

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 2, 1985**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

**THE CLERK:** — I beg to advise the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present today to open this sitting.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

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

**Non-Controversial Bills**

**Bill No. 54 — An Act respecting Apprenticeship and Qualification for Certification in Certain Trades**

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

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, rather, as chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 54, An Act Respecting Apprenticeship and Qualification in Certain Trades, as being controversial.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Second reading, next sitting.

**Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Sharing (Potash) Act**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Sharing (Potash) Act, as being non-controversial.

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

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Department of Social Services Act**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Department of Social Services Act, as being non-controversial.

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

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Tax Enforcement Act**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Tax Enforcement Act, as being non-controversial.

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

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 58 — An Act to promote Regulatory Reform in Saskatchewan by repealing Certain Obsolete Statutes**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 58, An Act to promote Regulatory Reform in Saskatchewan by repealing Certain Obsolete Statutes, as being non-controversial.

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

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 59 — An Act to amend The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan Act**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 59, An act to amend The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan as being non-controversial.

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

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. MULLER:** — It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to this House a group of students from Christopher Lake. There's 20 students. Their teacher is Linda Klughart; chaperons, Debra Greschner, Lois Warren, Evelyn Paul and Dennis Corriveau.

Being from one of the most beautiful spots in the province of Saskatchewan, up in the lakeland area where I would advise all you members to sometime come up and visit — and I'm sure they would treat you as well as you people will treat them here today — I would ask all members to give them a hand and a welcome to the legislature. I hope their trip has been interesting, and I hope they have a good trip home. I'll be visiting with them at 2:30 for refreshments and pictures.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MRS. SMITH:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have the honour of standing in for the Deputy Premier today. Unfortunately he's not here. And I'm sure that he would welcome 39 students, grades 4, 5, 6, and 7, from the Carievale Elementary School in Carievale, Saskatchewan, along with their teacher, Gale Spence.

I understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Deputy Premier considers Carievale to be his home town. And if the leadership that deals for the future up in the gallery is equal to the leadership of the Deputy premier, this province will be well served in the future.

I look forward to meeting with the group for possible questions that you may have and for some refreshments at 2:30. And I would ask all members to welcome them.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, an all of the members of the Assembly today, 10 grade 8 through 10 students who are in the Speaker's gallery, attending today from the Paul Dojack Youth Centre, along with Danen Connell and Ward Lerat.

They are seated on the left side of the Speaker's gallery. The students wanted to indicate to the Assembly today that they appreciated very much the \$7.5 million expansion recently announced to the Paul Dojack Youth Centre. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were somewhat disappointed that the plans did not include a swimming pool.

I wish that all members would welcome our guests to the Assembly today. I trust that, although it was a disappointment that there wasn't a pool, that your afternoon here today will not be a disappointment. Thank you very much.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Independent Inquiry into Possible Conflict of Interest

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and the House Leader, I'd like, I guess, to address my question to the acting, acting House Leader. And, Mr. Acting, Acting House Leader, my question deals with the suspension of the PC member for Prince Albert over the member's apparent failure to fully disclose his financial interest in the \$3.5 million Rainbow Bay resort at Redberry.

Yesterday, the Premier indicated that he has ordered the Minister of Parks to investigate, but I want to indicate to you that the actions of the current park minister and his predecessor should also be part of the investigation.

And so what I ask you then, in light of that, will in fact the Premier and your government now take the only effective action that is appropriate, and that is to appoint an outside independent person to inquire into this most unfortunate and, I say, scandalous situation?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — As the acting, acting, acting, acting Premier for today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You should know about the leadership race. Let me tell you, he's got 7 looking over his shoulder over there, and don't talk to me about leadership campaigns, I mean, ours are settled.

Having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier indicated yesterday what action he was taking. There is a long-standing commitment to eastern Canada — and I gather most members were aware of that — by both the Premier and the Minister of Finance, and the Deputy Premier had a speaking engagement at Cut Knife. And so I simply state that the Premier indicated yesterday what course of action he was taking. I have every confidence. If the opposition does not feel that's adequate, they can pursue the matter further, just to indicate that we have had allegations of all sorts of inquiries in the past and they've been found wanting.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A supplement, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As the Minister of Justice has indicated, we in the opposition are not, in fact, satisfied with the internal investigation.

And what I ask you: do you honestly believe that the cloud that hangs over this legislature by the action of the member from Prince Albert, the cloud and the suspicion of inside information to benefit himself, do you believe that the people of this province will be satisfied by having the very minister to whom the cloud hangs over, as the Legislative Secretary — do you believe that that, in fact, will satisfy the doubts that the people of Saskatchewan have in respect to the transaction?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well I ask everybody to look up and see if they see a cloud hanging over. It looks pretty sunny and bright to me out there.

But having said that, I have little doubt that, assuming a full and complete inquiry, that no, I don't think everyone will be satisfied. I know that the NDP will not be satisfied, no matter what the issue is.

You asked the question: will everyone be satisfied? No. If you're not satisfied with the extent of the investigation when the Premier reports to the Assembly, as he's undertaken to do, then you know as well as I do that you've got every opportunity to pursue it at that time. And I frankly think you're being unfair in prejudging it.

### **Transportation of PCBs**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question is to the accident-prone Minister of the Environment, and it deals with the latest PCB-contaminated material spill, this time along No. 11 Highway between Prince Albert and Saskatoon. I gather this was one highway which hadn't had anything spilled on it yet.

Mr. Minister, you claimed that the proposed PCB treatment plant for Regina will pose no threat to Regina residents because you have assured us the transportation of PCB material is "handled with the utmost care," I think were your words. Well in this incident, 24 electrical transformers were dumped into the back of an open truck. A number of them leaked PCB contaminated material all the way from Prince Albert to Saskatoon, and no one even tumbled to the problem until the next day. In light of this incident, Mr. Minister, how can you claim that the people of Regina have nothing to worry about with respect to the transportation of PCBs in and out of the city?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question in regards to the transportation of PCBs, there has been an order in council, a federal order in council, in regards to how it will be and should be handled, and will be handled in the province of Saskatchewan. I've talked to Don Mazankowski, the Minister of Transport, today. He informs me

that this incident that you are referring to is being looked into by the federal Department of Transport. Under his order he will look into it and see what, if anything, if any charges are necessary. We are also doing an investigation through the Department of the Environment of Saskatchewan in regards to what happened how it happened, and how to prevent it from happening again.

In regards to your PPM plant here in the city of Regina . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In regards . . . You asked that question first there. In regards to that I have talked, I have talked to the mayor, some of your council just this morning about it. I've also asked them what was the procedure that went on in regards to allowing the building permit to go ahead. They said, well we worked in consultation with you guys. We issued the building permit at a council meeting that was carried through a council.

They carried it through; it was done through an open council meeting. The building permit was approved. We are putting in that we have a minister's order in regards to regulations that we need to protect the area around there. I don't know what else you could ask.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment. I had a call from an individual in Saskatoon this morning who said that on the day of spill, when the transformers were being hauled from Prince Albert to Saskatoon, he had followed that truck between Macdowall and Duck Lake.

He said that he had followed that truck for three kilometres, and the PCB contaminated oil was coming off the back of the flat bed to such an extent that he had to have his windshield wipers on to remove it.

Now, Mr. Minister, I would ask you whether or not you would believe that this is a minor detail, this major spill of PCBs, and whether or not you believe that this individual, when he was told by your department that what he should do was take his car to the car wash, that that's appropriate.

And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to check this out and see whether or not that major stretch of road in this province has been contaminated the same as the stretch of the Trans-Canada near Kenora in Ontario, where you, Mr. Minister, and the Minister of Highways were so concerned about the fact that there was a contamination. What are you going to do about cleaning up your act?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. It's very difficult to hear in here when members on both sides of the House are talking back and forth across the floor.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In regards to this gentleman that followed him in the car, I'm unaware of it at present. If you have the name of the gentleman, or if he's contacted the Department of the Environment, I'll follow it up and get back to you.

In regards to the transportation of the amount that was piled, I'm only quoting an SPC report that they've sent to me — the only one I've got from them to date. They say there was approximately 30 litres — total — lost from three transformers.

There were three KVA transformers, each one holding approximately 22 litres. When they arrived there there was approximately 30 litres missing from the three transformers. I have no other report back from the Department of Environment. When I do get it, I will report back to you with it.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I would ask you whether or not the amount of PCB-contaminated oil in those transformers was measured before it left Prince Albert, because

obviously it must have been if they knew how much was in it. And if they were measuring the PCB-contaminated oil, why wouldn't they leave it out of the transformers? Why wouldn't they leave it out and put it in safe containers to haul it?

And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, whether or not this individual can now come to your department with the assurance that you will deal with it in terms of cleaning up his automobile, and whether or not he and his vehicle and any members in his automobile were contaminated in this process.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with regards to his first question, how would they know how much they held? That's the capacity, the maximum capacity of those three, each one of those transformers. So that's what they're using, maximum capacity. Whether they were full or not, we have no way of knowing. But there was 30 litres, approximately, missing from the three transformers. So that, if all of it was lost in transport, that's how much was lost in transport. I'm suing SPC's quotes to us.

In regards to the gentleman or the car, I'll report back to you on that.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, the members opposite and the minister are wondering what the individual's name is. I can tell you that he's an individual who's on the PC executive of the constituency of Mayfair, who went to his MLA, got no results, was told to go wash his own car. He called me, and I will give you the name of the individual right after question period.

But I would ask you, Mr. Minister, whether or not, when you sanctimoniously talk about a PCB transformer being hauled through this province from Kenora, and you're concerned about it, what test have you done on the road between Prince Albert and Saskatoon to check out the contamination in that area?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — I sent an official from the Department of Environment out to try to find if there was any spills on the highway. We talked to the truck driver. The department officials talked to the truck driver with regards to where he had stopped the one time. And they also accompanied that person; there was one from the department of federal transport along. They were looking to see if they could find any spots that on the highway there may be some. I haven't got a report back, but, to the best of my knowledge, they couldn't locate any at all on the highway, no spots on the highway.

In regards to the amount of that 30 litres, you must remember, too, that it was only less than 1 per cent PCB contamination in the mineral oil itself. So it was 85 parts per million of PCB contamination within the mineral oil. So it was nothing compared to the Kenora one which was 40 per cent, or which is a lot greater.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Minister, about two to three weeks ago an individual was interviewed on one of the Regina radio stations in the early morning program, and had the same complaint, had been involved in the . . . had been following the truck from Kenora, had got PCBs on the vehicle, called your department asked for assistance, and was told, in effect, to go fend for themselves. That wasn't what they were doing.

Mr. Minister, you asked earlier what more we want from your department, Mr. Minister, will you and your department start discharging, your responsibility? Will you start to check on these spills? Will you assist people who have been involved in it? My question, Mr. Minister, is: when are you and your department going to start to do your job?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could get into a lot of debates, about doing the job. But let me tell you something. First of all, that it's absolutely not true . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just listen a minute, will you? In regards to that member or that person coming to the Department of the Environment after he had come through the spill in Kenora, he was, he

was told what to do, how to do it. He was taken to the medical centre . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, whenever he reports it.

The second part of that is, is that spoils are only . . . The Department of the Environment can only handle spills that are reported. That is the key to everything. If you don't report it, we don't know about it. Any spills that are reported are investigated, especially where they contain a high contamination of, say, PCBs or any other hazardous commodities.

So I don't know what else the department could do in regards to protecting the environment.

In regards to the transportation of transformers by SPC, there's an order went out today or going out today, in regards to how SPC will handle the transportation of transformers in this province, and that leading transformers will come under the federal Department of Transport's order.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Minister, on March 12th, in a letter, a copy of which that widely circulated, you gave the plant in Regina permission to proceed.

Mr. Minister, in light of all that has occurred, will you now follow the legislation? Will you now require an environmental impact statement and hold public hearings into the location of this plant so that the public questions with respect to their safety may be answered?

Mr. Minister, they are not satisfied with your simply brushing them aside. Will you now follow the legislation, request an environmental impact statement, and hold public hearings into the location of this plant?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, first of all let's be sure of what we're talking about in regards to this PPM plant.

In 1983 there was a pilot project carried out at the Ross Industrial area in regards to how they would process this PCB contaminated oil. It was viewed by all the news media. In 1984 we did 100,000 litres in this province, decontamination of PCB containing — or mineral oil containing PCBs — 100,000 litres.

All this project does now is put it from being out in the environment into a safe place — doing it in the same area that it is being done in all the time.

Another important fact you've got to remember is that in consultation with the city of Regina, the building permit was issued by the city of Regina after they had . . . after we'd been in consultation and saying, it appears all right. What do you think? Do you go along with it? We've worked it out.

And the city of Regina have drafted out and asked for two or three things. We've got many, many more things in the minister's order that protect the environment. I don't know any other way you could consult the people of Regina any better than we've done.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — How about public hearings? That was my question.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been at least two or three EIAs done in the area up there in regards to the oil upgrader, and with regards to the rail line relocation in the same area — we could, you could do an EIA on everything that comes into this province. If the city of Regina doesn't want business in here, that's fine, I can't help that. That isn't my job.

And if you talk . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you talk about taking time and having EIAs and covering up, I just go back a few years to what they done. And I'll tell you something. At least this government is doing it up front so everybody sees it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister . . . New question, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, will you simply take the time to reread the legislation applicable to your department, and will you admit to this House that an environmental impact statement on rail line location does not cover, either practically or under your legislation, the location of a PCB plant in Regina? Will you admit they're two different problems, and under your legislation, should be the subject of two different environmental impact statements, and given the public interest in PCBs, a public hearing in this case?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in regards to the EIA, on a rail line relocation, it better well cover such things as PCBs, because it's a transportation that has this goods. It is the concern of the department of environment in regards to it, any rail line relocation any place in this province.

So, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an EIA can be done if that is the absolute necessity. But I can tell you that long before an EIA is done, the city of Regina better look at their building permit, and what they want in this here, in this province because, or in this city, because they have worked with us and we feel, the Department of Environment feels, that it is safe to go ahead. And it is not a PCB plant, it is a detoxification of PCBs from mineral oils which is less than . . . it's 0.5 of 2 per cent contamination, make clear of that.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Minister, specifically, which one of these studies you're referring to covered the particular operation of the PCB plant? In your view, which one of these studies specifically covered this problem?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — First of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it isn't a PCB plant, but it's a detoxification of PCB from mineral oil, which is altogether different. It is the concern of the public here in Regina, the storage of and the handling of this contaminated oil, and that is exactly what you won't . . . (inaudible) . . . And that's exactly what you will have in regards to when you're transporting anything over a railway.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well apart from . . . Mr. Speaker, apart from making Lorna McLaren look good, I'm not sure what the minister's function is. It doesn't appear to be to answer questions.

Mr. Minister, will you tell me which study it was that specifically covers the operations of this plant in north Regina that you claim has already been done?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — I'm saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been two EIAs done in the very short while in regards to that area. If we were to do an EIA on every single industry that comes into here then we'd probably never have no industry in this province. The concern of the Department of the Environment is to make it safe for the public. If it is safe for the public, then we do not need an EIA.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, given those weak answers that we have been treated to this afternoon, will you admit what is becoming obvious to everyone and is obvious from your letter of March 12, 1985? And that is that you've made a deal with these people. You're already given them your word, and that's why you're not going to have a public hearing, because you've already given them your word they're going to have it.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Mr. Department of the Environment makes no deals with nobody, first of all. Second to all is, our concern is only, our concern is the decontamination of PCB . . . mineral oil containing PCBs. That is the only role the Department of the Environment has: to protect the environment, and get rid of this vast amount of oil that's out there in the province that has contaminates in it, PCB.

We've started on it two years ago. We'd like to continue. If the people of Regina don't want it here, then the city council has a right to revoke the building permit. If they don't want to revoke



their building permit we have said, and we have said . . . and I've said in this House we will work with them to put in the regulations that will safeguard the people in the area and safeguard the aquifer. And if that isn't sufficient, I really don't know what would be.

### Grants to Regina and Saskatoon

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I address a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. This has to do with the grants to the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, and I am coupling in this question grants which are made by other departments with which the minister, I'm sure, is familiar.

But taking all the grants together — revenue sharing, and the augmented provincial capital grant, and the transit grants, and the health grant, and recreation and cultural facilities' grants, and urban assistance — will the minister agree that in this year's budget compared with last year's budget the city of Regina will lose about \$1.5 million in grants, and the city of Saskatoon will lose close to \$2 million in grants?

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, although that's a budget or estimate question, I'll deal with it as I dealt with it about a week ago. I think, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. The member has asked a question. Allow the minister to answer. It's very difficult to hear in here when . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order. The Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, as I tried to point out to the Leader of the Opposition last week or 10 days ago when he asked the same question, which surprises me that that's allowed in this House anyway, but I think as I tried to point out, we're trying to do two things, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the member from Centre wants to answer the question or wants to allow me to answer the question.

As I tried to point out to the Leader of the Opposition about 10 days ago, there were two things we tried to accomplish this year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. Allow the minister to answer the question.

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — As I tried to point out to the Leader of the Opposition, we've tried to do two things. For a number of years the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association had been urging the then government, and urged us after we became government, to take all the various grants that were in different departments that pertained to urban municipalities, and put them into one block grant, and that would accomplish two things.

That would allow urban municipalities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make their own priority choices. Therefore they wouldn't be dictated by the province. So we looked at the Minister of Culture and Youth's recreation grants, and we wondered if we could fold those into a new grant, our grants and Highways grants. We felt that this year was not the year to do the rec . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I presume that they want the answer today or next week. I'm not sure.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I'd ask members on both sides of the House to keep little decorum so that the minister can answer the questions.

Order! The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg knows very well that nobody's to talk when the Speaker is on his feet.

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — I'll try and keep it as short as I can, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Their attention

span is very short.

I think, Mr. Speaker, what we've tried to do is put all these funds, as much as we could this year and next year, into one fund. As it pertains to the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon, their capital grants were increased not decreased. And if you want to tell me that the city of Regina had any funds coming to them this year from the Department of Highways under the old urban assistance grants, you're wrong.

### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

#### **Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Department of Revenue and Financial Services Act**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Department of Revenue and Financial Services Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Revenue and Financial Services Amendment Act, 1985**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Revenue and Financial Services Act, 1985.

Motion agreed to on division and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Municipal Revenue sharing Act.

Motion agreed to on division and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — I would ask members for order in the House when we're going through first readings. It's very difficult to hear. And I would like members to show a bit of decorum.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. Why is the member standing, the member from Saskatoon Mayfair?

### **POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

**MR. GLAUSER:** — I wish to raise a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Point of privilege, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

During question period the member from Shaunavon was referring to a phone call that I was to have received about the PCB.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. It's very difficult for the Speaker to hear when the members won't be quiet. I would ask that we hear the point of privilege from the member from Saskatoon Mayfair.

**MR. GLAUSER:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It had to do with a phone call that I received. I do confirm receiving the phone call. But the remarks that were made by the member from

Shaunavon are completely false and untrue.

The gentleman in question informed me that he had been in touch with the Environment Department in Saskatoon. I suggested that he work closely with them until he was completely satisfied that his vehicle had been decontaminated. I did not, at any time, tell him to go wash his car. I therefore feel that this is an unfortunate incident and that it does deserve an apology.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order. Order. A dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfil the conditions of a parliamentary privilege.

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

#### EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

#### Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 49

##### Item 1 (continued)

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, last night I asked you how you felt that the tax increases, the largest in Saskatchewan's history, levied primarily at middle- and low-income earners, would assist in economic growth in Saskatchewan, and thus would assist in creating jobs.

Mr. Minister, you spent 15 minutes, most of it running off at the mouth about irrelevant political matters. I've had an opportunity to review your comments in *Hansard*. I must say I can't distil out of *Hansard*, a nice, crisp answer. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd like to try that again — if you'd like to explain how these tax increases contribute to economic growth and how by so doing they contribute to a looser job market.

Mr. Minister, I invite you, having stepped on it, being fresh, to try it again, because your answer last night, apart from being a political diatribe on a whole lot of issues, didn't make a lot of sense.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well it doesn't take much of an economic genius to understand that when we remove the property improvement grant and make that commitment to additional funds to education, much of which is capital expenditures, that is going to create employment and give economic stability — something that I said yesterday.

I would suspect as well that the major commitment to education made in the budget, which resulted from increased taxation or reduction of rebates, that more teachers will be hired. And I have no doubt, I have no doubt that those expenditures will in fact stimulate the economy, and will increase employment.

I find some difficulty in the hon. Member's position, because I believe it was the federal New Democratic party that said there should be tax increases, provided they're used for capital expenditures to stimulate the economy.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, will you tell the House how many additional teachers you expect to be hired because of these tax increases? That indeed is a novel position.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — It's a novel position only to the New Democratic Party. The STF and others involved in the education believe that the additional funding will in fact allow for increased hiring.

That's obviously up to the school boards and how they're going to allocate their funds. I would be surprised if every school board took the position: oh, we're just going to use those moneys to

reduce local taxation. Although interesting enough, in I believe both Saskatoon and Regina for the first time in 10 years, over 10 years, no increases in educational mill rates.

(1445)

Having said that, there are not many in the country, beyond the eight across, that does not agree that increased funding in education, hospitals, and the capital expenditures will in fact create jobs. I find your position, frankly, surprising, because you've argued totally the opposite through the last three sessions.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, do you agree with the Minister of Finance who has said on repeated occasions that one of the major causes of the economic stagnation in which Canada finds itself today, and western nations find themselves, is in fact the large deficit that governments are running? Do you agree with the Minister of Finance that large deficits are in fact the cause of economic stagnation?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well certainly they are a cause. It's interestingly enough that many economists who attribute the high deficits to the cause of . . . one of the causes of economic stagnation in the United States, are now beginning to recognize that the American economy, for example, has begun to absorb and deal with a higher deficit. But there's little doubt that the significant increase in the deficit in the United States did cause stagnation. That has settled down and countries can function with higher deficits.

So, yes, it was a cause. Is it a total cause? No. And I don't think the Minister of Finance — I know the Minister of Finance had not said that it was.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That's right, Mr. Minister. The huge deficits which governments have run has been a cause of economic stagnation, in part because they have caused abnormally high interest rates. Interest rates today vis-à-vis the rate of inflation are at an all-time high. I ask members to find a time in history when interest rates, when the prime rate has been three times the rate of inflation, which is what it is at present. Mr. Minister, that is brought about in large part because governments in Saskatchewan and elsewhere have been running huge deficits.

Mr. Minister, your government joined this band of irresponsible drunken sailors in office. For 30 years, virtually 40 years, since the Second World War, governments in Canada — governments in Saskatchewan, rather, had had balanced budgets. In the 38 years following the Second World War, it can't have been more than five, six years, in which a deficit was actually run.

Mr. Minister, your government came into office, pretended that the economic rules do not apply to them; that you've invented a new system of bookkeeping, that you can promise lavishly during the election as irresponsibly as you like and then implement those promises which are most expensive and which by and large help the multinational oil companies and not the ordinary people. And you can pretend that the economic laws don't apply to you. Well, Mr. Minister, the law of gravity applies to Conservatives in Saskatchewan as well as elsewhere.

Mr. Minister, I say to you that part of the economic stagnation that we are experiencing right now in Saskatchewan, the reason why welfare rates are at an all-time high; why unemployment rate is at an all-time high; why the rate of job creation is the third lowest in Canada; well the major reasons for that is the huge deficit which your government has run up by its irresponsible campaign and its irresponsible management of a province's resources in office.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, again: urge your colleagues to withdraw this budget. Bring in a new one which will deal with the economic problems in Saskatchewan, and which won't simply attempt to paper over top of it.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well your argument gets sillier and sillier as you go along, so please keep talking.

You keep in mind that if you take your argument, why did the New Democratic Party during 10 years of office, increase the deficit of the Crown corporations to up over \$5 billion?

Secondly, when you talk about interest rates and inflation, let's go back to 1980-891 when interest rates were 17, 18, and 19 per cent. And what did you propose to do about it? You brought in a prohibition against foreclosure of the home. That's your sum total of your actions.

I suggest to the hon. member that if at that time you had have taken some of the provincial resource revenues and used them to subsidize down and lower the interest rates for farmers, in particular, and small-business men, they would not have faced a terrible crunch at that time. But let me take the argument a step further because I'm having difficulty, and I'm sure your colleague are, trying to figure out where you're coming from.

You're taking the argument of the party that — the former party, now, I guess — that wanted to repeal the law of gravity, because here's what the federal NDP have just said in their most recent task force. I'm sure you're a supporter of that position. They are going to increase initiatives in agriculture, going to spend . . . Their proposal is \$100 million additional in agricultural mortgage refinancing. It wouldn't help one farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, given the amounts.

You're going to spend, totally (this is a New Democratic Party policy) \$270 million for grants to encourage conservation and efficiency — a total of 2,000 jobs in Canada. You're going to spend 500 million in housing. SHC points out that the 500 million is insufficient to double the CMHC activity. Money would be better spent helping people own their own homes. Saskatchewan alone spent \$18 million in 1983 to help 6,000 people buy their homes. You're going to spend 480 million for municipal capital. What's that work out to, about a couple of dollars? Peanuts.

But how do you intend to fund that, that modest proposal, if I can use the phrase? You're going to increase income taxes so you get an additional 400 million. You're going to increase the income tax for those earning over 50,000 to raise over a billion dollars. You're going to raise the taxes on the RRSP, dividend tax credits, so that people — average wage earners — cannot get the deduction, and raise over half a billion dollars. You're going to raise the corporate taxes to get another billion dollars.

So what are you arguing? You're not arguing your party policy. Maybe the WCC reject and you should get together, because I think the woolly-headed thinking is coming very much together.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I cannot understand why your government is so oblivious to the problems of the unemployed, as you patently are. You have played games with them. You've brought in no meaningful programs, no commitment to full employment. The document which had been circulated last year from Executive Council, which said that higher levels of unemployment were becoming socially acceptable, patently does describe the policy of the Tory Party whether or not you people have the courage to admit it.

The effects of unemployment, Mr. Minister, ought to be a concern to your government. We're losing \$900 million a year in lost wages. The rate of . . . The crime rate in the cities is ballooning in Prince Albert. When we were there this spring we were told that rates of some crimes had doubled; rates of B&Es and crop-related thefts in Regina have increased very markedly. That's the beginning, Mr. Minister, of social unrest. I don't want to put a fine point on that, but the problem is becoming a very serious one, not just for those who are unemployed, but for society as a whole.

We have the food banks, which I invite Mr. Minister to tour the food bank which is in my riding. I'm going to ask the minister in a moment if he has taken an opportunity to go through that food bank — a huge warehouse with a large number of people in it who are sorting food, some of it of good quality; some of the vegetables, frankly, of mediocre quality. That, Mr. Minister, is the 1985

equivalent of the soup kitchen of the 30s. The soup kitchens of the 30s produced not just a great deal of anguish in those who suffered from such an unjust economic system, but it produced a good deal of social unrest as well. It produced problems for everyone, Mr. Minister. It produced a new social order, and in a sense, a new political order. It produced some new political parties, and the old political parties which emerged from the '30s had changed drastically.

And like the '30s, Mr. Minister, if the old line parties today want to survive, you're going to have to change. It simply isn't enough to say, as you people have been saying, that the problem will take care of itself; the people can look after themselves. There's nothing we can do.

Mr. Minister, I say to you as the New Democratic Party has said to the Saskatchewan people, it doesn't have to be this way. The public of Saskatchewan don't believe it has to be this way and they're not prepared to accept it.

Mr. Minister, your government is on the verge of kissing a 55-seat majority good-bye. The reason why you're doing it is because you people have failed to deal with the problems that affect people. Mr. Minister, you brought in an economic policy, "Open for Business," which members of this side of the House felt ill-advised and naïve when you brought it in. We said so. Apparently members opposite now also feel it was ill-advised and naïve because it has been dropped from their language.

That was supposed to bring in new prosperity, new investment, and new jobs. What we have had, Mr. Minister, is less investment than we've had, in real terms, in a long period of time — the lowest retail sales in Canada, a record that I'm surprised that you're prepared to defend, much less accept; fewer housing starts than in many, many years; a rate of unemployment that is the highest it's been in recent history; and fewer jobs for young people every single year. And I read those to you yesterday. Each year there were fewer jobs for young people.

I don't know about you, Mr. Minister, but that concerns a lot of Saskatchewan people. It concerns Saskatchewan people that a generation of young people are growing up without the security of a job. Young people don't want — they don't believe the world owes them a living, but they do believe the world owes them an opportunity for a career.

Mr. Minister, the ill-advised economic policies which you and your government have introduced have denied them an opportunity for a career. That isn't acceptable to the opposition; it's not acceptable to the public of Saskatchewan. And if the government members opposite continue to accept it as inevitable, then I can tell you that you're not going to be there after the next election.

The whole economic thrust of this government relied on big business, on big oil, big resource companies. It gave it away in the hope that they might give something back. Huge tax breaks for oil companies, totalling more than \$100 million a year; royalty rates that are the most generous in Canada. It's no wonder that Saskoil has a higher return on investment than any other Canadian oil company. That's because they do most of their work in Saskatchewan where this government is almost paying them to carry it off.

You've given loan guarantees to Manalta; Husky Oil in the hundreds of millions of dollars. But there's been no display of any confidence by this government — by the Devine government — it's Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan business, Saskatchewan co-ops. There's been no suggestion by this government that we can do the job for ourselves.

Our whole economic history since the war, has been, Mr. Minister, that when we have a government in office which believes in Saskatchewan people, which says to Saskatchewan people: we can do it ourselves; let's roll up our sleeves and get going, we've succeeded, and succeeded grandly, as we did under the CCF in the '50s and early '60s, and as we did in the '70s under the NDP administration. When, Mr. Minister, we've had old-line parties in office, be it the

Liberal government of the '60s or the Conservative government of the '80s who believe that economic growth comes from inviting others to come and cart away our resources and our heritage, we've achieved nothing but economic stagnation.

(1500)

Now, Mr. Minister, to top off all of that, you have not just given away the resources, but you've asked the Saskatchewan consumer, the middle income Saskatchewan person, the ordinary Saskatchewan taxpayer to pick up the cost with these huge, unprecedented tax increases. Not only are such things as the flat tax, the 5 per cent tax on used cars, and the removal of the property improvement grants unfair because you're asking the ordinary Saskatchewan person to pay the taxes formerly paid by resource companies — not only, Mr. Minister, is it unfair, but it also retards economic growth. We already have the lowest rate of growth of economic sales in Canada.

Mr. Minister, there's no place for us to go, but I can tell you, we're going to be a long time leaving the basement so long as this government continues to pursue its ill-advised tax increases, its ill-advised reliance upon foreign multinationals to do the job that Saskatchewan people are ready, willing, and able to do for themselves. The consequence, Mr. Minister, is less money for consumers, less revenue for Saskatchewan business, and fewer jobs for Saskatchewan.

Not only do we have a double standard government which provides socialism for the rich, the oil companies, and free enterprise for the poor, the ordinary Saskatchewan consumer; not only have you got the roles reversed, but in this case it is just bad economics as well.

I say once again, Mr. Minister, if you had any sense of responsibility to your portfolio, you would be urging the Minister of Finance to withdraw this ill-advised, ill-conceived budget, bring in a new one which deals with the real problems facing Saskatchewan people because if you don't, the Saskatchewan people are going to find someone else who will.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well they've already rejected your proposals and your economic solutions which are simply bigger government. You indicated to the public, what your educational program was for the universities, and that was found very much wanting in this budget by the universities. And your proposals paled by comparison to the educational expenditures set out in the budget.

It's interesting that when we talk about the oil industry, and you say that they're not paying their fair share, for the first time they are the highest single source of revenue in the province of Saskatchewan, and Saskatchewan after the initial year which rewards only success, not failure, as your program, we have the highest royalties in North America. So they are paying.

If you want to talk about the economic history and the short overview, well what happened in the depression, which is very much in your mentality, yes, there were changes. And it's interesting that in tougher economic times they did not revert to the changes that came about after the depression, but in fact took a new course of action which is a recognition that the private sector must be allowed to grow and make decisions contrary to the philosophy in the programs you put forward. I don't buy the argument, and I have never bought the argument, that in tougher economic times causes low income people to commit crimes, rapes, and whatever.

I don't believe that all of these criminal activities should be put on because they're attributed to low income people. But that's the argument that's made. It's the argument made by you and some criminologists and some psychologists and some sociologists, that tougher economic times meet higher crime rate, which is really saying that it's the poor that commit the crimes.

I suggest to you that in fairness in much of the violent crimes, the robbery comes . . . are drug-related and not economy-related. So you take that position. I frankly find it insulting to low

income people and the less advantaged that are trying to make it in society and build a good life-style for their families. So I simply reject that argument in total, and it's interesting when you just talk about the food bank that the Salvation Army is no longer participating in Regina and have withdrawn from it. So you know, your arguments are found wanting.

The difficulty you have is that your proposals and the only one that has come forward on a consistent basis, is more government. Not more government expenditures in health and education because the proposals you had made are less in terms of expenditures than are set forward in this budget. In other words, the Conservative government is proposing to spend far more on health and education than you had proposed, and that includes the universities. And we have the specific proposals set forward, I believe either by yourself or your colleague from Shaunavon or Quill Lakes, as to how much would be spent. And when he took it to the University of Regina and the University of Saskatoon, they laughed. They laughed at a time when they were deeply concerned about expenditures at the universities because it was totally inadequate.

We were at least listening to their arguments that there had to be some fundamental refinancing and restructuring, and we delivered on this budget. And for you to argue, for you to argue that you would spend more is in complete contradiction to your party's public statements.

So the only answer you come up with is more government, and to take your very argument as to what was came about from the recession, or the depression of the 1930s, yes, the public did endorse parties of more government. But they just as widely rejected them during the recent economic downturn, because it was that system that helped cause the economic downturn — this uncontrolled growth of government. So we can sit and argue economic philosophies for a long time, but all of the specifics that you've put forward have been found wanting in the past.

If you want to give a political message to me, fair enough, but I suggest that maybe (and you're one of the few that were prepared to admit that you lost the last election in the New Democratic Party), maybe the best thing you could do is stand up and say to the public, all right, here's specifically what we stand for. And the old ideas that you're now putting forward, like a government Crown corporation to do all of the government construct in business, is not the way to go. Your proposals of more Crown corporations and bigger government is not the way to go.

So we can debate this for a long time. We obviously have differences, but I do suggest to you, in all objectivity, that the proposals you've had in the past were found wanting and, I suggest to you, will be found wanting again.

Item 1 agreed to.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Sorry, Mr. Minister. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. What item are you reading here? I can't ...

**HON. MR. LANE:** — If I can advise the hon. member, it was agreed yesterday. We're on the Employment Development Agency, on page 35 and we've gone through, at the same time, all of the aspects making up the fund which takes us page 36 to 39 inclusive. The actual vote — vote 1 — is on page 35.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. We are on page 35, and when we finish page 35, we'll go to page 36 — Employment Development Agency, Development Fund. And you may ask further questions at that time, if you wish.

Vote 49 agreed to.

## CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE



EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Employment Development Fund — Vote 65

Item 1

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Go back to item no. 1. Mr. Minister, as I understand this item, item no. 1, this is a subsidy to employers — may be public or private sector — who hire people, and the program thereby encourages public or private sector employers to hire people. Is that . . . is this the program . . . is this what I think it is?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, this is the summer student program, the first one. And eligible employers include farmers, business people, non-profit organizations, local and municipal government. It's 50 per cent of the employees wages up to \$3 an hour, or \$400 per month, whichever is less. That's the summer subsidy, and it now applies to high school students 16 years of age or over.

We've debated and went through this yesterday. I'm prepared, if you're asking the criteria in that, to send you the information on each of the programs to determine eligibility, and it should set out the objectives, although we had discussed most of them — however you want to handle it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I have a specific question, Mr. Minister. In public accounts this morning I was asking the department officials about what I assume to have been the same program in 1983-84 fiscal year. What we were told is that there is nothing . . . there's no attempt made, successful or otherwise, to ensure that this is new activity. There's no attempt made to ensure that these aren't employees which they've always hired during the summer.

I raise the issue because listed among . . . in public accounts, listed among the benefactors were quite a number of law . . . quite a number of lawyer . . . of law firms. One in particular — I know what it is because I applied for that job 20 years ago, didn't get it, but probably to the, in probably in the best interests of the law firm. But I knew what, I knew what they were doing. They're getting a subsidy for a position that they have had for 20 years. Someone who comes in during the summer, does the Land Titles Office work, a bit of legal work during the summer . . .

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, has that been changed? Are we now taking some steps to ensure that these payments are for new economic activity, activity which hasn't taken place in the past?

Some of them as well, Mr. Minister, which I saw listed in public accounts, were clearly recreational and resort firms which only operated during the summer. And if, as we were told about by the officials this morning in public accounts, there's no attempt made to ensure that is new economic activity, the payments to those people is accomplishing nothing. You're just giving way \$1,000 to \$2,000 to some employers who would have hired the people anyway.

Another one was a member of this Assembly who had applied for the grant and got it, and I question . . . Sorry, it is a former member of the Assembly. And I wonder about the propriety of that. But apart from that, he's no longer a member of the Assembly. Apart from that, again because it was a ranch, and because he would always have hired extra people during the summer to help with the cattle, my guess would be that it wasn't new economic activity. So I wonder about that problem, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well there's no doubt that the objective is to get students working for the summer. That's the objective. Secondly, we recognize that in many cases they may find hired some anyway . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if we go back to the argument that we had last year, I mean, and I think you stood up in the Assembly and said you have to do something for the

summer students and get them working . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You know, I frankly don't see it as a waste if the . . . You know, we're looking now at about over 8,000 students that are going to participate in the program. I have no doubt that in many cases that perhaps they would have hired people anyway.

(1515)

But I suspect that if we compare to last year when it was four with the program, and now up to eight, that perhaps we are, in fact, hiring about 4,000 more that wouldn't have participated before. I can't tell you if those are all new or would have been new, but certainly an increase of four over last year is a significant difference.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not going to pursue this endlessly. I say it is inappropriate to be giving funds to private employers for employees that they would have hired anyway and, indeed, have been hiring every summer — at least, in one case, for the last 21 years, which was the date when I applied for the job.

Mr. Minister, I say you are throwing money away. What has happened is that some sharp-eyed administrator in a law firm has thought, hey, there's a thousand bucks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it may have been in the best interests of the law firm.

But I say, Mr. Minister, that you should take some steps to assure yourself that it's new economic activity, that the position hasn't been filled in past summers. It is pointless to give grants to owners of recreational facilities along lake fronts who only hire during the summer. You're paying for economic activity which has gone on anyway. Why not marshal the funds such that it creates new economic activity? Why give it away? There aren't huge sums of money, but you are giving them away, and people are abusing it.

If you said, Mr. Minister, that we can't stop all the abuse, I'd say you're right. But, Mr. Minister, you're not even attempting to curtail the abuses. You're freely allowing it. I say, Mr. Minister, that's inappropriate.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well I suppose we could argue. We think that it's advantageous to young people to have the opportunity and be assured of an opportunity of working during the summer. I have no doubt that there are some jobs that employers would hire summer students anyway, and that this is a benefit to them more than a benefit to the students.

But if we take a look at numbers, there's a significant increase this year over last year, and I'm assuming that with the applications to the Canada manpower centres the general criteria of work experience is an adequate one. I'm sure that there are some, but I frankly think that is a small price to pay.

Most students that we've talked to, and the reports that we got back from last year, felt that the Saskatchewan program of a year ago was probably the best in the country, and we believe it enhanced with the changes this year in the co-operation of the Government of Canada. I believe that the students will be satisfied. So there are some that would have been working anyway. I believe that's a small price to pay.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It's an unnecessary price to pay, Mr. Minister. That's my point. Mr. Minister, we're actually on item no. 2, grants under the access youth employment program. It is said that this was contained in the Advanced Education and Manpower vote. I couldn't find precisely the similar name. Perhaps I didn't look long enough. What item was this in Advanced Education last year?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I'm sorry?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — We are actually on item no. 2, grants under the access youth employment program said to be included last year in Advanced Education and Manpower. Perhaps for lack of looking I didn't see precisely the same name in the last year's estimates, and I'm wondering where it appeared.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Okay. Last year it was under the title of grants to youth services, and it included both what are now items 1 and 2. So it's just . . . I don't know whether that would be an audit or an accounting figure but rather than lump them as they were in the past. I am advised by my colleague that your question in item 1, they are to be jobs that wouldn't have gone other, so if you have indication of someone who is abusing it, you can let us know.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That answer is somewhat belated. You could have saved the whole conversation some time ago. I was told in Public Accounts that was not the case in '83. Are you telling me that' snow been changed and it is the case in '85?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well I'm advised that seasonal jobs are deemed to be new jobs.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That's my point, of course. Lots of seasonal jobs are jobs that occur every year and will happen anyway, so you're playing with words when you say seasonal jobs are deemed to be new jobs. In many cases what they are deemed is not what they actually are. Mr. Minister . . . Okay, go on to the next item then, Mr. Chairman.

Item 1 agreed to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Does the minister of parks have a point he wishes to bring on the agenda?

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if I may have leave of the Assembly to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank the members of the opposition for allowing me to interrupt their debate in order to introduce guests.

Seated in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to you, and to the other members of the Assembly, a group of students from Witchekan Lake Reserve, which is just north of the town of Spiritwood and sits in my constituency of Turtleford.

Accompanying the group is Margaret Fineday and Mike Fineday. And we have nine students altogether. I wonder if they could rise and be welcomed by the members of the Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

#### CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

#### EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

#### Employment Development Fund — Vote 65

Item 2

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — One last question. Are relatives exempt? We asked this question of the

officials in Public Accounts this morning? They didn't think so, but didn't know.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No. People can hire their sons and daughters.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well I'm not going to carry this on endlessly but, Mr. Minister, the possibilities for abuse, when you can hire your own children, are pretty obvious. I would think that any sensible program would prohibit people from hiring their own children. If their own children aren't employed elsewhere, you can always put them on salary and so take advantage of the grant. There's no way in the world of stopping that sort of abuse.

I say, Mr. Minister, if you're allowing them to hire their own children, you're opening up yourself wide open. You're inviting abuse. You're not just opening up to abuse, you are really inviting it.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Most of the summer programs have allowed that, and it's primarily geared for farmers or the small-business men that may well hire an extra child or, in fact, in some cases the child is simply going to put the money and use it to pay costs of education next year. We understand that's going on, but we think that that's not unhealthy.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3 agreed to.

#### **Item 4**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — What was budgeted for this . . . in this item last year, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Last year the budget was \$360,000. This year it's \$610,000.

Item 4 agreed to.

Items 5 and 6 agreed to.

#### **Item 7**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — What is expected to be the total cost of our participation in SaskExpo '86?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Total cost, including all the performers and people from Saskatchewan we expect to hire, and a lot of students . . . our estimate is \$6.5 million in total.

Item 7 agreed to.

Items 8 and 9 agreed to.

#### **Item 10**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat estimate in '84-85 was 3.2 million. This year there is estimated 1.5 million from Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat; 2 million from Economic Development Agency.

Two questions: are we now going to have two different agencies making those grants, or again, is this just an illustration of another example where you've been padding your development fund by pulling money out of another vote which would have been there in any event?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No, they are delivering the program — the specific departments as are set out. It's the same amount that was budgeted for last year. We had discussed that with the hon.

member yesterday.

Item 10 agreed to.

**Item 11**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, this subvote is down from 3 million. Why is this amount down?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — On reviewing the program last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, 60 per cent of the trainees have been retained under the program. So the ability to bring new people on and find employment for the other hasn't quite been as successful as we wanted. But we want to keep those working and improve the opportunity, so that's the reason for it.

Item 11 agreed to.

Items 12 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

**Item 15**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The amount budgeted here again, Mr. Minister, is down. Why is that?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — The breakthrough program that was previously budgeted under this has been moved to the vocational rehabilitation program, so that's the reason for it.

Item 15 agreed to.

Item 16 agreed to.

**Item 17**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Oh, sorry, Mr. Chairman. I should have . . . Mr. Minister, is it correct to assume that this expenditure has been made necessary by the proclamation of the Young Offenders Act? And if it is, what's the total cost of the necessary changes that will be made?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I only have the information available as they apply to the capital programs, and I detailed them yesterday for the opposition, but they do result from the implementation of the Young Offenders Act.

The Regina youth centre upgrading and site preparation — I detailed them yesterday. Nine hundred and thirty-five thousand in Saskatoon, correctional centre upgrading - -that includes living unit, etc. But the major expenditure in Saskatoon is an upgrading of Kilburn Hall. The total in Saskatoon is 1.9 million. In Prince Albert it's 860,000 — I'm sorry, in Prince Albert it's 270,000. In North Battleford it's 860,000. We have a work camp proposed of 150,000. That will undoubtedly be in northern Saskatchewan, but a final decision has not been made.

(1530)

Item 17 agreed to.

Items 18 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

**Item 23**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Again, do you have an up-to-date estimate of the total cost, the total provincial expenditure on this item?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — The total cost of the project has increased from \$13 million to \$14.5 million. Federal government will contribute \$5 million, the province and the cities each providing \$4.75 million. Any costs above \$15 million will be solely the responsibility of the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina.

Item 23 agreed to.

**Item 24**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, for 1.5 million, which I note is unchanged from last year, you are not going to move a whole lot of rail bed. What are we getting for \$1.5 million?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, of the 1.5 million, some 700,000 is part of the agreement with the city of Regina for contribution towards administration of the city's rail relocation office; presentation of phase 1 application to the CTC. It also includes track construction, grading, grade separation, Wascana Creek bridge, building construction, track removal, supervision, and engineering management administration. I can give you the man-weeks in employment if you wish, or person-weeks of employment if you wish on each of those projects. For track construction 7,800; grading, 2,000; grade separation, 1,200; building construction, 1,000 person-weeks; track removal, 800 person-weeks; supervision and engineering, 2,000; and management administration, 3,500 person-weeks. That's over the total program, obviously.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — For 1.5 million we're going to get that many weeks employment, we're going to get an office, and we're going to get a presentation to the CRTC. Do we have any commitment from the federal government, and the parties that be, who are actually going to move this railway line, or are we going to study the cursed thing from now until some time into the next century?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — This is the presentation still on phase 1. I gather there's been no commitment by the railroads or anything else on phase 2.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There's a foot dragging, Mr. Minister. It's not a comment directed at the provincial government, although it is in the sense that the primary responsibility to muscle this thing along works with the provincial government.

The foot dragging on this is really unfortunate. There's never been a time when we needed the jobs more. The city badly needs that land freed up for development. Now is the time to move with that project, and the foot dragging by you and your colleagues in Ottawa is most unfortunate. I wish, Mr. Minister, that you would see the light, and I wish when you do that you would take the message to Ottawa — that this is a project whose idea has come.

Mr. Minister, we're here year after year, and we vote 1.5 million for a project that is stalled. Responsibility for that rests with you and with your cousins in Ottawa, and I wish you'd both get off the mark and get going on it.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Am I to take it from your comments that you are in favour of Regina rail relocation and believe that it is a high priority that should be proceeded with immediately?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The rail lines, the city needs to get the rail lines out of the city and free up that land. The precise fashion in which it's done is not necessarily an item to be discussed in these estimates, although I'll be happy to do that if you like. I have my own views on it.

But the city needs to get those rail lines out of there, get the property developed. I say that you and the federal government are just dragging your feet on it, no intention of moving with it in anything like the immediate future, and I really wish you'd get going.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well I'm assuming that that was an obtuse way of saying that you accept this as a high priority and that that's where the funds should be expended in Regina. I'm interested in your position on that, and I appreciate it, and I accept your criticism for what it's worth.

Item 24 agreed to.

**Item 25**

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Just a couple of clarifications, Mr. Minister, and I'm not going to go back to a subvote we just passed. Could you indicate if the forms for the programs that you have announced today will be sent out to the groups? And also, would it be possible to send some of the forms and applications out to the members? I know, myself, I would like to have some of them forms.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I'll undertake to supply you with all the forms, the programs that have been announced, and that the forms have been issued. We'll get them over to you. Well, the ones that are printed up we'll get to you over in the next couple of days.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Just another one. I want to go back to subvote 2 and the youth . . . access the youth, and I just want clarification. Does the program apply to an individual that is 16 years of age — I know that's what you said yesterday, 16 years of age — and/or going into grade 12 the following year, a student who has finished grade 11? Is it both?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No, there are two programs. One is the summer program. The Access Youth is available to any unemployed youth between the ages of 16 and 24, and the wage subsidy is \$2.50 per hour for a period of 30 weeks. So that applies to any unemployed youth between 16 and 24.

The summer student program is the one you're referring to with 50 per cent of the employee's wages up to \$3 an hour or \$400 a month, and that applies to students entitled to work in Canada that are at least 16 years of age, and they must be attending high school or post-secondary institutions in 1984-85 and intend to return in the fall. So that's the summer program.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Attending high school. Could they be attending high school at grade 10, 11, or 12 . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — As long as they're 16.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — As long as they're 16. But just assume that we have a 17-year-old that's in grade 10.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — As long as they're legally entitled to work in Canada and, secondly, that they are going to school again in the fall . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . as long as they're going to return in the fall.

Item 25 agreed to.

Vote 65 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES — 1985**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 49**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 49 agreed to.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Again I would like to thank the officials that assisted me during estimates, and the opposition for the interesting debate and the clear and lucid statement of their policies and election platform.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the officials as well. I want to express the regret that they can't be of more assistance to us. If they weren't led by such an obtuse government, they might really be able to do some good. And it's a great shame that such talent is being wasted by such an idiotic government.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**HEALTH**

**Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 32**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — The next item before us is the Department of Health. Would the minister introduce his officials, please.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to do so. Seated beside me is my deputy minister of Health, Walter Podiluk; to my right is the associate deputy minister of Health, Mr. George Loewen; seated directly behind me is the assistant deputy minister of Health, Mr. Dick Bailey; seated in the seat to the side of Mr. Podiluk is the director of policy and research services, Mr. Don Philippon; seated behind the deputy minister is Mr. Lawrence Krahn, the director of administration.

(1545)

And the back row we have Mr. Steve Petz, the executive director of continuing care; Mr. Ted Wright, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan; Mr. John Yarske, the executive director of the psych services branch; Mr. Gerry Patchett, the executive director of the medical care insurance commission; and Jack Drummond, the budget officer.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to start our estimates with a few remarks pertaining to the Department of Health.

Mr. Chairman, estimates provides an opportunity for members of the Assembly to carry out a detailed review of proposed government expenditures for the coming year, and as we begin to review the 1985-86 Health department estimates, I want to set the stage for this review and put it in context by discussing our health care system from three important perspectives.

First I'd like to discuss the accomplishments over the past three years; secondly, some of the current initiatives that we're undertaking in health in Saskatchewan; and thirdly, and perhaps the most important, Mr. Chairman, the challenges that face us and the new ways that we must approach them.

Let's start by looking at the past three years, Mr. Chairman, when I became Minister of Health in the spring of 1982, I was shocked by what I saw and heard about the state of the province's health care system, and I quickly found out what the NDP attitude to health care really was. It was as if the NDP had been like a watchmaker. They put the watch together, and they wound it



up, and then they kept telling the whole world about what a wonderful thing they had created. But they forgot, Mr. Chairman, that watches don't run and keep time forever all by themselves. They have to be cleaned and adjusted, and old parts have to be replaced when they are worn out. But the NDP didn't want to acknowledge that. They just kept telling the people that the watch was perfect and did nothing else.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in 1982 we soon found out that the watch was far from perfect. It's main spring had run down. It needed a good cleaning, and like the NDP Party itself, it was behind the times. So obviously, Mr. Chairman, when our PC government took office we soon found out that we had a major rebuilding job to do on our health care system and we wasted no time in setting about that job in a logical and efficient way. During budget debate a couple of weeks ago, I outlined many of the steps we have taken over the past three years to re-establish health care on a firm foundation in Saskatchewan. But the members opposite tend to have short memories, so I'm going to go over some of the list again, just in case they've forgotten.

And I'm going to start with long-term care since that's an area they seem to be fond of talking about. During the first two years of this government, we allocated \$11 million for special care home construction. Last year we announced a five-year plan to provide 1,500 new and upgraded beds in 60 communities throughout Saskatchewan. And we're also going ahead with a 238-bed facility in Saskatoon.

We launched a new program of integrated facilities to maintain rural hospitals and improve local access to special care home. We encouraged the formation of district co-ordinating committees. Many committees are now set up, working really well for local co-ordination of services. And, Mr. Chairman, what I mean by a co-ordinating committee, it was the people involved in that community in that area — involved with special care homes, involved in acute care hospitals, and involved in home care — all working together for the benefit of those people in their community. Over \$1 million for new initiatives in special care homes and home care. Innovative ideas, Mr. Chairman, ideas such as respite care, adult day care, home care for people with heavy care needs, and program for people with behavioural problems.

Another major program focussing on the elderly, of course, is the chiropody program or the foot care program. This program, I'm proud to say, is now implemented on a regional basis to give maximum access to the seniors of this province. We have 10 offices throughout Saskatchewan, with 20 satellite clinics serving the elderly people of the province. This response to the priority needs of the elderly as identified by the seniors themselves, to help them maintain mobility and therefore greater independence. And I must indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that this was a promise by the NDP government in 1975 and in 1978. It wasn't a promise of our government in 1982, but I can say that it's up and functioning in 30 clinics throughout this province. These initiatives, Mr. Chairman, add up to major expansion and upgrading, but they're only a start.

Let's look at some other important areas. Let's look at cancer services, for example. Our commitment in our first year of government towards capital construction and expanded services for cancer was a sizable commitment. This includes a new clinic in Saskatoon, and money for a five-year equipment purchase program and money to improve staffing. The benefits, Mr. Chairman, are already very obvious. We have purchased two linear accelerators, and have a new computer system on order to improve treatment planning, and several professional staff have been added in Regina, and in Saskatoon.

This was a five-year plan. This was the first five-year plan in Health. It was worked out with the cancer commission . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I can tell you, one of the members, the member from Moosomin says long-range planning, and that's exactly what it is — long-range, sound planning using the taxpayers' money of this province to take a long-range view and put the dollars where they should be in equipment, in purchases, in facilities, and in personnel.

Let's take a look at mental health, another area where we saw some weaknesses when we came

into government. Through consultations with the mental health association and many other groups, we are bringing about action that will once again make Saskatchewan a leader in mental health in Canada and in North America.

In 1983-84, we've expanded the services for children and youth. New funding has been brought about to develop and expand crisis hostels in Regina and Saskatoon. There's been increased training positions for psychiatrists with four new residency positions.

And in 1984-85 alone, \$700,000 for new initiatives in several areas — such things as crisis management, support for self-help groups, suicide prevention, expanded autism services, and other innovative service projects.

Let's take a look at the hospitals. And I hope the boys across the way are paying attention over there, because I tell you fellows, this is all good stuff.

New hospital projects have been started in Lloydminster, in Nipawin, in Maidstone, and major expansions in Melfort and Yorkton. And on the service side, on the service side, Mr. Chairman, over 480 new nursing positions since we took office in '82. In Regina we've had increases totalling 800,000 per year to expand open heart surgery and 125,000 to extend CAT scanning services here in the city of Regina.

A new pediatric intensive care unit at the University Hospital costing over 700,000 a year; a small-hospital incentives program to provide important new services — for example, dietetic counselling in rural areas and respite care in over 20 rural hospitals. Many initiatives in Saskatoon to address ridding those problems totalling at a cost of \$8 million per year.

And let's look at some other areas, Mr. Chairman. Let's take a look at a few more of our initiatives; 2.7 million for the new Kinsmen children's rehab centre in Saskatoon which is now open, and I can proudly say the best rehab centre for children in all of Canada; consolidation of the ambulance services in the Health department for better planning and co-ordination and major increases in program funding.

The expansion of the SAIL) Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living) program by adding aids for the blind people; the doubling of speech therapy positions from 10 to 20 in the province of Saskatchewan — another area I'm very proud of; co-operation with the Lion's Club in establishing the first eye bank in western Canada; and a major agreement with the College of Medicine and the federal government to stabilize physician services in northern Saskatchewan; the expansion of the alcoholism prevention and treatment services in the North and greater emphasis on home care as part of northern services to reduce smoking especially among our young people.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on, but I don't want the members opposite to look too bad by comparison. But let me just remind everyone that the initiatives I've outlined didn't take place over 15 years, they didn't take place over five years, they are our initiatives that our PC government have brought in just three years in office. And that's what I call a real commitment to being number one in health care. Those are some of the things we have done. But we cannot rest on our past laurels.

Let us look at some of the new initiatives, some of the things we are addressing now to improve the health care for the people of Saskatchewan. And I want to turn to the second part of the three major points. I want to discuss about our health care system. I'm talking about initiatives in this year's budget.

And it's the fourth year in a row my colleague, the finance minister, has brought down a reasonable and an intelligent budget, a budget that recognizes the importance of health care to Saskatchewan residents. I'm sure the members opposite will want to know more detail about the

budget later on, but let us just point out some of the highlights for everyone's benefit.

The first one I'd like to discuss is the capital health fund — a 5-year, \$300 million construction program that addresses the needs of Saskatoon and Regina, and many smaller centres — a logical, sensible program that sets out a course of action, allows effective planning and efficient management of over \$300 million.

The members opposite try to pretend this fund isn't for real, just a paper number. Well I can tell you, they're the only ones that think that. Ask the 60 communities that are getting nursing home beds, or ask the hospital officials. They know it's for real, and they're glad to finally have a government that cares. Let me highlight some of the main points.

There have been major renovation and expansion of St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon, and that will be starting this year; there will be an addition of two floors to the University Hospital, adding 300 beds, and that will start this year; there will be the replacement of the Saskatoon City Hospital, a brand-new hospital starting in 1988; there will be an immediate start on the remaining phases of the Regina General Hospital regeneration program, again, starting this year; the construction of the new Wascana Rehabilitation Centre in Regina, again, construction to start this fall; and a new 100-bed hospital for Estevan, the completion of a five-year special care home construction program.

As I've said, 1,500 beds in 60 communities throughout Saskatchewan, hospital construction and renovation in about 20 communities as part of our integrated facilities program, and a variety of construction and renovation projects in other communities throughout the province.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, this program will cost \$300 million. And to the members opposite, I repeat what I've told you before. If you don't believe it, you just wait and see. And let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, there's going to be lots more.

Some of the other initiatives — adding two new CAT scanners, one in Regina, and one in Saskatoon. And that will double the number of CAT scanners in this province in one year. And those will be purchased this year.

We've announced details of the remaining years of the special care home construction program. Firm commitments, not just vague promises made on the eve of an election.

Mental health is another important area we haven't overlooked. We've provided funding for self-help groups. Some of them are S.H.A.R.E. in Prince Albert, the Crocus Co-op in Saskatoon, the Portage Program in North Battleford, and the By Ourselves group here in Regina.

We put forward funding for the Regina crisis management project, funding for the Rainbow Youth Center here in Regina, and funding for other community groups and programs. This is all strengthening the network of community support services for people with mental health problems, another area that had been sadly neglected for years. The needs are obvious, and we're working co-operatively with local groups to address them.

Mr. Chairman, this year's budget reinforces our government's commitment to health care. It does this in part through the specific initiatives I have mentioned. But it does this in another important way as well. And this leads to the third major point I want to discuss — the challenges that face us in health care and the ways in which we will meet them and meet them effectively in the future.

When the finance minister brought down his budget on April the 10th, he released a document, Mr. Chairman, called *Partnership For Progress: Working Together to Build a Stronger Tomorrow*. That document outlines a five-year program costing \$1.5 billion that will focus on four major areas: on education, on employment, on agriculture, and on health care.

I want to quote briefly from the section on health care, because it sums up the situation that we now find ourselves in. And I quote from *Partnership for Progress*:

The health care system has moved through several periods of evolution and adaptation. The introduction of hospital insurance and medical care are usually noted as the most historic and dramatic developments in this evolution. However, the issues and opportunities of the 1980s and 1990s will represent an equally important turning point in the development of health care in this province.

(1600)

Mr. Chairman, I think the challenges are pretty well known by now. There is a need to deal with the increasing and changing demand resulting from our ever-aging population. There is a need to develop a rational approach to the valuable but costly new medical technologies. And there is a need to find effective ways to promote healthier lifestyles and encourage responsible utilization of services. I'm sure we could list other challenges. But these are some of the main ones.

As the finance minister's document said, meeting these challenges will require a partnership. And as far as health care is concerned, I think it is going to call for a much different approach to health care issues, both politically and otherwise.

Let me explain what I mean. We have always talked about our province's health care system. But that system has really been a collection of separate parts. We've had a hospital plan, a nursing home plan, mental health programs, and so on.

And very often, -Mr. Chairman, we have treated those various parts in isolation, instead of trying to see them as part of a coherent system. In turn, this tends to create a situation of which different sectors become adversaries or competitors for dollars, for facilities, for staff, or whatever it may be that they want.

As I have said, I don't think that approach can continue if we are to successfully meet the challenges that face us. The one thing we simply can't afford — to keep on pouring millions more dollars into the system each year. And when I say we, Mr. Chairman, I just don't mean the present government. I mean all of us who live in this province of Saskatchewan.

The day is past when the health care organizations and the facilities and the groups can expect governments to keep funding more money to satisfy their requests. After all, health ministers aren't magicians. I can't pull hospitals out of hats by turning around and say they're rehab centres.

Obviously what we need is a consensus. We have to get everyone in health care working together — to agree on the right direction and the priorities, and to identify ways of changing the system without making it unaffordable.

And I am personally trying to encourage this new approach through a consultation process which I have started. I am challenging people to look beyond their own facility or their own area of concern or their own profession, and to see themselves as part of a larger system, a system greatly important to the people of Saskatchewan.

The kind of new approach I've described is one we need in the political arena as well. Earlier in my remarks I spoke about many of the initiatives the present government has taken in health care, and I also spoke about some of the failures of the previous government. And that highlights a couple of points that we would all admit if we're perfectly honest.

First, no one government or political party owns health care. Health care is part of the social fabric of our province, and no government is going to destroy it or to take it away.

Secondly, no matter how much a government does in health care, there will always be things that can be pointed to as needing improvement. But we usually don't admit these things. Opposition members of whatever party try to suggest that health care is in a mess, but they know that isn't true. And ministers of health from whatever party get defensive and suggest that everything is perfect, but we know darn well that that isn't true either.

I'm not suggesting the government shouldn't have to account for how it spends the public money. That accountability is vital to our political democratic system. But it doesn't make sense, Mr. Chairman, to argue the system is falling apart, just because the blue book shows a drop in a few positions in some area. There is no law of nature that says positions have to stay the same way forever regardless of changing needs or priorities.

And it isn't rational, Mr. Chairman, to claim that health care is being eroded just because money has been taken from one area and moved to another area that's more pressing. We have to keep things in proportion and, as I said, we all have to work together.

And I invite all members in this Assembly, in this House, to join in a positive and a very constructive debate. Good ideas, Mr. Chairman, are good ideas no matter who puts them forward, and I want to hear from everyone here who has a good idea and has a contribution to improving health care.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I have covered the three areas I said I wanted to talk about in my opening statement. So we will now try to provide the members opposite with whatever . . . with the answers to whatever question they may feel free to ask. And I hope, sincerely hope, that out of our discussions that we will generate some ideas that will help us to make our health care here in Saskatchewan better for the citizens that we're here to serve. Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

#### **Item 1**

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, and your staff. I expect our debate will be informative. And if the answers are forthcoming, I'm sure that your final statement that co-operation in accepting positive, constructive ideas . . . that this debate will be what you wish, that being constructive. And I suppose, to that end, I would take exception with a few of your remarks, one being the first, I suppose, dispute or the first disagreement I would have with you is the state of the health care in the province of Saskatchewan at the time that you took office.

There would be very few medical professional people who knew the health situation in North America, or in fact in the world, who would agree with you on that matter, because the majority of people who understand the health care system would agree that our province has — at least until 1982 and maybe still today given the fact that we have Conservative governments across Canada — have the best health care system anywhere in North America.

My colleague will know that in Saskatchewan in the period from 1971 to 1982, far from being a time when health care was underfunded or that there weren't construction going on, that you need only go to major hospitals like the General and look at the buildings that were constructed or the nursing homes that were built, to realize that you're not, in fact, telling the truth when you talk about the fact that no nursing homes were built and no hospitals were constructed. That simply isn't accurate, and you know it.

And I think, if we're going to have a fair debate, your partisan comments about what was done between '71 and 1982 you should leave out of the debate. Because you know as well as I that it's not correct to say that nothing was done or that, in fact, it's improved a great deal since the

election of 1982. And I cite one example.

The nursing home lists in Regina which you, Mr. Minister, when you were a member, and I remember very clearly sitting there when I and others thought that you would be the best leader of the Conservative Party and when you ran for the leadership, and I remember that you complained loudly when the waiting lists in Regina were 500. And you will remember that. And you are, I believe, basically an honest man, and you will remember how upset you were when the waiting lists reached 500 in the city of Regina. You will know, as well as I, that the waiting lists in Regina, since 1982, have increased to 1,500.

And for you to say that all is wondrous since 1982 when you became the minister, and we've solved the waiting lists across the province, and five years from now we're even going to do better — the record of your first three years says something quite different.

Your first three years, the waiting list in Regina has basically doubled. I have a report here prepared for the city of Regina by the city administration at a meeting of March 6, 1985, which says: "According to the Regina Assessment and Placement Service statistics, there is a total of 1,500 long-term patients awaiting placement in long-term facilities, including 270 on an urgent list."

Now, Mr. Minister, the waiting list has grown so phenomenally in Regina under your good administration and all of these intelligent budgets that if you hadn't stood in this House and said how good it was, most people would not realize that things have gotten that much better. Because if you're on a waiting list and the list has grown from 5 or 600 to 1,500, it's hard for them to understand and believe your speech when you say that things have gotten so much better. And so I think that in dealing with the estimates of the Health department, then we should be honest when you get up to your feet and talk about how great things are in the province.

The members opposite talk about a moratorium. And they're correct. There has been a moratorium in Regina for three years. There hasn't been one nursing home bed built. Mr. Minister, you have placed a moratorium on nursing home construction for the past three years.

And you say now, a year or six months before an election, you say, "Forget about what I did. Forget about the fact that I didn't build one nursing home in Regina, that I put a freeze on nursing home construction, that I told my staff not to design any beds for Regina." And what he has done, in fact, is put a freeze on nursing home beds in Regina and there hasn't been any increase. In fact, the waiting list has doubled. Now, Mr. Minister, that isn't the worst of what you have done in nursing homes.

When you took office the payment for a bed in a nursing home or for a room in a nursing home was \$390. Now you will know that that number has increased significantly. It has increased by \$84 every month — \$84 every month . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Prince Albert says people don't believe me. But I'll tell you there is one member they don't believe, and that is the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. We are on Health estimates, and not on the reputation of the member from P.A.-Duck Lake.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I think we should not spend much time on the reputation of the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I said we wouldn't.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — And you won't.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — What I was asking the minister and outlining to him is that if he believes in co-operation from the opposition then he should keep his facts a little closer to reality. And the one that he's saying about how great he has done in the area of nursing homes is simply not to be believed.

I cite another example. In 1983-84 he announced in this Assembly that he was going to spend \$4 million on nursing home construction. And with great fanfare he held a press conference and he announced the list, and many of the homes are on the new list that he announced this year — many of them. He announced the list that he was going to spend \$4 million on nursing home construction.

Well, interesting enough, when the *Public Accounts* were released this year we found that he spent not \$4 million — not a little more or a little less — but, in fact, \$2.6 million or 40 per cent less than he announced. And I say, Mr. Minister, that that is not being honest. That is misleading the public of the province. That is what you sued to call in opposition, jiggy-pokery. And for you, Mr. Minister, to come here sanctimoniously saying how great you have done in the area of nursing home construction, that is not accurate.

Mr. Minister, in the area of nursing home rates, I want to get back to the area of what you have done in terms of increasing the rates. If I am correct you now increase the rates every four months — or is it every three months? Automatically, the seniors have an increase in their rates. Now you are telling everyone else in the province that it's at time of restraint, that they can't have increases, that teachers can't have increases, that nurses, there's no money for them. But yet for your nursing home beds you take those old people who many of them are unable to defend themselves and increase their rates every three months. And you have increased their rates from 390, by \$84.

And, Mr. Minister, if you work that out — do a quick calculation on how much that is in a percentage — you will find that it's about a 20 per cent increase for the seniors of the province since you have become minister.

And Mr. Minister, in a year, on the 9,000 beds in the province, that means \$9 million — \$9 million you have increased nursing home rates every year. And I say for you to come here and say what a great job you're doing, you are simply not telling the whole story. And if we're going to have a reasonable debate where we are all being honest with one another, then you should get up and say, look, I had some trouble with getting enough money for nursing homes and I had to cut the 4 million by 1.4 million and build less beds than I announced.

(1615)

If you were an honest person you would say that today. You would say, and this what I announce in this budget I'm going to try to keep to, but notice that last year I didn't spent 40 per cent of it, and that may happen again this year. You would say that to us, and you would also say that many of these projects that we've announced, whether it's regeneration or whether it's the rehab centre, you would say to them, now remember this is the fourth time I'm announcing it. This isn't a new wondrous announcement. This is the fourth time I'm announcing the rehab centre. You should say that.

If you want to be honest with this committee you would stand here and say, I'm going to re-announce the Lloydminster hospital, or I'm going to re-announce the regeneration of the General Hospital, and you don't do that. You've announced this same list four times. And for you to expect the people of the province to believe you after you call wolf three, four times and say, but wait till 1990, I'm going to do it; believe me; trust me — they simply don't. And I say to you that's why the doctors are now holding study sessions in Swift Current — is because they don't trust you any more. They simply don't trust what the minister is saying.

And I say to you that this is becoming more and more obvious. Whether it's the community clinics, whether it's the doctors, whether it's the dental program, Mr. Minister, the people of this province simply no longer believe you and your colleagues when you do two things: one, get elected and promise to cut taxes and then increase them: when you continually announce nursing homes and hospitals and then don't build them; when you announce you are going to spend certain sums of money in great fanfare and then decide to cut it by 40 per cent and not announce the cut. That is dishonest.

And you, Mr. Minister, are being called to task by many groups in this province, not the least of them, the leaders of our medical community, the doctors, because they are saying that it's difficult to negotiate with you. It's no longer conciliation. They are saying they are dealing with you with a gun at their head. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that while you will get up in this House and try to explain away all these problems and say, no problems in this province, we have the best health care anywhere.

I want to tell you that on CBC this morning on the national news, do you want to know what was on the national news about Saskatchewan? First of all, the major PCB spill, and secondly, the doctors holding study sessions. This is where health has gone in Saskatchewan under your administration. We now make the CBC news nationally, based on the fact that doctors are walking out and holding study sessions. And for you to stand, and for you to stand here and say that all is well, believe me, trust me — I think that is stretching the truth. And, Mr. Minister, I would like you to stand up and now give the true story about where health is in the province.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I most certainly will, and when I give the true story I won't make any allegations about stretching or untruths, as the person across the floor seemed to do in his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I was very close to standing on a point of privilege because some of the innuendo and some of the allegations that he was making, I think, were almost transcending the rules of parliamentary decorum in this house. I'd ask you to pay strict attention to that, Mr. Chairman.

You want to know some of the truth about nursing home construction. Well, I'll tell you the truth about nursing home construction. I'll take one small community — Duck Lake, Saskatchewan.

Duck Lake, Saskatchewan had asked for many years for a nursing home. It had an NDP member who was a cabinet minister in the NDP government, and they'd asked time and time and time again for a nursing home.

Duck Lake never were granted a nursing home under the NDP. Duck Lake will be getting a brand-new, 30-bed nursing home this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — There is the truth.

The member likes to talk about the number of beds that are being built. Let's take a look at that. During the last six years of the NDP they added 533 beds — over six years.

During the first three years of the Progressive Conservative government, we've added 500 beds, and with our commitment of our five-year plan, which is sound and firm, we will have 1,630 beds over a six-year period. That's the truth, and those are the facts.

The member opposite says that the residence charge is increasing quarterly, and that's correct; it is. It's on a formula designed to give that senior a respectable amount of disposable income.



And again I'll tell you the truth, because when I came in as the minister and found that the senior citizens of this province were allowed by the NDP party to have a total disposable income of \$60 a month, approximately \$60 a month, I thought that was unfair. And I can tell you what it is today. It is \$155 a month of disposable income for our senior citizens.

And the member says things aren't being built. And he knows as well as anyone else — he had a brief stay in cabinet at one time — he knows that there are certain things that are beyond your control. You budget . . . the estimates are what you estimate you will spend in a given year, but there are many factors that can cause projects to slow down or speed up, and you don't always spend what you say you're going to. And in some cases you may spend more. He should understand that. I don't know if he learned that when he was the minister or not.

But let's take a look at this year. Let's just take a look at this year of some of the places that are going to have construction. Regina Lutheran, he says there's no construction there. Get in your car, drive up, have a look over supper time, and you will see there's construction events taking place.

Kelvington, another place that will have construction completed, estimated completion, June 1985; Lutheran home, Regina, May 1985; Davidson, August 1985; Outlook, August 1985; Kinistino, September 1985; Wawota, October 1985.

And well I remember going to Wawota. I remember very distinctly, Mr. Chairman, my visit to that fine town of Wawota. They had been pleading like a voice in the wilderness for years to try and get some facilities in that part of Saskatchewan — in Stoughton, in Wawota, and in Whitewood. And it may be coincidental why those areas never had facilities put in there. But, Mr. Chairman, I'd encourage you and the people to go back and see that those areas were represented by Conservative MLAs.

And then it was the government opposite of the day who did things purely on political lines, and those people had been calling for years for a home. I went out there . . . I remember distinctly the beautiful senior citizens. They were all there. I came in; they were the most hospitable group. They laid out their case as best they could to me of the need. Mr. Chairman, I felt that need that day in Wawota.

And I remember that night the planning committee, the younger people of the community of Wawota, the ones who it was their fathers, and their aunts, and uncles that were there in the afternoon. We went down to their local café, had a nice supper. I remember them giving me a picture of a harvest scene or a farm scene that hangs on my wall today. And I drove out of that town of Wawota, and I thought, you've been neglected for many years and, by golly, Wawota, you're going to get a 30-bed nursing home. And I'm proud to say that in October of '85, we plan to have it built.

On Saskatoon Circle Drive, a gentlemen in Saskatoon that I respect greatly, and I think the people of Saskatchewan respect, the pastor of Circle Drive church, Pastor Boldt, came to me, and said, I see a need for a nursing home. And I think we look at the track record of Pastor Boldt. He's the man that gets things done. And Pastor Boldt, and his congregation, and the many people they will service in Saskatoon, will have a new 50-bed nursing home completed in November of 1985.

And also in Lloydminster, we'll have completion. And in Indian Head in December of '85. And I said Stoughton — and in Stoughton in 1985; and in Kindersley in March of 1986. So certainly there's construction going on.

There's no moratorium. But there was a moratorium, a real moratorium, that I can produce the letter signed by one Walter Smishek, saying that we will place a moratorium on nursing home

construction, and they did that in 1976.

So there, Mr. Chairman, I hope I've answered some of the questions that the member asked in his opening round.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, I was asking you about the problem in Regina with nursing home beds. You conveniently didn't talk about the Regina problem, and your concerns when you were in opposition when the waiting list was 700, and the fact that it has now gone to 1,500.

But, Mr. Minister, I'm not arguing with you about the fact of whether you build any nursing homes or not. I well realize that you have built some nursing homes. And of course every time you build a nursing home, you're serving a need in that community, as every government does, whether you're Liberal or NDP or Conservative.

We were in power from '44 till 1982 almost continuously. Where do you suppose all the nursing homes that were built in the 1950s came from? Who do you suppose built those? Or who do you suppose built the nursing home in Invermay, and Norquay, and other places around the province, that I went to open?

I'm not arguing with you whether or not you build nursing homes, or whether we did. Of course we all built nursing homes. The question is, Mr. Minister: is there a problem?

And I will ask you again about the city of Regina, Mr. Minister. Can you outline how well you have done in three years in dealing with that problem? How well have you done? Has it gone down or up?

And I would also ask you: how many beds have you built in Regina? You say there was no moratorium in Regina. How many new beds have been opened since you became the minister?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, I think the main thing to look at, if one takes a reasonable approach to the requirement of beds and waiting lists, if you look at waiting lists, Mr. Chairman, it used to be the situation where people would put their names on a number of homes to try and get in, you see, because they were concerned that they wouldn't be able to get in to that nursing home. So it's very difficult to say what a waiting list signifies.

What I did find, and what we're addressing, is that in Regina and other areas, there were people who were in nursing homes who could still exist in their community in their own home with support services. That is why we brought in the home care into Regina and into Saskatoon.

And definitely, Mr. Chairman, we have brought about one of the best innovations in assessing the needs of the elderly, and that is district co-ordinating committees where everyone has a standard assessment. And by that, those people who are needing to get into the homes can get into the homes. Certainly there are waiting lists; nobody disputes that. But the thing with dealing with the waiting list is to address that waiting list so that those who need the care get in, and those who can be serviced in another way within the home with home care and support services are looked after in that regard. That's the direction that we're going on.

As far as the construction of beds, I indicated to him that we have authorized, and they will be completed this year in June, the 11 beds at the Lutheran home, which are — let me explain — 11 beds for very hard to manage and heavy care type of people.

We have also indicated that this year we will be starting, in '85-86 the Salvation Army, 30 beds; and in '86-87, 48 beds in Santa Maria. So that's 78 beds in the near future. Eleven beds . . . if he wants to go up — if he needs a ride I might even take him up.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, I want to get this clear. In opposition you said that there

was a disaster in Regina in terms of waiting lists for nursing homes. That waiting list, by your own admission, has doubled, and you have yet to open one bed. Is that accurate? Well tell me what happened with the waiting list since you became minister in Regina, that's what I asked.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I just started to explain to you when you started bellowing from your seat, and it's always hard for you to hear and talk at the same time, that the waiting list, as you well understand, the waiting list that exists may have that same person on three or four different homes. A waiting list of that nature really isn't that credible.

The important thing is that you take that waiting list, be it 700, 800, 1,200 or whatever it is, and you assess those people whose needs are the greatest. And you give them the same assessment — the same assessment — so it isn't because who you know, or payment under the table, or anything of that nature, how you get in, it's because you are assessed centrally, and that way those people needing the assessment and needing the place are the first in the home. That's what we're doing.

(1630)

You can look at waiting lists — they change. People sometimes put their name on when they come or as a place opens up. If they haven't gone through this assessment they may not want to come in. They say I just had my name on there because some day I want to come in. That's what the waiting list tells you. But when you have common assessment, there is where you're really serving the needs of the people, and that's what we're doing.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I don't want to get into a debate about the way the lists are made up. You have very much changed your story 180 degrees in the past three years about waiting lists, because this isn't the Graham Taylor that I heard arguing about waiting lists when he was in opposition. At that time the waiting lists were very accurate. You seem to have your role mixed up.

I wonder when you changed your mind about the waiting lists in the city of Regina. I can clearly remember hearing you say that the waiting lists were accurate, that they were too long at that time. And what I want to ask you again: has the waiting list in Regina gone up or down, regardless of whether you agree that it's a good waiting list system or not, has it gone up or down under your term as Minister of Health?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well as I indicated to you that if anyone's mixed up, or I will indicate to you, it's you. Because I think if you go out — and I would ask you to do this, and I say this in all fairness and sincerity . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well would you listen for a moment? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, listen once more. Look, boy, you might learn something if you listen once more. And I'll tell you about the waiting list, and I'll tell you what to do.

I tell you to go out, and I challenge you to go out to any of the homes in Regina. You go out to them, my friend, and you ask them if they're not a better system today for dealing with waiting lists . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's the system . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . How many are on it? There's a number of people on the waiting list. I don't make any denial of that, but what I'm telling you is this, Mr. Chairman: if you would take the decency to go out and talk to the people who run the special care homes, the people who have to deal daily with getting people into special care homes, and ask them if there is not a better system of dealing with waiting lists in the city of Regina now than there was under his jurisdiction.

I challenge him — I challenge him to go out and ask them, because he'll get the true answer that it is much improved.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, you, and the people who are trying to tell you what to say, realize that your argument is phony, because what I'm not arguing is whether your

system of assessing people is good or bad. What I'm talking about is the actual number of people on the waiting list.

And what I would like to know is whether the number has gone up or down since you became minister.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — My officials tell me that we don't have those numbers. They're not tabulated. We know the number of people out there that are being assessed under an improved system, and there's no denying that. They're being assessed. The people who need to get into the homes are getting into the homes, and those are the ones with high priority needs.

Now whether they . . . you know, you can argue: is the waiting list bigger or smaller? I mean, what does that tell you? Because the waiting list, and you don't seem to understand this, and I'll say it to you once more, and I'll say it slowly, and I'll say it clearly, just as I used to teach grade 7, the same way.

It is this. It could be Mr. Black, and he could be on the waiting list in Santa Maria, and he could be on the waiting list at the Salvation Army, and he could be on the waiting list in a number of homes. You know, does that give you an accurate fact? You can say there's 1,500, there's 1,600, there's eight, there's 12.

The main thing — and listen to this: the main thing is this: that how many there are, that those who have the needs are the ones that are being dealt with. And I can stand here, and I can stand here proudly and say that that system is in place, and I can tell you that that system came into place under this jurisdiction.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, if you think changing the red tape in your department is going to solve the problem of the 1,500 people who are waiting for nursing home beds, by changing the list or by changing how you compile the list, how do you think that solves the problem for the people waiting? It doesn't help them at all. I can answer that for you.

Now let's forget about the way you compile the list. Can you, in your mind, Mr. Minister, tell you whether there are more people waiting to get into a nursing home now that there were when you took office? Now can you tell me that?

You're the Minister of Health. You're getting paid \$60,000 a year plus whatever — \$40,000 in expenses — and you would have us believe and the public of Regina believe that you don't know whether the number of people waiting to get into nursing homes in Regina has gone up or down. Is that what you're saying? Is that what you people are saying to you, that we don't know how many people? I don't believe it.

And I want to know whether or not the number of people waiting to get into nursing homes in Regina has gone up, as I believe and as the people on the waiting list will believe, or has it gone down? Obviously it's one or the other. And you're avoiding the question by giving this rambling speech about a red-tape assessment form.

I'll tell you a person waiting to get into a nursing home doesn't really give a darn about how you compile the list. What they want to know is how far down they are, how many people are ahead of them waiting to get in, and you would have the people of the province believe that you don't know.

Well, I'll tell you the reason you're not telling us. I'll give you credit that you're smarter than not knowing, but you're embarrassed about the fact that when you were in opposition you complained vehemently about the waiting list in Regina, and it has doubled.

And what have you done, sir? You have not built one nursing home bed in Regina. Not one has

been opened in the past three years, when you cried “foul” in 1982 and said they were too long then. Your solution has been to build not one bed. You say you now have 11 — 11 that you will open later this year.

Now, Mr. Minister, if you are serious that we had a crisis in 1982 when you took office, and the waiting list has now doubled, and your solution is to build 11 beds, I say that the people of the province are not going to believe you when you say what a great minister you are or how you’re able to get money, because it’s an insult to the people of Regina and to the 1,500 people.

And this is from a Regina study. You may call the city of Regina not able to compile a list, but obviously you can’t because you say that you don’t have the number compiled. But the city of Regina — and I’ll send you a copy of this — has done the work for you, because you seem incapable of doing it.

And I’ll read to you again. At the January 11 council meeting, city council passed a motion that Mayor Schneider, along with the board of health and social planning, go as a delegation to the Government of Saskatchewan and ask the following . . .

And later on in that it says . . . Now they will tell you how many there are on the waiting list, because you don’t obviously know. According to the Regina assessment and placement service statistics — Is that in your department? — that there is a total of 1,500 long-term care patients away on the waiting list.

Now the city of Regina how are, I believe, closer to the scene than what you appear to be because you can’t give me the number — this is March 6 of 1985, a little over a month ago — are saying there are 1,500. Can you confirm or deny that there are about 1,500 people waiting to get into nursing homes?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — First of all, what I would like to indicate to you are a couple of facts that I think should be brought out — just to jog your memory. The last nursing home bed that your government ever built in Regina was in 1976. That was six years before you were defeated. That was six years before you were defeated, and he tries to let on there was no waiting list at that time.

However, I want to tell you this too, that a person today in Regina needing to get into a nursing home, going through the assessment and the co-ordinating committee, has to wait from one to four weeks to be placed. One to four weeks to be placed into a nursing home, and that is much better record than it was previously when they had to wait much longer. One to four weeks.

Also, you must realize that there are other initiatives that are taking place. Palliser Place, here in Regina, there is going to be nursing services in there that will allow a large number of people to be accommodated in that facility.

You talk about the 1,500. That’s 1,500 people that are needing care, not that 1,500 are waiting to get into a nursing homes. And that’s what he wants to mislead and try and give the wrong impression. Those 1,500 people are people that are assessed as needing some type of service and care. That may well be that many of them need home care, and if that’s what they need and not into a nursing home, that’s what we will provide them with. Because the old idea of putting everybody in a nursing home and leaving them there until they succumb is not the way we look at it in health care in this government.

If they need nursing home accommodation, it’s one to four weeks, and they are in to a nursing home if they can be living in their community with support services from home care, or if they may need to go into an acute care hospital for a period of time and backed with those support services, that is what we are providing for them.

So when he stands up and says there's 1,500 wanting to get into a nursing home, I want to tell you that that member is purposely trying to mislead the people of this Assembly and the people of this province, because the 1,500 people are requiring some type of care. That may well be 900 needing home care. That may well be 2 or 300 needing into a nursing home. That may well be that some of them have to go to an acute care hospital for a hospital for a time. But let me tell you if the senior citizen who needs care can get into a nursing home in this city in one to four weeks, I think that is a very good record.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, obviously you are getting confused. You've got too many stories out there, because it's impossible to get into a nursing home in one to four weeks. I have had literally 10s and 20s of people in Regina phoning me who have been on your waiting list for over a year, and I say to you, Mr. Minister, you're the person misleading the House and the people of the province, and the people of Regina will be the ones to judge you because you are not accurate. And your staff will know that you can't get into a nursing in one to four weeks.

Your credibility continues to go downhill, and I can well appreciate now what the doctors say when they say they phone you. You phone at 8 in the morning when you've been consulting on an agreement and say the deals off, and this is what's happening right across the province with you and your statements. This is why you have a hard time keeping deputy ministers, because nobody can believe you. Yes, I feel sorry for Walter. I know what the job is keeping you out of trouble.

But I say to you it's getting very, very difficult for people in this province to believe you when you would have me believe that any senior can get into a nursing home in one week. That is not true, and you know it. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, when you try to stand here in this Assembly and mislead the seniors of this city saying that they can get into a nursing home in one week, your credibility has sunk to a new low.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, again, an attempt to mislead. I said, from one to four weeks for the heavy care people, the people who need to get in the most, who have been assessed. The committee said, look at . . . this person has to be in there. The heaviest care needs, of all the ones we've looked at, within one to four weeks, the person is in.

He mentions about the doctors and negotiating. And I'd just like to lay this out, you know, because it seems very strange to see a fellow on the other side . . . I know he wants to keep extra billing, and certainly that's very evident that's where he is coming from.

We have made a decision we will eliminate extra billing, but it's very easy to see that he has switched all around. And now, although his party say they want to eliminate it, not that member. He wants to keep it. He's right on the side of the doctors.

I want to lay out for the audience, and for the people here, just the type of consultation that has taken place with the doctors. And I will start back on August the 30th . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes. He says I don't consult. That's right. On August the 30th . . . or 13th of '84, I was in contact with the president of the SMA, Dr. Rick Twanow of Melfort, indicated to him that we would like to start a consultation to eliminate extra billing in the province of Saskatchewan.

On August the 20th, we met again. The SMA said they would not want to meet until November, after they'd had their regional assembly. I agreed to that.

On November the 14th, we met with the SMA, and we set up a consultation process with joint chairmanship. My deputy, Mr. Walter Podiluk, being one chairman; Dr. Rick Twanow, the head of the SMA, being the other chairman — joint chairmanship.

This committee then met again on December the 3rd, 1984, where the SMA tabled their proposal. Again, on January the 17th, the committee met again, and we reacted to the proposal.

We met again on February the 14th. The committee met, and I agreed to take the issue to the cabinet. The SMA said, would you let the cabinet of Saskatchewan have a look at it?

On March the 14th, a committee of the cabinet met with the SMA. On April the . . . no, excuse me, on April the 2nd. On March the 14th, there was another meeting.

On April the 19th, I phoned Dr. Twanow to tell him that the position of the cabinet was the same as I had stated it would be on August the 13th, 1984.

I have since met with the new chairman, Dr. Brian Maber, of the SMA, and I'm ready to meet with them at any time.

So for him to stand up again to try and mislead, to try and give out false information — that we do not consult and we do not negotiate — is entirely false.

I think the record that I just read in indicates that this government, and this Department of Health, are willing to sign an agreement with the SMA. And we will sign that agreement. But that agreement will not contain any aspect of extra billing.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, we'll check out your word and we'll see whether you have Bill in on Monday, because if you don't hurry it along with your help and get the Bill written up, then I guess we'll introduce it for you, and we'll find out who's playing the game, because I think you're playing a game with extra and direct billing, or you'd have the Bill in here. Where is the Bill?

And I'll tell you that you're not the first province to bring the Bill in, and we'll see whether or not you're playing a game. I think you are. The doctors think you are. And I think the people of the province are beginning to believe that you are playing a game.

But we'll find out. If it isn't in Monday, then I guess the NDP will bring in a Bill, and see whether we have your support. We'll see whether you can get your act together and see whether the Bill will be here on Monday. And we'll know tomorrow because you'll give notice, and we'll see. We'll call your bluff on direct billing and see whether or not . . . who has whose support on that issue.

Because I think you're playing a con game. I don't think you intend to bring the legislation in or you'd have it in by now. We've been sitting for 31 days; we haven't seen it yet. And you keep saying, well, we might or we will. But the whole problem is: the doctors don't know whether they can trust you; the people of the province don't know; and they're beginning to wonder.

But let's get back to the nursing home beds in Regina. Let's get back to the nursing home beds and the problems that were there in 1982. And you say there was a problem in 1982 and I agree with you. There weren't enough nursing home beds when we were in government the last few years. There weren't enough beds in Regina. I will be honest enough to admit to you. You will be honest enough to admit that there was a problem in 1982.

I think we can accept the fact that the problem has gotten worse in the three years you are minister. What we can't seem to agree on is that your solution to the problem has been to build not one bed in the city of Regina. You who were so concerned in opposition, and you almost brought tears to people's eyes as you try to today, but the only thing is people know they're crocodile tears about your concern about people on waiting lists.

And I say to you: if it was such a great concern in 1982, how many beds in Regina have you opened? How many beds have been opened up to today?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I'm interested to hear the talk of bringing in a Bill on Monday, a Bill, you know, all of a sudden. A few minutes ago he was saying, you don't deal fairly with the doctors. Now he said, we will bring in a Bill. That is typical NDP confrontation type of politics.

I said that we are working in consultation with the doctors to sign an agreement — to sign an agreement. The government here has been in for three years. We have decided that we will not allow extra billing in this province. The NDP were in power for 11 years — 11 years — and what they always said: we will end extra billing. But they didn't have the intestinal fortitude to ever do it.

And now you see the way he deals again. Does he want to sign an agreement? No, he wouldn't sit down and consult and sign an agreement. No, we'll bring in legislation. That's their way. Confrontation. Have a fight.

I remember only so well 1962. I remember that, and many people in this Assembly do. I remember who the man was that signed the agreement to allow extra billing in this province. Some of you younger members mightn't remember.

But I'll tell you who that man was, and I'll tell you where he sits in this Assembly today. He's the Leader of the Opposition. He sits over there. He was the man that allowed extra billing in this province. He's the father of extra billing, and now he makes an idle boast about bringing in an Act.

Confrontation politics. Not the decency to sit down with the medical profession, as we have on seven or eight situations and said, look, we will work on an agreement. And that agreement will be Saskatoon agreement 1982, not ramming in a Bill without consultation — typical NDP confrontation. I can tell you, as long as you have those kind of tactics, you and your leader will sit over there for many years to come.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I want to bring you back to the reality of the real world that you keep trying slipping out of when you talk about the nursing home lists in Regina.

Mr. Minister, I'll ask you for the 120th time: how many nursing home beds have you opened in Regina since you became minister?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — You know, he keeps going on this waiting list. I guess it's the only issue he really has, and I want to indicate to him, and I will say that there are 11 beds for heavy care people being built at the nursing home. There are going to be 30 built this year at the Salvation Army home, and there's going to be 48 built in the next year at the Santa Maria home. So you add those up; you're getting up to close to 100 beds.

But let me point out: you see, if the member opposite was really sincere, he would indicate and he would acknowledge the many improvements that have been brought about that do not require the necessity of nursing home beds. Back in those days, in the mid-70s, we didn't have respite care. We didn't have respite care. We didn't have adult day care. We didn't have home care. We didn't have palliative care.

We have all of those new systems — systems designed to help people remain in their communities, to live their life with their families, with their loved ones, where they really want to be. And also we have brought in the new concept of enriched housing — housing where they can stay there with a bit of minimal care.

And I find . . . and I'll give you the example that I often use in Saskatchewan because I visited it, and I had a fine meal at that place, and that was in Southey, Saskatchewan, a little town just



across the valley. And they have an enriched housing complex there. There's no nursing care whatsoever, some home care. And I want to tell you that the people in Southey are living there. They're living well. They're well looked after. And the average age was 83 years old the day I visited there. That's enriched housing.

So ladies and gentlemen, and members, you must realize that we are bringing in many new innovative type of delivery systems.

I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan, and I want to tell this legislature, that when we have completed the five-year plan with the nursing home beds that this government has said they are going to build, and we will build, Saskatchewan will lead all of the nation and North America in the number of beds per population — number one, truly number one.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — You remind me of a speech that was given by a previous minister. And I don't know, Mr. Minister, whether we can trust you or not, given your record in Regina. This is your record. In opposition you said at 800, the 500, the lists were exorbitant, that you couldn't stand it, that you just thought it was a great problem. Now, Mr. Minister, the lists have doubled and you have not built one bed. You have not opened one bed in three years.

Now get the logic of this: when you became minister you said the waiting lists of 800 were too high, that it was an urgent problem and you were going to deal with it immediately. You got elected. You became minister. You were appointed I believe on the 8th of May in 1982. That is now three years ago. Three years ago, Mr. Minister, you said that the problem in Regina was a crises — and I remember you saying that — with 800 on the waiting list.

There are now 1,500, which you pretend don't exist because of some formula, some jiggery-pokery that you try to cover up. But I'll tell you, the Regina city council says they've done a study, and they find there are 1,500.

And now you're saying we don't need nursing home beds. There are many other options. We have enriched housing. We have all of these other things. We no longer need nursing homes. Well when did you realize we didn't need nursing home? When did you decide that you didn't need any more nursing homes in Regina?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who put the moratorium on nursing homes?

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — The moratorium in Regina was started in 1982 by your government. There hasn't been one bed opened. Not one bed opened. Not one bed.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your problem is that you can't get the facts straight. And I would ask you again if you would tell me how many beds you have opened. And I ask the question very short and succinctly: how many beds have you opened, as minister, in the city of Regina in the last three years? How many beds?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Well once again, Mr. Chairman, the member confuses the issue, and I'm afraid — and I hate to say this because I thought he did understand, but I'm beginning to wonder whether he does — that there's 1,500 — as he says is the number — and I don't know the city of Regina. It's some figure he's quoting from somewhere, but those are not people needing to get into a nursing home. Those are people who need some type of care. Five hundred and eight-five of those people maybe need home care — fine and dandy. Thirty-five of them may need to get into a hospital, and may well be in the hospital by now and back out — fine and dandy. A few more may have to get into a nursing home. Those that are designated to have to get into the nursing home are in there from one to four weeks — I think a fine example.

And when I hear this member get up and talk about nursing home, nursing home, I think he doesn't even really realize the concept of today. And maybe he wants to go back to the old system where the old people had to stay in the community or else be in the nursing home with no support.

Graham Taylor doesn't believe that I want to have home care. I want to have respite care, adult day care, palliative care. Let me tell you about palliative care, what that is. That is for those people who unfortunately are going to be passing away. That is a system where those people can live out the remainder of their days with support in their own home. That is the kind of compassionate service that we want to provide for health care in Saskatchewan.

So for the member opposite to try to quote a figure of 1,500, and try and make that misrepresentation that there are 1,500 people out there in Regina today banging on the door of a nursing home to get in, is really stretching the truth. I don't doubt that there are 1,500 people in this city that need some type of care, and that type of care will be respite care, and that type of care may be adult day care, and that may be palliative care, and that's what this health department will be providing.

And that is listening to the needs of people, and that is being compassionate and looking after people where their needs can best be addressed and keeping the, more important, in their home with their loves ones so they can see their grandchildren and enjoy them. That's the kind of service delivery.

And if he wants to try and mislead and say there's 1,500 knocking on the door, let him so do, but I am telling you the type of assistance that we will be delivering not only in Regina, but across this fine province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, I missed the number. How many nursing home beds have you opened since 1982 in Regina?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I'm afraid, my friend, you miss an awful lot, not just a number.

You know, I remember when you first came in here. I remember when you first came in, and I remember when you were the minister. You missed a lot in those days. You were a young lad, rather immature, green behind the ears. I thought you would mature and get so you could grasp things, but — not being disrespectful — but really you still do miss quite a bit. However, we will try and outline for you.

I told you that there were 11 beds for heavy care people being built right now at the Lutheran home . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, right now. Go out at supper time and have a look. Maybe you can help out.

There are going to be 30 beds built in the Salvation Army home this year., There will be 78 beds built at the Santa Maria next year. That is a total of 89.

Also, because the surrounding environs sometimes move into Regina, there are 15 beds in Indian Head, 45 miles from Regina. There will be 30 new beds in Lumsden, about 20 miles. And there will be 10 beds in Fort Qu'Appelle, about another 35 miles. Take those all together, you will see there's quite a number of beds being built right in Regina and surrounding areas.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Being 5 o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until 7 p.m. this evening.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.