communique says, and all it says is, that we would like to see the grain car co-ordinator exercise additional powers. With that I agree, although I suspect the Minister of Agriculture may have some qualifications.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **Resolution No. 7 — Beef and Hog price Stabilization**

**MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford)** moved, seconded by Mr. A.W. Engel (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):

That this Assembly continue to press the federal government to fulfil its responsibility for the implementation of meaningful stabilization programs for beef and hog producers at the national level.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move this motion as a producer representing a constituency that is seriously affected by depressed prices in the cattle industry and for the hog producers. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government's action is long overdue, and that we should be pressing them to implement programs that are going to stabilize the industry. We have a tendency in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and it is the instinct of producers — and not a bad one but it does cause a problem — that if we own the land, if we own the buildings and the machinery, we have freedom and independence and control of the agricultural industry. But our history, Mr. Speaker, shows us that this is not so.

Sixty years ago, Saskatchewan producers owned the land. They owned the buildings. But they found themselves victims of vicious exploitation. They had no idea from one day to the next what they were going to get for their product. Producers 42 years ago decided they simply could not, and they would not tolerate this exploitation. They banded together and formed their own organizations to handle their grain; they organized the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the United Grain Growers. And they demanded that the federal government implement a marketing structure which gave them some equality and security. The federal government delivered the Canadian Wheat Board. Later on they demanded of Ottawa a plan which gave them some stability through the boom and bust cycles of agriculture that are beyond the individual's control. Thus we have the grain stabilization program, from which many producers have benefited in the province of Saskatchewan in recent times.

The issues in livestock are no different. Security in the industry will not be obtained until



there is a willingness to act on marketing and to implement a stabilization program. This is the challenge of the '80s in the livestock industry. Mr. Speaker, it is an important challenge because the livestock industry is an important industry. In the province of Saskatchewan alone there are close to 2.5 million head of cattle. In the years '74, '75 and '76 there were over 3 million head of beef cattle in the province. In recent years, close to 1 million of these has been marketed in Saskatchewan stockyards annually, even with severely depressed prices, in the range of \$30 per cwt. It is clear that this is an extremely valuable industry in our province. It is worth millions of dollars.

The same is true of hogs, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan hogs have numbered over a half million mark in recent years. Just over half-a-million hogs are marketed in Saskatchewan annually. And again, Mr. Speaker, even with hog carcasses selling for the low price of \$40 per cwt. as they are now and have been since December, this means millions of dollars to the Saskatchewan economy.

Farmers in Saskatchewan are concerned about the recent price drops in beef and pork. The price of beef has dropped 10 cents to 15 cents a pound over the four months since the beginning of the year. The poor price of hogs has meant pay-out from SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program). SHARP, which made a pay-out of \$256,000 in the last quarter of 1979, and which is anticipating a pay-out of three to four times that amount for the first quarter of 1981, is suddenly a very popular program.

SHARP is attractive because the provincial government took the initiative four years ago to set up a stabilization plan for hogs with the producer and governments contributing to guarantees at least the cost of production. But, Mr. Speaker, a program like SHARP should not have to be the provincial government's responsibility. While SHARP has had some success in stabilizing the price for producers in Saskatchewan because it is accompanied by a provincial marketing plan through the hog commission, the province cannot afford to continue this program.

The province has not been able to start a stabilization program for beef despite the fact that the beef industry in the province of Saskatchewan is larger and more diversified than the hog industry. If marketing and stabilization plans are to be really effective for beef and pork they must be national in scope. We have repeatedly proposed to the federal minister of agriculture that he organize immediately, and implement, a national marketing plan for both beef and hogs. In marketing plans Agriculture Minister Whelan agrees with us, as he always has on the issue of marketing boards. It is meaningless though to hear a minister talk when you know he does not have the support of his cabinet for what he is saying.

Mr. Whelan has suggested that it is the provinces that are the holdup. I believe it is up to the federal government to show leadership in this area. Mr. Whelan should be prepared to attend the ministers of agriculture conference this summer and lay on the table a national marketing system for beef and hogs that has the support of his government.

On agricultural issues, as in transportation issues, the jurisdiction remains federal and any situation, to be of value, must be a national solution. Provincial governments can only do certain things. In the face of no action by a federal government the province can implement stabilization plans and marketing plans. But they are costly to provincial taxpayers and they are limited in what they can achieve.

In transportation we purchased 1,000 hopper cars which will move a quarter of a

million bushels worth of grain to market every year. But still we can not implement the solutions that are necessary to solve the transportation problem itself.

To achieve a meaningful hog and beef marketing stabilization program we must look to Ottawa, and tell them in no uncertain terms that we await their action.

The Trudeau government claims to have decided that it is now ready to listen to the West. But it remains to be seen whether they are ready to deliver. Our job is to keep them squirming.

We must make Ottawa realize that the open market has not been working for producers. In simple terms, Mr. Speaker, this open market is unfair to the producers. It is unfair because producers as individuals have no influence on the price. Beef producers, for example, have to make decisions on increasing or decreasing production two years prior to marketing their product. By the time the product is ready to be sold, the prices are often far different from when they were forced to make the production decision.

If we look again at history, Mr. Speaker, we see that in an attempt to overcome uncertain prices and excessive margins by middlemen, grain producers initially requested legislation regulating the firms which handled their product. The best example of this is the Canadian Grain Act, which regulated elevators and elevator agents. The legislation, however, did not ensure price stability. The producers moved to protect themselves by forming co-operatives to pool the returns and reduce the risk of short-term fluctuating prices.

Eventually producers realized that the only way they could be effectively protected from the large companies selling their product was to have their own marketing board. This resulted in pressure on the federal government in the '30s and finally a Canadian Wheat Board to act as the sole marketing agent for producers' wheat, oats and barley. One of the prime reasons wheat producers pushed for orderly marketing was the wide fluctuation between the price of grain at harvest, and the following spring. The cycle was short and occurred so frequently that they felt they must do something about it.

Beef producers, however, experience only two or three of four cycles in their lifetime so it is hard for them to maintain the same pressure for change. Mr. Speaker, you will note that hogs and poultry have shorter cycles and most provinces do have marketing boards and supply control schemes for poultry.

Another one of the most important reasons was sheer need. Producers were much more dependent upon the income from wheat in the early days than they were on income from beef or hogs. Often cattle and hogs were kept as a sideline to make use of marginal land and to cushion the grain cycle. With increasing specialization in the farm industry and more producers dependent strictly on returns from livestock, this reason now applies to the livestock industry.

Livestock producers are on the ropes, Mr. Speaker, and they have been since 1974. It used to be said at one time that beef producers could expect three bad years in every ten. Now we see a situation developing where ranchers and mixed farmers are going to be able to count on three good years in the last ten. The beef cycle, which the large ranchers and their right-wing organizations have clung to, as if it were their only salvations, has come back to haunt them year after year.

The open market implies peaks and valleys in the prices received by the producer. When the prices were going down, the large operator held his product, as only he could afford to do. The small producer was forced to sell his herd and reduce his breeding herd. Then when the prices rose, the large rancher was ready and willing to sell and cash in on the market. The small rancher, the cow-calf producer and the mixed farmers were left with a depleted herd and were not able to make gains. In fact, they were even lucky to retrieve the cost of production.

I would like to give the House an example of what the open market in beef has means to the producer, Mr. Speaker. The publication Agriculture Statistics put out by the provincial Department of Agriculture, lists average livestock prices for each year back to the 1920s.

I would ask members to look at the year 1951 when the average price per cwt. for beef was \$27.71 and then look at 1970 when the average price was \$27.70. In the 19 years between 1951 and 1970, the cost of many of the inputs for livestock producers had doubled in price, but beef itself was going down one cent in the same period. That is the open market system at work, Mr. Speaker, the same open market system which has robbed farmers year after year and decade after decade.

We cannot in good conscience allow this to continue. That is why I call o all members to join with us to support this motion to press the federal government to fulfil its responsibilities for the implementation of a meaningful stabilization program for beef and hog producers at the national level.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a little time to say a few words regarding one of the proposals for a stabilization program. This program which was suggested is called a 100 per cent government margin. The reason I would like to bring a few points to bear is that for the consumer to look at this 100 per cent guaranteed margin, he may feel that the producer is receiving an exceedingly overgenerous guarantee. But when you consider this margin is based upon a five year average, the effect of it, given the inflation in our economy, is a guarantee of 85 per cent or less. Depending on the inflation rate, it will drop below 80 per cent, Mr. Speaker, although the guaranteed margin as part of one of the proposed plans sounds like a lot. I feel it is really a very minimal level at 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, just a few remarks on stabilization. I think the Minister of Agriculture and I largely agree on stabilization; I don't think either of us agrees with the member who just spoke.

Stabilization programs, as you know, are not new. They have been kicking around for some time in certain commodities. I suppose the one that has been around the longest is the grain stabilization program, but you'll notice in the grain stabilization program there is no mention of supply management which the member for Turtleford seems to use — stabilization and supply management and marketing board synonymously. It doesn't work that way. So far as the consumer is concerned, the best cure for high prices is high prices because they quit buying, they decrease the demand and the price gets back down where it belongs. As it relates to your 100 per cent guaranteed margin program, it is totally unworkable; it can't work. If you are to provide stabilization

programs which provide for 100 per cent guaranteed margin, all you are going to do is set up a system that will guarantee the people, at whatever cost of production, a break-even point. There is no incentive to produce which is where the incentive should be.

I'll tell you a little about your supply management and your stabilization program in your poultry industry. One of the oldest marketing boards in Canada is the turkey marketing board and since its inception about 10 years ago, our imports from the United States have gone up over 2,000 per cent. It is not what you would call an excellent batting average.

You talk about your right-wing cowboys complaining about the peaks and valleys in the beef industry. I have never heard such a bunch of nonsense. The peaks and valleys in the beef industry are caused by many things. There is the meat-grain interface and when grain prices are high, beef prices tend to vary opposite inversely. But one of the most significant factors in beef price fluctuations, in recent history in Canada, has been the policy of unscrupulous politicians. I have never analyzed this but I think it would bear out what I'm saying. Check prior to every election year and you see what the beef imports were just prior to the election. Every time they open the gates for beef imports the price of domestic beef goes down. It is just a fact of life when you have politicians who are more interested in staying in power than in providing good sound agriculture policy. When you have more voting consumers than you have voting producers, you are going to run into this sort of thing.

One of the stabilization programs I think has worked well (and it is a good program) is SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not a bad program based on a percentage of the previous sales as I recall . . . A good program — the same one advanced by Alvin Hamilton when he was minister of agriculture for the beef industry . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know he didn't have enough support from those eastern politicians. Those eastern politicians are largely consumer supported, as you know! That's the situation the way it is.

I am a little critical of the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan for announcing (well for many other reasons but this one as well and this is what we are talking about today\_ that he is going to discontinue SHARP before he has encouraged Eugene Whelan and company to bring in a national program. I think it is a mistake. It is a contributory program, as I think all stabilization programs should be. I think it is a mistake that the minister would discontinue it before he has something in place. Because of all the industries in the agricultural sector that have fluctuations. I would suggest the hog industry has the most violent fluctuations of any. I think it is necessary that this program should stay in place until something replaces it.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have lots more to say on this particular motion. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **Resolution No. 24 — Churchill Port Development**

**MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville)** moved, seconded by the member for Pelly (Mr. Lusney):

That this Assembly commend the Canadian Wheat Board for its continued use of the port of Churchill and encourage the development of the port as a

full northern port, including the expansion of the port by movement of more grains through the port, the upgrading of the Herchmer subdivision and the institution of the interchange agreement.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think more so today than a month ago, when the question of the use of the port of Churchill was first proposed in this resolution, its importance is evident as the discussions are centring, in many parts by much of the media, in regard to that very question. Also the fact that the shipping season will be opening a month sooner than normally expected, and for many other reasons, I think this is a very important resolution.

It is a real pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to make a motion commending the Canadian Wheat Board for its continued use of the port of Churchill and encouraging the development of the port as a full northern port. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I said commending, not as the opposition members have said for the last two or three months (and we may be here another couple of months) that we were always condemning the federal government initiatives.

This would necessarily include, Mr. Speaker, the expansion of the port by movement of more grains through the port, the upgrading of the Herchmer subdivision and the institution of the interchange agreement.

The port of Churchill has a long history of serving the West from its origins as a port used for many years in the fur trade to its establishment as a major grain exporting port for western Canada. I would like to take a few moments to outline the history of western Canadian grain exports through the port of Churchill since 1931 to provide this Assembly with a historical perspective.

Between 1931 and 1939 when World War I broke out, grain exports from Churchill varied from a low of 545,000 bushels to a high of 4.2 million bushels. The port was closed during the war years and from 1940 to 1946 only 740,000 bushels of grain were shipped from Churchill.

After the war, Mr. Speaker, shipping resumed and steadily increased in 1945, a total of 2.9 million bushels of grain were shipped. Mr. Speaker, by 1952 this had risen to over 6.5 million bushels of grain and by 1959, to over 21.7 million bushels. Exports were down in 1960 and 1961 but in 1962 returned to the 21 million bushel mark where it remained until 1965 when exports reached over 24.7 million bushels. For the remainder of the '60s grain exports varied between 21 million to 24 million bushels.

In 1970, barley began to be shipped through Churchill. Until then wheat had been the main export. In 1971, Mr. Speaker, over 4.9 million bushels of barley were exported along with 20.5 million bushels of wheat. In 1975, 22.7 million bushels were shipped from Churchill. In 1976, almost equal amounts of barley and wheat were shipped. Just over 14 million bushels of what and 14.3 million bushels of barley added up to over 26.5 million bushels of grain, making 1976 a record year, Mr. Speaker. In 1977, the total export of grain declined slightly to 26.5 million bushels. In 1978, the last year for which figures are available, shows a total export of grain of 23.9 million. Mr. Speaker, that means over the last 10 years an average of 24 million bushels per year were shipped through Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Canadian Wheat Board for its use of the port

of Churchill. It is a function of the wheat board to provide the best return to producers it can. By shipping grain through Churchill, the wheat board has verified the port does provide a cost benefit to grain producers. Under the wheat board there has been a substantial increase in tonnage over the years. However, factors outside the wheat board's control have caused the use made of the port of Churchill to remain a great disappointment to the farmers of western Canada. While the Canadian Wheat Board and the Government of Saskatchewan have consistently supported the use of Churchill, successive Liberal and Tory federal governments have hedged in their commitments to develop the port.

Mr. Speaker, let me take the new Liberal government at Ottawa, as an example. In the recent federal election they promised to spend \$800 million to double track the CN rail line from Winnipeg to Vancouver, when they still haven't been able to complete \$8 million worth of rail line and promised port improvement to Churchill in 1978. Mr. Speaker, the new double tracking proposal is window dressing. In many areas where double tracking is practical, it has already been done and is taking place. In some other areas it will provide no advantage. It is another election promise designed to keep the farmers quiet. It is another election promise which shows how shallow the Liberal Party's grasp of the grain-handling situation really is on the Prairies.

That has been confirmed, Mr. Speaker, by the new Minister of Transport, Mr. Pepin, in his statements about the crowrate and by his indecision over the commitments made by the Clark government to support the development of Prince Rupert. The development of Prince Rupert is needed badly and is one area where the Conservatives were more aggressive than the Liberals, more aggressive, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by some \$20 million. I know the opposition members will agree with me.

I would like to remind them that the federal Tories promised their own double-tracking system from Tete Jaune, B.C. to Prince Rupert. Of course, we in this government did not expect as many miles of double tracking from the Tories as from the Liberals. We already knew John Crosbie had promised most of the Tory budget as a gift to the oil companies and to the federal treasury. Mr. Deputy Speaker, my point is simply that both of the old-line parties are prepared to promise millions for grain handling during election time but neither the Liberal or Conservative governments at Ottawa are prepared to come through when they form the government.

The previous short-lived Conservative government under Joe Clark promised last spring that the Conservatives would make greater use of Churchill, that's what they promised. Only three months later Jack Murta, the Tory MP appointed chairman of the task force looking at the grain handling and transportation system called Churchill, 'a costly luxury we can't afford, and definitely one of the main bottlenecks in the system.' Murta said the facility might have to be scrapped as a grain terminal.

Now, that is despite assurances by Jake Epp, another federal person (or was he a provincial, but he was a Conservative), the then minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, that Churchill is 'a vital port and figures very prominently in the country's grain handling system.'

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He's a good man!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Oh yes, a good man, except he is contradictory when he speaks of what Jack Murta said just a little while before, so very contradictory on that point. The needed improvements were not begun nor completed during the Tory government's

term in office, Mr. Speaker.

The previous Liberal government showed exactly the same lack of good faith in their dealings with Churchill. When the Hall commission recommended that grain shipments to Churchill be increased, Transport Minister Otto Lang commissioned his good friend and buddy and ex-campaign manager, Rob Bryden's firm, to study the practical application of the recommendation. A good man for him to appoint wasn't it? This brazen move was a slap to the face to the Hall commission, as it was known by all of western Canada that Bryden Development Consultants had just before their appointment already publicly stated that they felt the port of Churchill was uneconomical.

Bryden Development Consultants had already worked on a brief to the Hall commission for an organization representing the St. Lawrence Seaway shipowners and shippers who had already indicated that they were strongly opposed to any development at Churchill. These were the people Otto Lang got to produce another report. Somehow it was supposed to be indicative of improved usage of Churchill.

Under these circumstances it was no surprise to anyone when the report slammed Churchill. Even though in April 1978 Otto Lang promised \$7.1 million to upgrade the Hudson Bay route and the port facilities of Churchill, the Bryden incident left western farmers with little faith in Otto Lang's statement of support for Churchill. Unfortunately this lack of faith appears to have been borne out. Since Otto Lang's promise, Liberal and Conservative governments have not even spent the \$40,000 it would require to equip the port facilities at Churchill to handle hopper cars.

At the same time, work on the Herchmer subdivision has been progressing painfully slow. As of December 1, 1979, 30 miles of bank widening remains to be done, 100 miles of ballast need to be replaced and 50 miles of rail need to be replaced as well. That's what you call Conservative and Liberal progress — a deliberate tortoise pace seemingly bent on achieving the goal sometime in the year 2000, maybe.

The negative attitude toward the port of Churchill held by the old-line parties is also obvious from their attitude to rail line abandonment in Saskatchewan. The PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) report (and in my opinion another red herring to obscure the purpose of the Hall report) rather than bring more light on the subject and to get a different political outlook, recommended the abandonment of the Preeceville-Kelvington section of the Preeceville subdivision of the CNR, and the possible construction of CP line from the mainline to Kelvington by way of Fosston. Under the present grain handling system, this would eliminate Kelvington, Nut Mountain and Lintlaw from delivering grain to Churchill. The three delivery points together have a five-year average of over 2.6 million bushels a year. If they were forced to ship their grain by CP rail to Vancouver or Thunder Bay they would lose from 10 cents to 27 cents per bushel depending on the grain delivery point and terminal used.

On the other hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if an interchange agreement were reached between CN and CP, and rail line rehabilitation was planned accordingly, even with existing grain handling facilities, the total deliveries made to Churchill could nearly double. The Hall report recommended that stop-off charges at inland terminals be eliminated so grain can be cleaned and reshipped from inland terminal points.

The report also recommended a 25 million to 30 million bushel terminal to be built at Yorkton. I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would suggest Melville is the logical point for many

reasons, one of them being to serve an 80 mile to 100 mile radius to provide surge capacity for the port of Churchill. Now shipping insurance rates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would have to be readjusted to allow for a longer shipping season. These recommendations, along with upgrading the Herchmer subdivision to handle hopper cars, would make Churchill capable of handling 55 million to 56 million bushels a year — yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 55 million to 56 million bushels and more. Use of a terminal at Melville would eliminate needles hauling of 600,000 to 700,000 bushels of screenings to Churchill.

I have discussed how much grain shipments through the port of Churchill have increased over the years and the potential for increased grain shipments recognized in the Hall report. I would like now, in a bit more detail, to state some of the improvements needed for the port of Churchill. The single most needed improvement is upgrading of the Herchmer subdivision which is the section of the CNR from Gillam to Churchill. The CNR advised that at the present only boxcars can be handled at Churchill because 50 miles of the subdivision still has light steel, and in the summer months has trouble spots known as sink holes or frost holes. These are areas where the permafrost melts and allows the ballast and steel to sink into the ground, resulting in slower traffic and sometimes no traffic, and the risk of broken rails. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the federal government would make the effort, this problem could be overcome quite easily.

The Herchmer subdivision must be upgraded to be able to handle hopper cars. The present situation cannot be allowed to continue. More and more hopper cars are being purchased while the boxcar fleet is being depreciated. As branch lines are upgraded inland elevators are being upgraded for the content loading of hopper cars. I just want to state one other point is that I know the recent announcements by the executive of the Canadian Wheat Board has stated the priority of shipping grain will be where the most grain can be delivered as quickly and as cheaply as possible. And that argument has to be accepted, except, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are saying by this resolution and by passing this motion in the House that we are letting the federal government know, let us not forfeit Churchill in the long run because in the overall shipping scene the future of northern and eastern Saskatchewan, and central eastern prairies Churchill has outstanding possibilities in the future.

Now as hopper cars become more and more prevalent throughout the grain handling system, Churchill's export abilities are diminished as they are now. I urge the federal government to take immediate action to prevent this loss. Inaction now will destroy out potential ability to export 50 million bushels at a time when the grain handling system of western Canada is in a state of chaos. The need to be prepared to ship the increased production is evident. All people in the grain business know this, the federal government surely must know this. The farmers of western Canada will condemn those people who refuse to move on the port of Churchill. Other improvements which need to be done at the port of Churchill itself, include equipping the elevator at Churchill to handle the hopper cars, and continuing and expanding the present dredging program as need has shown, Mr. Deputy Speaker. These improvements are needed to allow Churchill to keep up with improvements being made throughout the rest of the grain handling system. At the same time many technological advances have been made to improve Arctic shipping. These changes can dramatically increase the value of Churchill as a port. Since the late '50s ice forecasting and satellite weather information has improved greatly. Ships' radar, sonar, and radio equipment has also improved. These improvements have extended the season at Churchill many times.

Insurance rates from Lloyd's of London have been available on a more flexible basis



since 1977. That year saw a 7 per cent increase in the season from July 23 to October 20. Hopefully, it will be even longer this year. The port of Churchill development board believes that a 30 per cent increase in the shipping season is possible. This means Churchill could stay open from about June 25 to November 10 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Hon. Leader of the Opposition says, Don Mazankowski says. Don Mazankowski said a lot of thing but didn't act on any . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with strengthened vessels, or semi-icebreaker bulk vessels like the MV Arctic, the port could be used from June 25 to December 30.

As I repeat again, Mazankowski said a lot of thing but didn't act on them. . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — The member for Melville has the floor.

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — An adequate supply of hopper cars, combined with a longer season would enable Churchill to handle more grain than the 55 million bushels suggested by the Hall report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, so far the main advantage of Churchill, which I've talked about, is its potential to help solve our grain handling problems. As every farm in western Canada knows, Churchill offers many other advantages as well. One of the most important of these is that the farmers can get higher prices for grain shipped to Europe. Churchill is 1,500 miles closer to Poland and 1,000 closer to Liverpool than Thunder Bay is.

The wheat board has been able in the past (and hopefully will be in the future) to ask for 12 cents per bushel more for barley, and 15 cents more per bushel for wheat at Churchill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, than at Thunder Bay.

Farmers could lose \$7 million a year if Churchill is crapped. Indeed, implementing the Hall recommendation to put 55 million bushels per year through the port should be done, and I hope, will be done. Besides higher prices, farmers in over one-third of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, pay lower freight rates to ship to Churchill than to ship to any other port.

One final advantage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to farmers would be a shorter turnaround time. I know that is questionable. Some people say it isn't, but it is if you put all the factors in place. There would be a shorter turnaround for railroad cars. This can be achieved because of the shorter distance to Churchill if upgraded facilities for handling hopper car were installed. A shorter turnaround time would mean fewer cars are needed, and a substantial savings in capital costs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have discussed pretty thoroughly why Churchill is important as a grain handling port. I have not had time to go into its potential as an all-round port for the North and its potential to handle other goods. These will be carefully discussed by the seconder, the member for Pelly, who is affected very much in that constituency by what is going to happen at the port of Churchill.

The rational movement of grain to an upgraded port at Churchill would go a long way to help solve many of our grain handling problems. It would also financially benefit many farmers in Saskatchewan.

I would like to close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by emphasizing the importance of the port of Churchill to the West. The more use Churchill receives, whether for exporting grain, or for exporting or importing other products, the more valuable it becomes.

Therefore, I move Resolution No. 24 (It's here, it's here. I didn't lose it.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I so move.

**MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly):** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to second the motion put forward by the member for Melville. I'd like to compliment him on his fine presentation. He has ably pointed out the wheat board should be commended for the use of the port of Churchill. He has also accurately described the benefits Saskatchewan farmers now receive from shipping grain through the port of Churchill and the increased benefits they would receive from the increased use of the port of Churchill as suggested by the Hall commission.

As the hon. member for Melville has stated, the need for cheaper grain transportation has been felt by the farmers in western Canada as long as they have been exporting grain. Throughout the 19th and the early 20th centuries, farmers were forced to submit to any freight rates that the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) and the eastern shipping interests felt like charging. The crowrate was one attempt to solve the problem of high freight rates. The construction of a railway to the port of Churchill was the second way.

The construction of the railway to Churchill was discussed as early as 1870 as a way to fight the monopoly of the CPR. In 1880 the government under John A. MacDonald gave the Manitoba government a charter to build a railway north of the CPR. MacDonald's government restricted the location of the proposed Manitoba railway because it was not prepared to challenge the monopoly of the CPR. It was not until 1908 that the federal government was forced to get involved in the project. Construction of the railway to Churchill was not completed until April 3, 1929. The last spike was ceremoniously wrapped in silver paper from a tobacco package, a symbol of the shoestring nature of the project. The elevator and port facilities were completed in 1931, over 50 years after the western pressure for the port had first made itself felt.

This is the historical attitude of succeeding Liberal and Tory federal governments in Churchill. We should not forget that we are continuing a long struggle when we call for the increased use of Churchill to serve western farmers. We must also recognize that we are fighting more than apathy. There are groups who have actively opposed the development of Churchill. Prime among these have been the St. Lawrence Seaway shipowners and shippers. It has been eastern interests like these that have told farmers you don't need Churchill. We'll look after you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the same shipowners last fall diverted ships to carry American grain across the Great Lakes, leaving our grain to sit in the terminals at Thunder Bay. It makes me ask whose interest is served to continue our heavy reliance on the port of Thunder Bay and the St. Lawrence Seaway? It certainly does not serve the farmers' interests. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Melville presented some statistics on the cost of shipping grain through Churchill compared to Thunder Bay. I know these figures are correct and I have some to add to them. The port of Churchill development board as done a cost study comparing grain movement from Churchill shipping blocks through port of Churchill and Thunder Bay in 1977-78. According to their study the average cost per tonne for shipping wheat through Churchill from the Churchill shipping blocks was \$7.80. This compares to a cost of \$13.80 per tonne to ship wheat through Thunder Bay to Montreal F.O.B. Similarly, the average cost of shipping barley

through Churchill is \$8.25 per tonne compared to a whopping \$27.45 per tonne for barley shipped through Thunder Bay, F.O.B. Montreal.

The reason for the saving is distance. From Saskatoon to Liverpool, England it is 1,128 miles closer to go by Churchill than it is to go by Montreal. From Regina, the Churchill route to Liverpool is 980 miles closer. From Edmonton, the saving is 1,151 miles, and from Calgary, 1,076 miles. Winnipeg is 480 miles closer to England via Churchill than via Montreal.

The two rail companies, in a joint CN-CP brief to Hall concerning Churchill, acknowledged that saving in loaded car miles could have been as high as 23 per cent if all the grain that had been moved to Churchill in 1974-75 had been moved from the areas closest to Churchill. In 1974-75, actual grain movements to Churchill saved 706,000 car miles that would have been necessary if the grain had moved to other ports.

Mr. Speaker, the figures show that an interchange agreement allowing CP trains to use the CN line would result in huge savings for western farmers. For example, if all the grain shipped in the 1977-78 year could have been shipped through Churchill, it would have resulted in a saving of \$67.4 million. It may not be realistic however to expect that amount of grain to be moved through Churchill but there is no doubt shipping could be at least doubled. One of the main problems discouraging the use of Churchill continues to be insurance regulations.

The shipping season has traditionally been July 23 to October 20 because these were the only dates within which insurance was available. This was true despite the fact a national research study verified common opinion that the port could be open another 24 days. In 1979, the insurance company agreed to extend its coverage back to July 20 gaining three days at the beginning of the season, and up to October 31 gaining 11 days at the end of the season. Efforts continue to have the season extended until November 10.

This year the M.V. Arctic picked up a load of grain in Churchill destined for Poland on November 17. The Arctic is willing to make a trip in both June and November in 1980. The federal government must make a commitment on these trips and on the arrangements necessary to make sure enough grain is available at the terminal for a pick-up.

The insurance rates imposed on Churchill could cripple the best of ports. From Montreal to Great Britain, insurance rates are 10 cents per \$100 value of cargo. From Vancouver to Great Britain, the rate is 17 cents to 19 cents per \$100 cargo. From Churchill to Great Britain, the rate is 55 cents per \$100 worth of cargo. Insurance rates from Churchill are five times that of Montreal and three times that of Vancouver, despite the fact that accident statistics on the Hudson Straights do not bear out these high rates.

The federal government, as well as the insurance companies, is doing some strange things. Why is it that the branch line subsidy paid on the Herchmer subdivision in 1977 was only 34 per cent of the Canadian National's reported operating cost when the normal branch line subsidy is 80 per cent to 85 per cent of the reported operating costs? Why is it that the Turnberry subdivision, north of Hudson Bay, the reported operating loss in 1976 was \$300,000 and to our knowledge, no subsidy has been paid.

Another action or rather lack of action, on behalf of the federal government also concerns me. Negotiations over the 1980 contract are currently stalled between the Public Service Alliance of Canada representatives representing the dock workers and the National Harbours Board. Because no settlement has been reached, the Canadian Wheat Board has taken options for shipping through Thunder Bay if there is no settlement. It is the responsibility of the grain transportation co-ordinator and the federal government to see that this matter is resolved smoothly.

The uncertainty created by the failure to negotiate a contract puts Churchill at a distinct and unfair disadvantage. Dock workers at Churchill are now paid less than at any other harbor in Canada. It is up to the federal government to show that they are not using the labor dispute as another way to discourage shipping through Churchill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think most farmers would agree with me when I say increased reliance on Thunder Bay as our eastern port does not serve western farmers' best interests. We must ask whose interest it serves when such a high percentage of grain transportation is handled through Thunder Bay and the Great Lakes?

I would like to bring to the attention of the Assembly a recent statement by the president of Cargill grain. I know the members opposite support Cargill grain. He says:

The Canadian seaway grain trade needs 10 additional lake vessels by 1985 if exports are to increase by the projected 20 million tonnes for that year. It is time prairie farmers took their heads out of the sand and began taking the eastern Canadian grain route seriously.

Why does he say that the Canadian seaway grain trade needs 10 more ships? I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the recent boom in American exports and increasing fuel costs have put the Canadian grain fleet in considerable demand. He says in 1980 the Canadian fleet will carry close to the same quantity of U.S. grain as Canadian to the export positions. And he wants Canadian farmers to press for a continued federal subsidy for shipbuilding of the seaway fleet, in fact a subsidy for Cargill grain and American farmers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it appears to me that the president of Cargill grain really wants western Canadian farmers' heads stuck in the sand, because it is the only way he could get them to support him in such a project. He wants no part of Churchill because Churchill would serve Canadian farmers only. But that's not what he tells the farmers. He says it is more economically viable to invest in the eastern route than to invest in railways destined to sink into the muskeg once the two and one-half month season is over.

I won't comment on his obviously misleading description of the capability of the port of Churchill. What I will say, is that we've seen such deceptions before. We've seen them in the reports produced and prepared by Bryden Consulting, as the hon. member for Melville has pointed out, and we've seen that successive Liberal and Tory governments have been only too ready to listen to such descriptions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's not the way we in the NDP see the potential of Churchill. I would remind the members opposite that's not the way John Diefenbaker saw the potential of Churchill and the North. I'd like to ask the members opposite what has replaced John Diefenbaker's vision of the North? Is it the member for Moosomin's

vision of the North, or is it the member for Nipawin's vision of the South? Considering Tory support for the U.S.-owned Cargill Grain Company, I would suggest here is little difference between the two.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s Ed Schreyer and the Manitoba NDP ended decades of Tory neglect of Churchill. They initiated, in co-operation with the federal government, a \$40 million improvement program. Under this agreement, Churchill got anew sewer and water system, paved streets, two apartment blocks, and 300 new rental housing units.

All administrative, educational, and recreational activities were combined in the new \$11 million Churchill town centre complex. The town centre contains Churchill's high school, civic offices, the hospital, hockey and curling rinks, bowling alley, pool rooms, swimming pool, theatre, library and cafeteria.

The Manitoba NDP government established a Churchill fabrication plant to prefab new houses and train unemployed, unskilled residents, mostly natives.

The National Harbours Board spent \$12 million to improve port facilities. Mr. Speaker, for awhile it looked like Churchill was going to come into its own. Unfortunately, two things have prevented that. One is the lack of action from the federal government in improving the rail line to Churchill.

The second was the election of a Tory government in Manitoba. One of the first acts of the Tory government was to close the Churchill prefab plant because it wasn't making a profit. The natives trained and put to work are again unemployed and placed on the welfare rolls.

The town centre is forced to operate on just half its required budget. The population is dropping, as it is throughout Manitoba.

Premier Lyon's Tory government is returning to the policy of former Tory governments, a policy of neglect which will mean a slide into decline for Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, such a policy must be stopped. Churchill has the potential to make great contributions to the West. For example, an offshore marine facility combined with new icebreaker cargo ships like the MV Arctic means western Canada could export large tonnages of varied products including potash, sulphur, coal, and pulp and paper, to world markets through Churchill. It could become the shortest route to western Canada to container cargoes. I'd like to discuss in more detail the export potential of Churchill.

First, what about potash through Churchill? In 1978 the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan contracted the IBI consultants to study the potash potential through Churchill.

The study identified savings in nautical miles to major potash customers from Churchill over Vancouver; some 5,500 miles of saving in Rotterdam, 1,700 miles to Rio de Janeiro, and 200 miles to South America. Churchill is also 250 miles to 300 miles closer to the prairie potash mines than is Vancouver.

The short shipping season out of Churchill would mean that only 35 per cent to 40 per cent of the potash shipped in a year could potentially be handled by that port, but still, it looked promising.

The problems? Again, there is the major deterrent of insurance rates. It is difficult to attract a ship to Churchill when insurance rates out of that port are 55 cents per \$100 value, while rates are only 17 cents or 19 cents out of Vancouver.

Another export possibility, I want to discuss is sulphur. Sulphur was shipped out of Churchill in 1974 and 1975; 50,000 tonnes the first year and 100,000 tonnes the second year. But when rail rates went up 80 per cent and storage rates charged by the National Harbours Board were higher at Churchill than at Montreal, the shipments stopped.

The long season made possible by the new ships would make it possible to bring iron ore from Baffin Island and other minerals including copper, zinc, lead, nickel and gold. These resources combined with electric power available from the Nelson River, coal from Alberta, and Pan-Arctic natural gas could allow Churchill to develop as an industrial centre.

With any oil development or mining in the Keewatin area of the North, Churchill would logically become the distribution centre for incoming supplies, as well as serving as the major port for exports.

To move products from Winnipeg to Churchill by rail, just under 1,000 miles, and then from Churchill to Eskimo Point, 170 miles by water up Hudson Bay costs a total of \$77 a tonne. To move the same tonne from Montreal to Eskimo Point by water, a distance of 300 miles costs \$143 — a saving via Churchill of 86 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, there are already facilities for coastal shipping and more could be made available if needed. At the north end of the main wharf there is an area 300 feet long dredged to 20 feet deep specifically for coastal shipping. Located behind the main wharf there is some 83,000 square feet of unheated storage area capable of handling 40,000 tons of general cargo. There is also an outside storage area of 250,000 square feet.

The rail from Winnipeg to Churchill is there. It is an essential rail serving the hydro-electric development of Gillam, and the mining development at Thompson. The rail is necessary and will have to be maintained and upgraded. Surely Winnipeg, using the rail connection to Churchill and the water connection from Churchill, should be the main route for supplies going to communities farther north.

Mr. Speaker, larger volumes of various types of shipping traffic through Churchill would enhance Churchill's advantages as a grain handling port. But even without it, Churchill's efficiency in that respect is proven. In 1977 the elevator's capacity was turned over about six times in less than four months, far surpassing any other Canadian export elevator. This is the kind of service farmers get from a shipping route its critics all call redundant.

Mr. Speaker, the Hudson Bay route is not redundant and will not become redundant. Its

very existence prevents grain shipping costs on the St. Lawrence Seaway from becoming completely out of line. My colleague, the member for Melville, has given many good reasons why this resolution deserves the support of all members of this Assembly. I believe that the facts speak for themselves on why we should support this resolution. Therefore, I am pleased to second this motion and to urge all members to rapidly bring this motion to a vote. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — For the information of the member for Pelly I will be as rapid as possible. I want to make a few comments on this motion in particular as it relates to the comments made by the member for Melville and the member for Pelly.

Firstly the member for Melville who, if his credibility is directly related to the motions which he puts before the House, then I would suggest his credibility has gone up substantially. One of the last motions he had before the House was with regard to migratory birds, which eventually broke down into a jurisdictional dispute over who owns the birds — whether it was Pierre Trudeau or Carter or Blakeney . . . Yes, why are you on your feet?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm on my feet because you are out of order. The member must confine his discussion to this resolution and not some other resolution on some other subject.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will attempt to tighten it up and keep it right on the resolution. Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that what we have here are two prepared speeches about motherhood and apple pie with absolutely no new ideas put before the Assembly with regard to the port of Churchill. Mr. Speaker, obviously one would have to draw that the NDP stands for no darn policies. Here we have two members who get up to discuss the resolution, which is a good resolution in print, Mr. Speaker. Maybe just to draw it to the attention of my hon. colleagues and the members of the House, we should just go over the resolution. It does say:

That this Assembly commend the Canadian Wheat Board for its continued use of the port of Churchill and encourage the development of the port as a full northern port, including the expansion of the port by movement of more grains through the port, the upgrading of the Herchmer subdivision, and the institution of the interchange agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is a good resolution. But what we need to be looking for, Mr. Speaker, is ideas, ways and means by which the use of the port of Churchill may be in fact expanded. Not, Mr. Speaker, to do as the two hon. members have before the Assembly this afternoon, to belabor this House and belabor the time of this House with rhetoric about how those two terrible old-line parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives have dampened and put a cap on expansion in the expansion of the port of Churchill., Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, if that is the only argument which these two members make and allude to (as they have) for the expansion and continued use of the port of Churchill, then, Mr. Speaker, obviously they should be corrected on some of their facts and some of the concerns which we have relating to those facts as we see them.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the port of Churchill and its continued used was supported by nobody more than Don Mazankowski, the short-lived minister responsible for the

Canadian Wheat Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Here was a man, Mr. Speaker, who had a vision for western Canada. Here was a man who had a vision for the port of Churchill. Here was a man, who had a vision for the farmers of Saskatchewan, the individuals. Here was a man who had that port open earlier than anybody else. Mr. Speaker, here was a man who kept it open longer than any other man.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — And, this man had a vision. He had icebreakers in place. He did all kinds of things to assure the farmers of Saskatchewan and the western Canadian economy that is based around agriculture that the port of Churchill would be used.

But, Mr. Speaker, who was it in this country who put Don Mazankowski down the tube? Who was it?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — NDP.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was a third party in our federal government system, calling an election, bringing the motion before the House, causing the fall of the Conservative government, the fall of the first government that faced the problems of this country fairly and squarely, including the port of Churchill. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the facts.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Yes, sir, I agree.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Those are the facts. And not only in so doing did they bring down the government, but they reduced themselves from what was, at least at that time, an influential place in the federal government system to absolutely nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government has concerns, I agree. They have a good concern about the port of Churchill. You two members need to realize it was your own federal counterparts who sold your ideas down the tube when they brought on a federal election and destroyed the federal Conservative government what was for once coming something for Canadians.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I obviously have no concern whatsoever for prepared speeches. Possibly, if these two individual members had something that they really had in their heads, that didn't have to be down in type every time they stood on their feet, then they could speak, Mr. Speaker, from their hearts. I would hate, Mr. Speaker, to be the member for Pelly walking out that door to be interviewed by the media. He sure gave us lots of facts and figures. Even In, Mr. Speaker, as one who really appreciates mathematics, couldn't remember all the facts and figures he had written down. I would like to know who his speech writer was. He must have worked in some computer room or something. maybe information services.

Now, what I am talking about here is that this government needs to have a vision. They need to have some ideas about how we could better use the port of Churchill. Now, Mr.



Speaker, how could that possibly happen? Here is one way. We talk about, as an opposition, the need to diversify in western Canada our agricultural base, our number one base. We need to diversify. We do not need to do as the Minister of Agriculture for this no-darn-policy government says, straight grain farm. We don't want that here in western Canada. We don't want it here in Saskatchewan. We want to diversity and we want to look at the many resources we have, that we could put through the port at Churchill. And how could we do that?

Here's how we could do that. If we take a look at a particular branch line in my hon. colleague's riding (the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley will allude to that in the House this afternoon and give a little more detailed report on that particular branch line.) I will tell you briefly that we have a Corning-Handsworth spur, which members of this Assembly may be familiar with — maybe. It's a Peebles to Wolseley line called the old Wolseley-Reston line.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, if we were to connect that line with Neudorf, we could do these kinds of things. We could move timber from Hudson Bay down to the south. We could move machinery, like Morris machinery for instance, out of Yorkton. That's pretty close to the member for Pelly's riding. That would serve you well, Mr. Member for Pelly. We could do that. We could move machinery. We could move coal from the hon. member for Estevan's riding straight through into Churchill. There is a proposal which we as an opposition have been advancing, not through motions in the House, but directly to the federal government and to our federal opposition counterparts.

Certainly there's an idea. And I see the member for Pelly is listening, and he's concerned. He knows that his time isn't best spent always watching the Flintstones.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, but look at my riding. We could move potash, and I see the Attorney General listening. He knows we could move potash very economically right up that newly developed line into the port at Churchill. And look at the benefits which would spin off — using an old Messer cliché, the spin-off benefits to western Canada — the timber, the machinery, the potash, the coal, all those things could be funnelled through the port of Churchill, and we would have great benefits for the people of Saskatchewan and for western Canada in general.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of idea I feel members of this House should have when they stand up and talk about a particular motion.

So in closing I would just say that I really do appreciate the motion. I think it is a very worthy motion but I'm disappointed in these two hon. members that they didn't give us some new ideas, instead of using it as a political base to take cheap and useless shots at the old Liberal and Conservative governments for not having done their jobs. Well that is not constructive to me. I would just say one more thing in concluding, I notice the member for Pelly said that the agricultural industry is looking for a cheaper way to move grain. Now I don't disagree with that. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House (and in particular the member for Pelly) should seriously take into consideration the Canadian Grain Commission's decision to allow the handling charges of elevators to be increased to this extent. If the elevators were to charge the maximum allowable under the Canadian Grain Commission decision — a decision made by about four men — it would equal the crowrate, Mr. Speaker.

And did we hear a word from the NDP government? No, sir, not one word. But if anybody suggest that maybe we could have some alterations to the crowrate to better move the

grain and transportation, then we get a great howl from this government, oh, they're going to remove the crowrate. I tell you exactly the same thing happened when those handling charges were increased. It was exactly the same thing as the crowrate. And you didn't get the message. You didn't have your calculator then, and where was your speech writer then? So obviously these two members have missed a couple or three very valid points.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member for Melville in debating this particular subject and his concern about rail lines, where the grain should go and the movement of resource products in this province, didn't mention one thing about the use of concrete railway ties. I don't know why that would be. I don't know at all.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say thank you to the Assembly for the time of the House. I think the motion is very worthy and some way or another we may get to support it.

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to join with my colleague for Moosomin in reacting to this motion, put forth by the member for Melville and the member for Pelly.

I heard a lot of statements, a lot of things being said about the depth of the canal and the size of the storage facilities and points which you were busy talking about. I heard you mention that they would bring coal from Alberta. I heard you talking about railroads from Winnipeg up to the Hudson Bay. I didn't hear you come out with any type of proposal that would benefit the people in Saskatchewan and particularly in eastern Saskatchewan, which would benefit the people in your constituency, the member for Melville's constituency, my constituency, the member for Moosomin's constituency, the member for Estevan or the member for Souris-Cannington. I want to put an idea forward to you. You fellows can stand up here; you can blame the federal government for not using the port of Churchill. I support the idea of the use of the port of Churchill. I would like to see it expanded. But let's do something about it. Have you talked to Jean-Luc Pepin about it? No way. You have been measuring up the granaries. Did you talk to Don Mazankowski? When Don Mazankowski was the member you wouldn't even answer his phone calls. Your minister wouldn't even welcome him. Don Mazankowski was the minister who allowed both the CP and CN to use the port of Churchill. What have you done? You get up in this legislature, put forth these great motions where nothing is done about it.

I tell you, we on this side have a plan and that is to build a railroad which will connect the border, the United States, with the port of Churchill, and you only have to build 50 miles of railroad my friends. That is form the spur he was talking about, the Corning-Handsworth spur over to Melville which is right in your constituency, Mr. Minister, right through to the town of Neudorf. From Wolseley to Peebles there is an existing railway bed which the member for Weyburn knows well, known as the Wolseley-Reston spur. That track bed is there; you just have to lay a track. Then you have to build a railroad from Wolseley through to Neudorf, a distance of about 30 miles and you're connected. With that you can move not Alberta coal but the coal from the Estevan coal fields right out to the Hudson Bay and to the European markets where they are dying for it. There's an economic spinoff for all of Saskatchewan and certainly eastern Saskatchewan. You can move the Morris Rod-Weeders and Leon's bulldozers into the United States market where they have good markets for these. I think they have a subplant down in Plentywood or somewhere in that area.

You have been talking about your timber industry. We know the timber industry in the town of Hudson Bay is in trouble right now. With a railroad of this type we could move lumber right down into my area and into your constituency, a welcome move for Saskatchewan. Right through where this railroad would be built, known as the Corning gravel fields, the gravel comes right in from that area up the CNR line and into the city of Regina. That's where they get their gravel from. Right from Corning. It could be accessible into your area.

I agree you had a researched speech. I don't know who did it for you. If you did it yourself, congratulations. Rather than standing there, let's not talk about the size of the granary and the storage, let's come up with a proposal which benefits the people of Saskatchewan and the people in our constituencies.

Before I take my seat I challenge you fellows, the member for Melville and the member for Pelly, to join with me and the member for Estevan and the member for Moosomin, in putting together a proposal and submitting it to Mr. Pepin to build this railway which would be of economic benefit. I welcome your input. I put that challenge out to you.

I would like to look at your comments, Mr. Member for Pelly and Mr. Member for Melville. Therefore, to allow time to study these, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

### **Research No. 27 — Nursing Home Facilities**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin)** moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan):

That this Assembly condemns the failure of the NDP government to provide adequate nursing home facilities to the senior citizens of Saskatchewan, and in particular condemns the unavailability of beds to administer level 3 and 4 care, the inordinate waiting lists to be admitted, the lack of equipment and facilities for adequate care, the undue difficulty in placing level 3 patients whose condition has deteriorated into level 4, the inadequate number of basic facilities in rural communities for level 4 patients, the inconsistency of funding and social aid regulations based on level of care and not in consideration of financial burdens placed on individual families, the limited and disjointed scope of programs designed for the mentally ill and the general understaffed and unco-ordinated atmosphere currently prevalent in nursing homes throughout Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have, as you would be aware, stood this motion for a considerable length of time for two reasons primarily — one being there were other matters which were possibly, at that particular time in the legislature, somewhat more important in terms of the House business, and, Mr. Speaker, I was giving the government ample time (and the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Health who I am sure must work in close consultation as related to the nursing home facilities and those particular cares of the people of Saskatchewan.)

Will be moving this motion at the conclusion of my remarks and I will just run it by the members so they are very clear as to what we are discussing here in the House this

afternoon. The motion will be as previously printed. Mr. Speaker, the motion more or less describes some of the concerns I have as it relates to the care of our elderly in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in tabling this motion which is, I suppose, (and I hope the government doesn't take it as seriously as maybe it reads) a motion condemning the government by failing to provide adequate nursing home facilities for senior citizens in the province. Let me say that I do so in an attempt to right what I consider to be a very serious wrong. I know that members of the government feel their nursing home care facilities are quite adequate and it is obvious on this side of the House that we don't feel they are as adequate as maybe they should be and there is need for some improvement.

Hoping the government can keep that in mind, my comments are made in that vein. I am only looking to see improvements made in the levels 3 and 4 home care facilities in particular. If they could take those suggestions under some form of advisement and take action on them, I would be pleased. Mr. Speaker, certainly they haven't at this point. I think I have given them ample time to put those particular changes into place. They know what my concerns are.

The wrong is that this government either overlooked or chooses to ignore the most significant part of the whole equation when deciding upon their priorities for home care nursing facilities. I am speaking of senior citizens themselves. There are many serious wrongs to be righted. One of the most serious is the lack of adequate numbers of beds for patients who require care levels 3 and 4.

In a study which I undertook last fall, a study which examined every nursing home registered with the Department of Social Services, the single, most common complaint related to the lack of an adequate number of beds for patients requiring level 3 and 4 care. Mr. Speaker, the government's position is that they have more beds per capita in the province of Saskatchewan than any other province in this country.

Now numbers of beds are not the sole answer to the nursing care home problem. Certainly, if you have a number of beds vacant in a particular area where there is no need for them and in another location have beds full and a waiting list, then that is in fact the problem.

I'm not being really overly critical of the government in this particular area. What it amounts to is a proper distribution of beds or rather an adequate number of beds to facilitate what can from time to time become an overload. That's really our concern. Fully, Mr. Speaker, one of every three nursing home administrators stated that was their most serious problem, the problem of a shortage of level 3 and 4 beds.

Now, if this government plans at this point in time to go against what the administrators of our nursing care homes believe to be the case through fact, then I feel they will find themselves in a most difficult situation. I for one am most prepared to accept the word of the administrators of nursing homes. I feel they are adequate. I have reason to feel they are adequate, inasmuch as my two-month study into the nursing care home problem brought these facts to surface. The government's response is that we have the in-home care program now and this is going to solve the problem. Mr. Speaker, that may well be my next study to see if in fact the directors of your in-home care board presently in place really believe that in-home care is going to solve the shortage of level 3 and 4 beds. I would suggest that it is not, on the long haul, going to solve the particular problem. What it will do, (and I won't disagree with the government on this),

is slow down, if you like, the process and possibly free-up some levels 3 and 4 beds for 1 and 2.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would appear therefore that there is a need for renovation of and expansion of existing facilities in nursing homes to provide better service for patients requiring care at levels 3 and 4. Obviously that seems to be the case. Now on this same note, their expansion should be occurring in a manner which will allow the large majority of senior citizens to find a place in a nursing home in their community so as to relieve the stress created by separation from family by long distances. Certainly the Minister of Health and the Minister of Social Services have made comments along the line that the in-home care program will help to relieve that particular kind of stress experienced by our elderly, by our senior citizens.

They are being taken away from their own homes, their communities where they were raised and where they grew up and located in cities like Regina. Heaven forbid, it's the last place one would ever want to have their senior citizens. I am sure there are many people have a great love for the city of Regina. As a rural resident I certainly have to be somewhat biased in favor of rural Saskatchewan. I know that most senior citizens would prefer to be in rural Saskatchewan and not in the city of Regina, making it very difficult for their relatives and loved ones to visit them, and give them a feeling of being in a (if you like) foreign atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, another major problem created both by inadequate bed allocation (and I stress that), not an inadequacy of numbers of beds, and by funding allocation occurs in the area of fee scheduling. That is one area in which it certainly seems to be a problem. The Minister of Social Services has recently indicated that large increases have been made available to the nursing home care program, yet under close scrutiny the actual amount the individual resident of a nursing home will receive forms only a small portion of the allocation. As rates for the various care levels rise, the resident is forced to pay more and more of the costs of his place in the nursing home. The gap between his contribution and the smaller portion which the government pays seems to widen daily.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this province should introduce a program, or at least consider a program, similar to British Columbia and Alberta whereby a fixed daily cost is provided and levied on institutional residents regardless of the care level required. This is not something I am saying should be done without any other consideration but a program this government could look at and take into consideration, to possibly adapt at least some of the facets of those programs which would be workable here in Saskatchewan for the benefit of our senior citizens. The program in Alberta charges (I believe) a flat daily fee of \$5 . . . on all such residents. The expansion of existing facilities would also serve to alleviate the length of time that a potential resident of a nursing home would have to wait to receive a bed in one of these facilities.

One of the major problems with this bed shortage relates to the handling of patients who are admitted as level 3 patients whose conditions deteriorate to a level 4 stage. Within the breakdown of statistics on bed shortages, it would appear that the lack of level 4 beds is by far the most acute. It would therefore be the first priority to begin expansion of beds at the level 4 stage. Mr. Speaker, when I say expansion of the level 4 beds, I don't say necessarily for what is the condition today, but what is inevitably going to be the condition tomorrow. I am emphasizing this point because I do not want to see this government of the province of Saskatchewan in a catch-up position as it relates to level 3 and 4 beds. I say this in the interest of the Minister of Health and in the interest of the Minister of Social Services, certainly they don't want to see themselves in

a catch-up position.

With inflation and the costs of building such nursing homes (and I know at one time the costs were about \$30,000 per bed) I agree they are very expensive but if we are going to put priorities in this province then let's put them with our senior citizens. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House can take that position.

A second problem relating to this area of patients' conditions deteriorating to level 4 arises when a level 4 patient remains in a level 3 bed. First of all they are not receiving the care their condition requires, and secondly they end up paying the large part of the costs for their care, whereas if they were in proper level 4 bed, they would be receiving appropriate care at no cost. The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I shall not.

But just before I close, I would like to make one brief comment. It concerns the placing of both mentally and physically handicapped people in these homes along with the senior citizens. This is a situation which must be corrected. The government must find ways to place these people in facilities where their particular difficulties can be looked after in an appropriate manner. Their problems and their needs are not usually the same as those of senior citizens. To ensure that the mentally and physically handicapped are able to receive the maximum appropriate care which their special circumstances require, a new or revised program should be effected, perhaps along the lines of an enhanced home care program specially adapted to their needs which could be created. This is one suggestion which I throw out for the minister responsible for social services. The spinoff would of course release nursing home beds for our needy senior citizens.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, there is a need for major revisions in the government's programs as they related to senior citizens.

There is a need for one central section within social services to co-ordinate a global examination, evaluation and promotion of all facets of the programs relating to our senior citizens. There is a need for an agency to co-ordinate the currently unco-ordinated series of medical care programs.

I want to emphasize this program as well. I, for one, will not deny that this government has many programs relating to social services and to the health needs of the people of Saskatchewan. I will not deny that. But what we need to do is amalgamate these many programs into an overall health care program, in the physical and mental areas, for the senior citizens and the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we need an agency to co-ordinate the currently unco-ordinated series of medicare care programs and to be responsible for ongoing assessment, referral and co-ordination of patient needs. We need to establish medical and special-care priorities and programs and monitor the entire geriatric health care programs.

It is for the reasons stated above that I have made this motion, Mr. Speaker. It is the sincere hope that it will jar this government into some progressive and concrete action. People are suffering and no amount of rhetoric in this Chamber or anywhere else will alleviate this suffering.

It requires action by this government. I hope we will witness some of this action soon, Mr. Speaker. Certainly this is my case as I speak on the motion I have before the House. I feel I have made points which are necessary to be made. There are many more

arguments. One certainly could speak for hours at length on a motion of this nature.

But what I have attempted to do to expedite the matters of the House is to clearly and concisely put before the government and the members of this Assembly, the cases that relate to level 3 and level 4 care patients and the level 1 and 2 as well, but to a lesser degree. I have related the concerns I have and put forth the inadequacies prevalent in the system today.

I have outlined what I feel to be some very workable solutions. I have not done that by having a dream in the night or something of that nature. I have done this by consulting with people in the profession, with the nursing care home administrators, with the doctors, with nurses, with the people who are now your new directors and part and parcel of the new in-home care program we support, Mr. Speaker. Certainly anything at all which can assist in this area is greeted by the opposition.

But it's not the answer and that is what I am trying to say to the House today. The in-home care program is not the answer in the long-term. We must make a decision today by supporting this motion. I tell members of this House, we can. This government can support the motion. By supporting this motion they can make a decision to assure this House and the people of Saskatchewan (in particular the senior citizens) that the shortages and inadequacies of level 3 and level 4 care in this province, and the disjointed and unco-ordinated effort being put forward by the present government programs can be improved.

That's all I'm saying, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying their programs are all wrong or they're not working, but they can be improved. That's the point I want to make very clear. Any member of this House who speaks against this motion or does not support this motion, clearly is accepting the system the way it is today and is not prepared to accept change and improvement to the system.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan), Resolution No. 27.

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the motion before us. The comments may develop into more than just a few. I wish that I would have an opportunity to compare what the member for Moosomin said today to the motion that he presented to the House. I would like to have supported a resolution which would have been reasonable in approach, which would have given some reasonable criticisms for the solutions of level 3 and level 4. We've admitted in this House that we have a study under way in this particular area.

I want to ask members in this House how the member for Moosomin expects me, as Minister of Health, to support a resolution that is condemning everything that we're doing in levels 3 and 4. Read the resolution.

He has not one good thing to say about our program, and yet has the audacity to come into this House and ask me, as Minister of Health, and the Minister of Social Services, to support that kind of a resolution. I could support many of the words that you've said today in the House, but don't ask me to support this kind of a resolution that has no resemblance at all to the reality that exists in Saskatchewan. None at all!

I certainly will be moving an amendment after I get through speaking on this resolution. I want to say to the member for Moosomin, I think it is rather regrettable that he could

not have brought forward a resolution that would have attempted to resolve and come to grips with some of the problems that exist out there. The problems are not that great that we can't address ourselves to them and as members of this House who are elected from all parts of Saskatchewan come up with some reasonable suggestions.

First of all, the member in his resolution says nothing to the allocation of beds and the distribution of beds — not one thing in his resolution! He condemns us for not having sufficient numbers of beds; that's what your resolution says.

I must respond to what the resolution says and not to what the member said in this House. I cannot, because the two don't relate. They simply don't relate. The member knows full well that when it comes to the number of beds in this province, when you take the total number of beds from level 1 right through to level 5, that this province compares well. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think no one could contradict me when I say we have more beds in this province per individual than any other province in Canada.

When it comes to levels 1, 2, and 3 beds, we have had to take substantial measures, in the last eight or nine years that we have been in power, to double and increase the number of beds that are available.

We have taken action in other areas. We have, Mr. Speaker, one of the more progressive housing programs in all of Canada. There is no doubt about that. Many senior citizens have told us, through the senior citizen's council, through the Saskatchewan Association of Special-Care Homes (who are representatives of all the nursing homes in this province) and I ask the member for Moosomin to have a look at the resolutions that have been passed over the last three or four years by the special-care homes association.

One of the resolutions they have passed is that we should not increase unduly the number of beds for levels 1, 2, and 3. Resolutions passed over the last three or four years have indicated to us, however, what we ought to do is to implement a home care program, which we have done. They asked us to provide other services in the community so that senior citizens could remain in their own communities as long as possible.

The policy and program of this government, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a continuum of services and programs to senior citizens. We recognize that you cannot provide for all senior citizens all the beds that are required in each of the communities in Saskatchewan. That is impossible. It would be too expensive to do so. I think for many senior citizens we simply would not be able to provide the specialized services in their communities.

The member's resolution, Mr. Speaker, condemns us for all of our programs. There isn't as I said, one good thing said about our programs in levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 in that resolution. I think therefore the resolution should be completely thrown out and we should address ourselves to the problem and to the reality that exists out there.

As I have indicated we have approximately 7,600 beds in levels 1, 2, and 3, in this province. We have another 1,000 to 1,100 level 4 beds. If you add on to that another 7,000 to 8,000 acute care beds, we have in this province approximately 16,000 beds. These are nursing home and hospital care beds.



Mr. Speaker, what I want to tell the member opposite, (and I agree with some of the things he said in the House) although it's not recorded in the resolution, in some areas we do have some difficulty because the beds are not evenly distributed. You will find, for example, in Saskatoon we have a problem with level 4. There is a lengthy waiting list in level 4 and we are addressing ourselves to that problem. But the member for Moosomin didn't indicate what his survey indicated in his particular area as far as level 4 was concerned.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Sure, I did.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, if the member had, then he would have told this House that last January there was only one level 4 person assessed as level 4 on the waiting list. I ask the member for Moosomin is one person, who is assessed level 4, in that particular area last January, a long waiting list? Mr. Speaker, I think it would be irresponsible of this government if there weren't a waiting list. It would tell me, Mr. Speaker, and indicate to me, that we have overbuilt our facilities, that we simply could not supply sufficient individuals to fill those beds.

Mr. Speaker, there are individuals in this province, and I think the member for Moosomin falls into that category, who would have all of our senior citizens horizontal after they retire. He would provide a bed for each and every one of them. Mr. Speaker, I say this because in 1975 the average age for senior citizens to go into a nursing home was around 73. Was it because they could no longer function in the community? Was it because it was cheaper for them to go into a nursing home? What were the reasons? Why are senior citizens moving into our nursing homes, when in other parts of this country and in Europe, the average age in 1977 (I want the members to listen to this) was 87 for one to enter a nursing home. Ours at that time was around 75 or 76. Why the difference? Why did we want to take our senior citizens and force them into nursing homes? I'll tell you why.

Mr. Speaker, what other provinces and particularly other governments in other countries have done, is to provide facilities in the community, an excellent home care program, a good geriatric program. They provided sheltered housing. They provided for the senior citizens in the community, visiting services. They took care of one of the essential items which senior citizens responded to us as the reason why they were in a nursing home. They were lonely. They said to us when we asked them, why are you in a nursing home? We moved because we were lonesome. We wanted to associate with someone.

You don't take care of the problems of senior citizens by providing a bed for him or her in a nursing home. What you do is provide a totality of services in the community so that the senior citizens then can socialize. That is why we have in this province 330 or 340 activity centres where senior citizens can go to socialize with their friends. But, Mr. Speaker, that isn't sufficient. We need in this province a good home care program. I know the Minister of Social Services is working on that. I think it would be the wrong approach to put in a crash program of substantially increasing the number of beds in levels 3 and 4.

We know that some of the nursing homes now in the province are having difficulties filling their levels 1 and 2 because of the home care program and because of other programs that we have initiated. That should reduce the pressure in certain areas on levels 3 and 4. That will reduce the pressure. Well, I will name the areas. They are all those areas in which the Minister of Social Services will be establishing home care

boards.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How many are established?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Well, he will answer that for you. I am not sure how many are established. But I would think that . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — All I have to know is where they have trouble filling levels 1 and 2.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I mentioned in the House when I brought in the home care program, we would go with those districts where there were very few services, where we had very few home care services. That is the criteria we have continued to use and will continue to use.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the members that because of some of the programs we have established, the average age now of senior citizens going into nursing homes is around 83. I would hope that as we continue to provide services in rural Saskatchewan and in urban Saskatchewan, a totality of services for our senior citizens, that the average age will continue to go up. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we can increase that age to about 87, 88 or 89 years within the next two or three years if we don't reverse our decision and build more and more beds. As the member for Moosomin indicated, to build beds at a cost of \$30,000 to \$40,000 (and they are probably over \$40,000 now) will put a real financial bind on many of those communities. They will want to fill those nursing homes in order to pay for them. I think, Mr. Speaker, that would be a disservice to our senior citizens. I hope this government will not take that easy course.

Mr. Speaker, we have recognized the need for some additional beds. We have made available two additional beds in rural hospitals. Some of the hospitals have simply not accepted them. That is their decision. But we have made that available to them. Those which have, we have recognized that in the grants we make available.

We also, Mr. Speaker, recognize that some of our nursing homes, particularly level 3, were taking care of residents who probably required more than just level 3. We have recognized that, through our \$300 per month up to 10 per cent of their level 3. I know the present Minister of Social Services will continue to improve that program and other programs.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the outset, I would like to have supported a resolution that would have addressed, itself to the reality which exists out there, that would have addressed itself to some of the problems we do have so that all members in this House could have supported that particular motion. But a motion, Mr. Speaker, that totally condemns the program we have established in this province, which is probably better than any other program right across Canada in its totality . . . In its totality. I will measure our program and I will challenge the member for Rosetown-Elrose to take our total program that we have for senior citizens and compare it to any other total program in any other province, and I will guarantee you that ours will be in the top one or two. That doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, we don't have some problems to which we should address ourselves. And we will address ourselves to those. But, Mr. Speaker, having indicated that I cannot support a resolution that totally condemns a worthwhile program. We will . . . (inaudible) . . . Well, that is why we have 111,000 here. Your statement makes about as much sense as the resolution did and the speech that the individual made.

Mr. Speaker, because the resolution does not face reality and does not give us any

solutions at all to the problems that exist out there, I cannot support that resolution and therefore, would like to move the following amendment. That all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for the positive steps taken to provide adequate special-care facilities for senior citizens in Saskatchewan, for increasing the number of special-care and level 4 beds, especially in rural communities, for the development of home care programs and co-ordinating them with other initiatives to assist all residents of Saskatchewan, not just the elderly, to continue to live with independence and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the member for Quill Lakes, Mr. Koskie, Minister of Social Services.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the amendment to the resolution. I want to say to the hon. member who moved the original motion. I'm rather surprised because I think he just put it in his own words. He wasn't very serious about the content of that motion because in his own words he said the motion was delayed because there were more important things. He put a motion on and I want to say that he spoke on it for about 5 to 10 minutes; he rambled through with the coherent message to the Assembly.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, if the member had been really serious, it would have dawned upon him that one of the essential problems facing the provinces in respect to the construction of further homes lies not with the provincial government but directly with the federal government. In fact we ran into it during the time of the Tory government. We ran into the problem in a Tory constituency, the constituency of Nipawin.

I want to tell you the arrangement we have had in the financing of the special care homes has been this. The local non-profit organization, the board, would put up 8 per cent. The provinces agreed to put up 20 per cent as a total grant. The federal government has agreed to finance the balance, 72 per cent, on the basis of a mortgage. Seventy-two per cent mortgage, that's the federal government's commitment to the senior citizens of Canada. But not only that, suddenly we were in the process of building homes in Saskatchewan, in fact in the constituency of Nipawin. I find the province agreed, the board had sufficient money, we approved the plans and lo and behold who was there to stop the construction of special-care homes? The federal government said we are going to put a maximum unit price on it at \$31,000 and there is no possible way of building any beds at \$31,000 a unit. What they did is say we will no longer subsidize the interest on the mortgage to the maximum amount which it cost the Nipawin board to build that home. Surely if the member had been serious, he would have at least included in his motion a condemnation of the federal government for reneging on an agreement to the senior citizens in the provinces throughout Canada.

I want to say that, as my colleague has indicated, if we want to really get into a debate vis-a-vis Alberta and what they provide their senior citizens as compared to Saskatchewan, I am prepared to place on the record, the record of this government and what it has given to senior citizens. I am prepared to challenge anyone on the dollars which we spend on our senior citizens relative to other provinces. I want to say that we have come a long way in providing a comprehensive package to senior citizens of

Saskatchewan. If you are going to approach the problem, I think you have to do it on an overall rationalization basis. We have, as my colleague has indicated, embarked on a massive housing program, many of them for the senior citizens, which I think you will find throughout the communities of Saskatchewan and in the cities. Another component is a form of sheltered housing, a further component is the home care package which we are putting in comprehensively throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

Finally, there is the special-care homes. We have to recognize that senior citizens, if they are asked, will say, I want to remain in my own home as long as I can. This is the information which we have received from the senior citizens and so what we are doing as a whole package is developing the home care. We have now in place some 25 boards out of the 45 and are working toward getting the total complement throughout the province.

But the thing is that we have done a number of studies, and one of the studies was done jointly for the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan by a Dr. Graham Clarkson. He found from his survey that a large number of the people who are residents of special-care homes were there against their own will. In other words, they weren't given the option and many would have chosen to go back to their own homes or to another residence if they had some support provisions. So what I am saying is we have to recognize that fact and then recognize who is able to operate within their own local home and community with support services like home care. Then we look at those who need more intensive care, and that is what we are addressing in the study which we are proposing.

I think the hon. members know we are addressing this problem, but in order to really determine the requirement, what is needed is to have standardized assessment and placement units. Because you will find through out the province we'll get a request for a special-care home supported by a list with a lot of people on it but when you go back to analyze that list, you will find that many of them don't want to go into the home. Many of them are put on there by doctors who say in the future they may require this care or sometimes their children put them on the list.

A very interesting study was done in Regina. Back in 1976 we did a study and it was found in that study there was a great need for more special-care homes. On the so-called waiting list there were 1,081 names. These individuals wanted to be in special-care homes. The department analyzed that list. They found there were 450 duplicate applications. In other words, various homes had the same applicants' names on them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . just a minute, let me finish my story. It is going to be quite impressive. A further 157 were out-of-town (even out-of-province). That left 474 applications from Regina residents.

A total of 539 Regina and out of-town applications were then checked. The check revealed 50 were deceased; 100 already in other special-care homes; 107 unable to be contacted because of change of address; 86 satisfied to remain at home; 50 in hospital, private nursing homes, etc., for a total of 413. Of these only 13 were assessed as requiring level 3 care, and 28 requiring level 2 care. Moreover, 50 of the 80 given the choice expressed a preference to stay in their own homes. So the request for additional beds (as you can understand) was quickly withdrawn.

The hon. member for Moosomin has indicated some concern for the number of beds in his particular area. I am prepared to admit that we are looking at and analysing some of the pockets as indicated by the Minister of Health, in order to establish a balance. You do find some areas (old settlements) where the population on the average tends to be older in a given area of the province than in another area and we are addressing that particular problem.

I just want to indicate that, even in respect of the survey which was done in the southeast or the province, we found there are a number of people who were on the list. . . In order to assess the basic reliability of those who were placed on the list, whether they required that type of care, we found that, taking a sample, only about 20 per cent of those who were on the list required the care even though they were listed as needing that type of care. What I am really saying is that what we need to put into place is a proper method of assessment and placement. That is what we are working on with the various home-care boards in order that it may be synchronized so the individual senior citizen will get the type of care required.

I want to mention another step which has been taken in the city of Saskatoon; we are establishing a home care board and here they are setting up a standard assessment and placement unit, as a pilot project, in co-ordination with the home care board, and that, accordingly will be making the placements in co-ordinating the type of care required.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I take very seriously the allegation made in the original motion. I think the opposition should have been commending the government for the outstanding effort it has been making to the senior citizens. In fact, they should be commending the government for the \$10 million or more that we have placed in home care. I want to indicate the home care program of Saskatchewan is so well received that the Alberta side of Lloydminster decided to accept the Saskatchewan version rather than the Alberta version. So I want to say that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to second this motion. I know the senior citizens of Saskatchewan strongly support the actions of this government. Certainly we will be working with them to improve their lot.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Before the member takes his place I wonder would he permit just a quick question for information services?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'd like to ask one question. Would you supply us with a copy of the report?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order.

**MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — I listened with quite a bit of interest to the bragging of a couple of ministers across the way. I don't think he was really serious in a lot of the things he was saying. He was just making a lot of noise. If they had been really serious, one of the things you wouldn't have raised was the number of dollars you are spending on social services on the special-care homes in western Canada. I would like to advise you that from statistics, you are the fourth in the four western provinces as far as actual dollars that are spent. So don't tell me that you are doing the best.

You are spending fewer dollars per capita on the senior citizens in Saskatchewan than any other of the four western provinces. Those figures are right out of the statistics. They are authentic, and you can't deny them. I'd like to make a couple of recommendations to the minister. He's in the process of a fairly serious study into the care of the senior citizens and the special-care homes. One of the things I'd like to recommend to the minister is that in this study they consider moving to the similar type of operation as we see in the three other western provinces.

That is, we look at a room and board type of charge for people in all levels of care so each of these people can afford to be in a home when they need to be. They can't today. And a number of them will tell you that they can't.

To back up my statement that they can't afford it, in 1971 one-third of the people in special-care homes were on social assistance and two-thirds were self-supporting. In 1979 those figures were exactly reversed. Two-thirds of the people now in special-care homes are on social assistance and one-third are self-supporting, an exact reversal from 1971 to 1979. And that's fact and you can check the facts.

Now your department is really not providing the services these people need at a cost they can afford. When you take a person living in a home in Rosetown in level 4, and ask him to subsidize you by \$700 a month, you can't tell me they can afford it. They just can't afford it, very few can. So it's gone beyond the point where you can say that you're doing a good thing. It's time you start to look at what's needed and you do something for them. I think we have to look at the dignity of people. You spoke of dignity; there isn't much dignity if you put them all on social assistance. They like to be self-supporting. In the other western provinces they can be self-supporting because they can pay their room and board out of their old-age pension and their supplement, in all cases. And you leave them with the dignity older people would like to have. Don't forget your hair is turning gray, Mr. Minister, and one of these days you will be one of those people.

I have been quite concerned about your home care program. I think it's a good idea to go into a home care program. But when you get out into the country, you are going to have difficulty finding people to staff the program. I talked to the home care boards in my district and they tell me it is a very real concern to find qualified people to do the job.

What you are doing is taking away a lot of the community spirit that was providing free service to these people by concerned individuals. You are taking away this kind of free service and you are going to be paying people to do it. But you could not pay a lot of these people to do that type of work. They do it as a labor of love but they won't do it for measly dollars. So I think in a very short time you are going to have a real difficulty staffing your home care program. If you can staff it, it'll be fine.

Let's talk about level 4. In Saskatchewan we have many people classified as level 4 who cannot get into level 4 beds. I have raised this with the minister on a number of occasions. This is becoming a very serious problem. When the minister over here was suggesting that a number of people had died before they finished their survey, I'm not surprised because of the speed of some of your surveys.

In Regina you have had people on waiting lists and when they eventually were invited to come into a home because there was a vacancy, they had been dead for two years before they received the letter. That shows a little of the speed at which things move in your departments. You are not keeping track, and I can tell you the people who are running these homes will verify that statement . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You bet

I'll take you. You come tonight and I'll take you.

I think it's necessary for this government to take a look at funding a level 4 person whether he is lying in a level 4 bed or a level 3 bed. He's receiving that kind of care regardless of which bed he's in. I think the Department of Health and the MCIC in particular are not doing their jobs and are not fulfilling their commitment to the general public when they do not provide funding for people who are classified as level 4. It's a deterrent fee, a very high deterrent fee. I have raised this with you a number of times because in most cases these people will be paying at least \$700 a month toward their care . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is true. I believe that until the day comes when you start supporting these people after you class them as level 4, you are not fulfilling the commitment of the MCIC in this province.

I'm not going to speak at length on this subject because I think we will be talking about social services again in the evening when we come into estimates. But I would just ask you to check some of the figures you are trying to give. Check what I have responded with because you will find what I have told you are facts which you will have to verify and challenge.

Amendment agreed.

**MR. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — On the motion as amended, I would like some time to study it. One of our members, who wanted to speak on it is not present for a moment or two, so I thought I would rise to my feet to suggest we adjourn the debate on this issue so she can get into the debate. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 29 — Rural Natural Gas Distribution System**

**MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River)** moved, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor):

That this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan consider designing and implementing, as soon as possible, a rural natural gas distribution system to extend to all rural residents of Saskatchewan the opportunity to consume natural gas.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my motion about natural gas distribution through the country is something that concerns me very much. In the 1940s and 1950s, we had power put through the country. I think it is about time in 1980, that we put gas through rural Saskatchewan. I'm sure the government took the credit for putting the power through this country in the '40s and '50s but at the same time power somehow or other happened to get through the rest of Canada. So I don't think they get all the credit. It just happened to be the days. Now, I think it is about time we keep up with the rest of Canada in getting natural gas throughout the country.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.

**CORRIGENDUM**

The following correction should appear in the speech by the Hon. G. MacMurchy in the Debates and Proceedings N.S. VOL. XXII No. 55A Friday, May 9, 1980, 10:00 a.m.

Paragraph 3 of Mr. MacMurchy's speech, lines 6 and 7 on page 2891 should read:

Depending upon the initial quality of milk, it perishes within approximately 4 to 8 hours if it is subjected to room temperatures.

[Note: the electronic version of the proceedings indicated has been corrected.]