

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 3, 1985

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

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

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and the House 17 students from Waldheim High School, grade 12 students. They've journeyed here today to be with us to watch question period. I'd like all members of the Assembly to welcome them here and hope they have a good trip, and I will be meeting with them later.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMPTON: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and to the members of the Assembly, a group in the Speaker's gallery from Preeceville School. There are 25 students accompanied by the principal of the school, Mr. John Mills, and Mr. Gerla, one of the teachers; three parents, Mrs. Brodziak, Mrs. Sawka, and Mrs. Preston.

I hope that the students here today enjoy question period, and I hope you enjoy your tour of the Legislative Building and your trip to Regina. I think you'll find it very interesting in here this morning, and I will be meeting with you about 11 o'clock for drinks and pictures. I would ask all members of the Assembly to greet them here today. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOUTIN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Legislative Assembly, 27 grade 12 students from Kinistino School, and their teacher, Blaine Attley, and their bus driver, Bob Granrud; and I'd urge all members to welcome them here, and I'll be having pictures and drinks with you at 10:30.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Costs of International Travel

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, deputy speaker. I address my question to the deputy premier, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, sometime called. But it deals with the expenditure, Mr. Deputy Premier, of tax dollars and your obligation to tell the taxpayers how much they're shelling out for your international trips.

As you're aware, Mr. Deputy Premier, the Premier and the Deputy Premier and a number of other cabinet ministers have made some 50 international trips. And we have requested information. In motions for returns, we filed for these trips in 1983.

My question to you is: can the Deputy Premier give the taxpayers of Saskatchewan a guarantee that you will see to it that the full details of the costs of these international trips by you and the Premier will be tabled in the legislature forthwith?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I will give the absolute and unequivocal guarantee that the information will be tabled in due course. I can also tell . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. The member has asked a question. Allow the Deputy Premier to answer.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I can also tell the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that I have a mountain of returns on my desk . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not this desk. But as they are vetted by my ever-cunning . . . I will have them tabled in this House.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplemental, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Will the Deputy Premier provide to the people and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, how much they shelled out for your trips which included Bulgaria, Frankfurt, Athens, Australia, London, New York, Vienna, Saudi Arabia, Los Angeles, Tokyo, and the list goes on. Will you include that in the information that you're going to provide? Some of these have been made prior. I wonder why the information hasn't been presented to the House.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to provide the information in the appropriate fashion. And while I'm providing the information, I will also talk about the Hoechst chemical company coming to Canada and expanding in Canada, in Regina, Saskatchewan, in Ross Industrial Park.

The North American headquarters, Mr. Speaker, the North American headquarters for crop protection for . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Obviously they don't want the answer, Mr. Speaker. They ask the questions but don't want the answers.

As it relates to Tokyo . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, will you . . . Mr. Speaker, as well, we can talk about Tokyo and the fact that for the first time we have signed a contract, a uranium contract, with a Japanese utility — a potential of a billion-dollar market. And we're now in that market. We never were before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — We can talk about cattle to Bulgaria, and we can talk about turn-key projects in the U.S.S.R. We can talk about 6 or 8 or \$9 million worth of rock pickers going into the U.S.S.R. And I'm hiding nothing. I'll talk about this all day if the members opposite want to. We have a pretty good record. It's a record that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, they tell us they didn't do that much travelling, and I think that's probably right. I can remember when the Leader of the Opposition, when he was premier, made a junket over to the U.K. and all he did while he was over there was spend about a hundred . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplemental to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier also provide forthwith the information to inform the taxpayers how much they paid for the Premier's trips to Hong Kong, Singapore, Peking, Changchun, Vienna twice, East Germany, Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Brasilia, London twice, New York, Columbus, Chicago, Denver, Boston, Palm Springs, Geneva, Zurich, Frankfurt, Bonn, Cologne, Paris, among the few?

Can the Deputy Premier provide this vital information so the taxpayers can make the determination whether these are paid holidays, or whether they serve a purpose to the taxpayers of this province?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Obviously, Mr. Speaker, again they ask another question that they don't want the answer to. And sure, we're prepared to provide the information in the

appropriate manner and also spell out some of the benefits that have flown from that.

And I compare it . . . You know, I mean, so we broke into a South American potash market as a result of the Premier's trip down there.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! It's very difficult to hear when there's so much noise in the legislature. I would ask members to keep some decorum so that everybody can hear the answer.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to, in a sentence, draw the comparison of our record to that of the former administration when they took a trip to London. When they took a trip to London, and in the financial Times of London, spent over \$100,000 advertising SGI, Saskoil, and dairy products: come to Saskatchewan; we'll help you get into the farming business. I compare our . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. KOSKIE: — I would like to ask a new question to the Deputy Premier. As I have said, Mr. Deputy Premier, that the cabinet ministers have made some 50 international trips, and that's a low estimate. And it's low because many of your ministers are constantly travelling the world under expense accounts of the Crown corporations, never announcing these trips.

I have one example here when you were the minister in charge of SMDC — just for one and a half days and it just covers the room — Beverly Wilshire Hotel. Do you know how much that cost the taxpayers, and of which you are hiding? Two hundred and ninety-nine dollars for one day. And that covers only the room.

Can you tell the Saskatchewan taxpayers when you're going to come clean and allow them to examine your performance in your travelling around the world at their expense.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, again . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. do the members want to hear the answer? Order, order. I would ask members then to be quiet so they can hear the answer.

Next question.

MR. KOSKIE: — New question. As I've indicated to you, Mr. Minister, there has been in excess of 50 international trips. And what concerns us, and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, is that there are additional trips being made by cabinet ministers in respect to their association with SMDC and other Crown corporations. And what I've indicated to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, one account, the Beverly Wilshire Hotel, \$299 for one night spent on the taxpayers' money. I'd like to ask you: do you not think it's fair that you do give an immediate accounting to the taxpayers of this extravagant waste of taxpayers' money?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I don't take as face value what the hon. member offers as fact . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it may well be. It may well be, and it might even be fact. But I won't trust you guys. I'll wait till I see the document. That's number one.

Number two, if it were \$1,000 a night, or \$2,000 a night, if you measure the returns . . . I don't even know what trip it was. I've been there from time to time. I've been there from time to time holidaying with my family. I was down there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I sure wasn't, knot-head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. I'm going to warn the members that they should be quiet during question period so I can also hear the questions and the answers.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I apologize to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. I shouldn't have called him a knot-head.

I recall one trip to California where I visited with Nuexco, Nuexco being the uranium . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What about it? What about it? I mean, you know, my job is to sell Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan products and commodities, and yes, it was, at that particular point, probably uranium. I was meeting with Nuexco (Nuclear Exchange Corporation), and with some degree of success, because we've penetrated the Japanese market. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, with the largest and richest uranium mine in the world, producing about 17, 18 per cent of the world's uranium, and the largest market in the world we hadn't even touched because those guys never left the marble palace.

I've been out selling Saskatchewan, I will continue to sell Saskatchewan, and I make no apology to members opposite for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Proposed new Saskatchewan Logo

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question to the Deputy Premier. It only involves a few tens of millions of dollars, so you'll no doubt dismiss it as a knot-head question, but I want to ask it of you anyway . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, just a few million dollars in taxpayers' money.

It involves, Mr. Premier, Mr. Deputy Premier, the expenditure of tax dollars. Will you confirm, Mr. Deputy Premier, that Dome Advertising agency of Regina recently presented to cabinet a plan for a new Government of Saskatchewan logo which would appear on all government stationery, vehicles, and buildings? Will you confirm as well that the proposal consists of a stylized Saskatchewan combined with a provincial flag, and will you report on the status of this proposal?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well I can take notice of the question. You can appreciate with all my worldly travels I don't get to every cabinet meeting. But I have absolutely no knowledge of any such proposal.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask the Deputy Premier why a change is even under consideration. A change in the government logo — involving as it does changes on vehicles, buildings, stationery — must involve, at a minimum, tens of millions of dollars.

I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, to report as well on the cost of the change, rounded off to the nearest million. That would be satisfactory for us.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — You know, in a quick consultation with the colleagues around me here, I can find no one that knows anything about any proposed change, so perhaps you'd better check the source of your leaks.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well so far, Mr. Minister, they've been reasonably accurate. At least we found your name on the hotel bills in the Hideaway Lounge of the Beverly Hills hotel. Mr. Minister, will you as well report to this House on why Dome Advertising is handling this proposal? You employ and have a visual identity office, staffed with competent, professional public servants. Will you report to this House on why you're spending tens of millions of dollars to hire an advertising agency, your political party's advertising agency, when you already have government employees hired and on staff who could do the same job for a small fraction of

what you're paying your political party's advertising agency?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — The only point I will make since his first supplementary, Mr. Speaker — and obviously he hasn't been listening to the answers because he hasn't got off the track that he started on — since the first supplementary, I've made it clear that no such proposal exists number one. Number two, you made reference to the fact that Dome Advertising was handling this proposal that doesn't exist, you know. And you made reference to the fact that they were our party agency, and that's true. And they're very good, and that's why we're here and you're there.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Deputy Premier, I know that this government has fine tuned to a fine art the art of changing your answers in mid course. You took notice of my first question, and took notice of subsequent questions. You didn't deny anything. When reporting back to the House, I'd ask you to report on one final matter. Will you confirm something that we already know, and that is that the reason why you don't like the wheat sheaf is because, in the public mind, that is identified with the former government, and you're . . . (inaudible) . . . on that as well.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — My God, Mr. Speaker, I'm almost ready to sit down with those guys and negotiate some new research funding for them. I've never heard such dumb questions in my life.

The wheat sheaf . . . The symbolic stylized wheat sheaf, the emblem of Saskatchewan, is one that we ought to be very, very proud of, and we are. And there is no such proposal as the hon. member is yipping about. I think he's trying to find a way to kill the clock so that question period doesn't go flat so we may have to cancel it and get on with the business of government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Policy Re Travel Expenses of Persons Accompanying Delegates

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, or the Speaker. I'd like to ask the Deputy Premier if he could outline to this House what the travel policy is relating to the accompanying on trips by respective wives of members of the cabinet, and various other employees of the Crown corporations.

Could you elucidate as to whether there's any particular policy, or is it in fact up to the individual whether or not the specific wife is to accompany, at taxpayers' money, the Deputy Premier, or any of his ministers, at the taxpayers' cost?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't hear the question with all of the noise going on there. I just . . .

MR. KOSKIE: — Obviously he needs more time to think up an answer. I asked you if you could indeed explain to the House what the policy is relating to having spouses accompany cabinet ministers, Crown corporation officials, and the like, and whether the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are indeed entitled, so to speak, to pick up the bill for these international holidays for wives when they accompany the respective representatives of this most-travelled government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — When are you leaving for China, Eric?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — On the 10th, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any change in policy, and I obviously . . . I'm obviously not going to state to the House the policy of government because you're right, I don't know it.

I can tell you what I do in my case, because my wife is not much of a traveller. In fact, she's the head of the math department at Notre Dame, and it's a little difficult for her to get away.

Otherwise I would take her on more of these trips.

But I pay it all out of “old hip national” here, even to prorating the hotel bill, because . . . and I don’t think it’s proper. I think that often wives are an asset on these kinds of trips and of some benefit to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to accompany their husbands on these kinds of trips. But the fact is I know that if I ever did that, I would come home, and you guys would be crying and moaning and trying to make an issue of it. And I don’t run that risk, quite simply.

So two . . . I guess it was two years ago I took my wife to Vienna, and she enjoyed the trip very much. We met some very good people over there. And some of them, Mr. Speaker, were the people from the embassy from Bulgaria, in Vienna. And a result of that visit we had a commitment to another boatload of cattle going to Bulgaria. And it’s been an excellent market for us, and we’ll continue to market Saskatchewan all over the world, Mr. Speaker, and that’s what we’re here for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — All right. A supplement, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I had asked the minister to outline the policy as it relates to the taxpayers picking up the cost of accompanying spouses, and the concern is that there is no definite policy, apparently, within the government. So I ask you, do you in fact think it’s fair, Mr. Deputy Premier, that senior officials and the chairman of the board, Mr. Cliff Wright, of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, were able to take a trip at the taxpayers’ money to China, Malaysia, and Japan at a total cost of \$28,000? And according to the minister in Crown corporations, the wives of the senior executive officers, and Mrs. Wright — their cost were incurred by the taxpayers of this province. Is that a concurrence with your initial policy?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I quite simply won’t pass judgement on the rightness or the wrongness of it. I understand that that policy on potash has not changed — I’m advised, has not changed. And if you want to do a little comparison to the days of the previous administration on Dombowsky, I suppose we could pull that together.

Gas Safety Inspections

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question to the Minister of Labour concerning the events surrounding the death of Polly Redhot. I don’t know if you find this as humorous as all your colleagues do, Mr. Minister. I note this morning, however, somebody in your department has some maturity and integrity, because they’ve admitted something you’ve refused to do, and that is that the targeting policy has been suspended.

My question, Mr. Minister is: in suspending the policies, will you take the obvious next step that needs to be taken and bring that branch up to full staff so they can, in fact, inspect all of the new gas installations in the province?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman’s report that we received, we have accepted a number of his recommendations. In fact, he is totally satisfied with what we have done in the branch. I have a letter on file to that effort.

The compensation part of it is in the hands of the Justice department, and it’s available for help from them at any time that the estate wants to contact the Justice department.

So in our mind the branch is doing its job. We are concerned about the safety of the people of Saskatchewan, and I have no qualms in that the job will get done.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, Mr. Minister, the Ombudsman had some qualms about whether or not the job would get done. That’s the very reason why this issue continues to haunt and dog

you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, as a background to the question, I note that you've initiated yet another study. Mr. Minister, you had your own study after the event became public knowledge, which nobody gave any credence to. The Ombudsman spent a good deal of time studying the event and filed a report, which I think everybody has given credibility to. And he has suggested, Mr. Minister, that you need to suspend the policy. You need to end the policy.

Mr. Minister, why in heaven's name, after all these studies, have you initiated yet another study, as your deputy minister says, to investigate these events? Will you not admit the obvious, that the policy was ill-advised, that it resulted in the tragic death of one human being and may result in more deaths unless you end the policy and bring that branch up to full staff?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will look at the estimates, you will find that the person-years that we have budgeted for is no different than it was last year, and, in fact, that we are seven and one-half person-years ahead of that department in 1981, which was under your jurisdiction.

And the study that you refer to was put under way long before the tragedy that happened with Polly Redhot. So we are awaiting that, which is going to be here momentarily. We have had the Ombudsman's report. We had no real difference of views as far as the Ombudsman was concerned, and a lot of the recommendation that we came with in our own report, along with the Ombudsman's report, are already in place.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 64 — An Act respecting the Exploration for and the Development, Conservation and Management of Mineral Resources

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Exploration for and the Development, Conservation and Management of Mineral Resources.

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

Bill NO. 65 — An Act respecting Crown Minerals and Crown Minerals Lands

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Crown Minerals and Crown Mineral Lands.

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

Bill No. 66 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Crown Minerals Act and The Mineral Resources Act, 1985

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Crown Minerals act and The Mineral Resources Act, 1985.

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

MOTIONS

Referral of Estimates to the Standing Committee on Estimates

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. I would ask the member from Shaunavon to keep quiet so that the Chair can hear the proceedings of the House. It's very difficult when someone's chattering across the floor continually to hear the House Leader or anyone else that's trying to conduct the business of the day.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Minister of Supply and Services:

That the estimates for the Legislative Assembly, being subvotes 1 to 3, 6, 7, 17, and 20 to 23 of vote 21 be withdrawn from the committee of finance and referred to the Standing Committee on Estimates.

That's the ordinary thing that we always do.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

HEALTH

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I have a couple of questions that I wanted to ask you in regards to Heritage Saskatchewan, the year that has been declared by your government, 1985. It has to do with a development in your constituency, in the town of Wolseley.

You will know that in your home town and in one of your towns in your constituency, in the community of Wolseley, your proposal to construct a new nursing home will require, at least in your terms, the destruction of Banbury House, which many people in your area consider to be of significant historical recognition, and will also seriously encroach on the court-house in Wolseley, which has been declared heritage property.

Mr. Minister, you will know that recommendations that have come forward would indicate that you are going down a path that is contrary to what many people in your area believe, and also many people in your government believe.

I would ask you to point out why it is that when you come to the point of negotiating this kind of a deal, you run into these kind of problems where you pretend to be negotiating, but when you don't get your way you simply put your head down and ram things through.

In your case, in your own community you got one of your individuals in the community to do a little study on it. It sounded like you were consulting. When he brought back a report that that house should be maintained, you said, I don't want your report; I'm not going to listen to it. As CBC reported the other morning, his word was not taken into consideration.

I would ask you, Mr. Minister: why is it that you have such a difficult time in negotiating with people? And you keep running into brick walls and then continuing on even when it's obvious

that you're getting into trouble with the people who are around you, on this issue.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I do not have very much difficulty with negotiating with people. I think the actions that have taken place over the period of three years in the Health department will indicate that.

As far as the Banbury House and the new Lakeside home, certainly I'll give you a little of the history of the Lakeside home. When I was first elected in '78 it was the intention of the NDP government to close Lakeside home in Wolseley. I brought considerable pressure on the home, which maintained that home. It's a home that was built in about 1913, probably one of the oldest in the province — it, and St. Anthony's Home in Moose Jaw — and both of them are going to be replaced by this government. Lakeside homes is going to have another 10 beds added for hard-to-manage people in the area.

So to build the home to the type of specifications for the quality of life that I talked about last night and the quality of care, it's necessary to build the home on one level so that these people can come out onto the borders of the beautiful reservoir in Wolseley, or the dam as we call it — know it so well — probably the best site, according to many of the professionals in the building field, for a nursing home, anywhere in Saskatchewan. So to build the type of nursing home that will be required, a single-level nursing home, it's going to be necessary (to fit it on the site), to use part of the area that is now the existing nursing home, and the area that is presently being occupied by Banbury House.

Banbury House I know very well. I've lived in Wolseley for many, many years. If there was a way that we could locate the nursing home without taking Banbury House out of there, we would have done it. We looked at every possible option.

We sent our local committee to indicate some of the things that they wanted to have in the home. And the employees, management, the residents, have all had input into the type of structure and feature that they would want to see there that will serve the needs of that community and that part of Saskatchewan for many years to come.

To build what we need, it's necessary that Banbury House must be removed. So therefore it will either be sold and removed, or else it will be taken down. Parts of it will be incorporated into the new home, so that the heritage of that family and of that house will be remembered.

But those were the situations, and I think that if the member was accurate and would do some research other than listening to a CBC report which, I must say with all due sincerity, does not always give the true picture of what the situation is . . .

We had the architects for the home do an independent survey. There was about a 75 per cent return of the letters mailed out, which is very high, and of that return approximately 85 per cent of the people in the Wolseley area said to remove or demolish the Banbury House. So that is what we're going to be doing. And as far as any problems with negotiations, I would think rather than reading the local newspaper or listening to CBC on *Saskatchewan Today*, if the member really was sincere and really wanted to find out the true feeling, that he would go out and talk to the people in the area.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I would ask the minister if he could inform me whether or not he had any communications with the Department of Culture and Recreation in terms of this construction, and if so, what was the commitment that you gave to them, and what was the conditions that they gave to you that the building could go ahead on the Banbury House site? I would like to know what the communications were and what Culture and Rec told you you should do if, in fact, the nursing home were to be built there.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I don't recall any written communication. I did talk to the minister

regarding the court-house, which is the only designated heritage property on the site. And I should point out it's the first court-house in the province of Saskatchewan. That court-house has been incorporated and built into the existing Lakeside Nursing Home. As the old home goes down, the court-house will be restored to the type of structure that it originally was. We've had some discussions on that.

Regarding Banbury House, it never was designated as a heritage property. If there were a way that it could have been saved, we certainly would have looked at it. But all that space is required for the new nursing home, and overwhelmingly — and I must emphasize that, overwhelmingly — the residents of Wolseley and surrounding district want to see the new nursing home on that site, a one-level nursing home. So I hope that answers the questions.

(1045)

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, Mr. Minister, you say that no communication took place. I have here an internal document which deals very clearly with the Wolseley Lakeside Nursing Home expansion. And it is signed and approved by the Minister of Recreation, Mr. Rick Folk, Minister. And the communication is from a W. Clarke, deputy minister of the Saskatchewan Culture and Recreation to the hon. minister, Mr. Rick Folk, re Wolseley Lakeside Nursing Home expansion. And in that communication of March 12th, 1984, which I'm sure your department is aware of, the conditions were set out very clearly that would stipulate how it should take place, what should take place if you were going to build on the Banbury site.

And the recommendations are, and which are agreed to and approved by the minister . . . And I will let you get a copy of this because just to make sure that you don't stand up and carry on with this tirade that you don't know anything about it, because I know you do. But there are four recommendations:

1. The proposed one-storey facility be built with the Banbury House relocated.

That's moving the Banbury House. That's one option. The other one is:

2. An alternate one-storey scheme with the Banbury House on its historic site.

That's alternative number two.

3. An alternate two-storey scheme with the Banbury House remaining on its historic site.

And number four:

4. A sketch of the Banbury House relocated adjacent to the court house.

Those are the four options that were given to you by the Department of Culture and Recreation. Now you're saying that the reports on CBC, on *Saskatchewan Today*, are inaccurate.

Now I would ask you whether or not the Mr. Minister of Culture and Creation and CBC and the newspapers are all wrong, and you are right. That's what you're having us believe here — that you are the only one right and everyone else in the world is wrong. I say to you that that approach to life is what continues to get you in trouble, is that you are the only one who knows anything — and that's why you have trouble keeping people around you. That's why you keep running into trouble with the doctors. That's why in your own constituency, when you fired the administrator at the Lakeside home last year, you run into those kind of problems and hire your Tory campaign manager.

It's not that everyone else in the world is wrong, sir. It's just that you continue on down this road

of pretending sanctimoniously that you are always doing everything on the up and up. And I say here that I have this internal document, which I will share with you and let you have a look at, that very clearly indicates that the conditions that were set out was that the home would either be let in place, the Banbury House left in place, or relocated. You're doing neither.

And I would ask you: on what grounds did you make that decision when your own colleagues are saying you should do something different?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — The member opposite again is trying to stretch the truth and trying to mislead, which he always likes to do. And I could tell you that there are many things in that report by the CBC that are false — false, false, false.

One, for example, and you just said it again, that I hired my campaign manager. My campaign manager is a man by the name of Tom Taylor, my brother. He was my campaign manager the first time I ran. He was my campaign manager the time I sought the leadership of this party. He was my campaign manager in the 1982 election, and he is my campaign manager for the next provincial election. He farms on a farm north of Candiac, Saskatchewan. That is the truth.

So there's one thing that indicates to you that you are the type of individual who will grasp at any type of straw to try and build a case. I told you when I stood in this House four minutes ago, that we looked at many options for the Banbury House. And I am not aware of what the deputy minister of culture and youth talks to his minister about. He has every right to look at various options. And I would ask you to question the minister when his estimates come on that.

But we looked at different options. We looked at moving Banbury House — we looked. And there's people in the gallery here today that sat in on those discussions with me and my department, that can verify to you that we took and we looked at incorporating that structure into the new nursing home. We looked at that. That was our first alternative. We looked at money to move it. We looked at various options.

Then, in believing in democracy and in believing in letting local people have a say in what they think should happen in their towns, we put forward through the architect, the architect that was hired, Mr. Banadyga — a very reputable architect — designed a questionnaire. That questionnaire went out to the people of Wolseley. I believe 75 per cent of them responded. And of those 75 per cent, a conclusive 80 per cent of them said that the nursing home should go as planned, one storey, on the beautiful banks of the reservoir, and that Banbury House, although none of us like to see it have to happen, either be sold or relocated or else be taken down, and some of the features of the house be incorporated in the home. That is the plan at this point in time.

You also had to bring in the situation of the doctors, and I'm rather glad you did. Because I would just like to tell you, and the members of this House, and the people in Saskatchewan, that my deputy was in conversation this morning with Dr. Ernie Baergen, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, and that they have a meeting set for Thursday, May the 9th — a continuation of consultation with the doctors of this province.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well I noticed that the minister clearly avoided the question that was asked about the recommendations that were given by the Department of Culture and Recreation.

He also says that when he fired, personally, Julie Campbell, last year, that the individual who he put in her place had nothing to do with his campaign, or he implied that. And the CBC may have been wrong — whether it was his campaign manager or his business manager — but I want to say that the individual you put in place of Julie Campbell, one Sandra Hextall, played a very important role in your campaign.

And you could stand up and be honest, Mr. Minister, and tell us what position she played, whether it was the business manager or whatever role she played. But for you to stand up here and pretend she had nothing to do with your campaign is being dishonest.

And I understand why you fired Julie Campbell. I understand why you fired her — because you wanted to put in one of your political people. And what you're trying to do here is once again push your way through on the removal of the Banbury House.

Now I stated very clearly that the internal document of March 12th set out the four options. Now I have another internal document, dated January 14, 1985, that says, in part, that you didn't follow any of those four. And this memo is from Dean Clark, director of heritage conservation division, Saskatchewan Culture and Recreation, to the deputy minister, and it's re the Wolseley Lakeside Nursing Home development.

And I want to read this into the record, Mr. Chairman. It says:

The planning for the construction of the new Wolseley Lakeside Nursing Home is well under way. Unfortunately, new architectural drawings have recently been put forward, deviating considerably from the conditions for prior approval to which the minister agreed in a memo of March 12th, 1984.

If you can follow this logic, Mr. Minister, and you seem to have difficulty doing that, certain recommendations were set out to you on where the Banbury House should be moved or left on the location.

And you went ahead, personally, not on the recommendation of the architect — because I know that because he has made public statements on what his opinion is — not on the recommendation of the committee that you set up, and then when they recommended that you move the building or leave it in place you said their opinion was not worthy of consideration either.

And I go on with the letter:

You will remember that the project impacts upon two historic structures, the provincially designated Wolseley court-house, and the undesignated, though historically significant, Banbury residence.

According to the preliminary plans upon which the minister's prior approval was based, the court-house would not be significantly impacted, and the Banbury residence was either to be accommodated in the plans for the new hospital, or relocated to a site nearby the court-house and restored for us as the hospital administrator's residence.

These are recommendations, Mr. Minister, which you say you had no knowledge of in the initial question. You said there was no communication, nothing was done. You said you discussed it personally with the minister and there was no problem.

Well these internal documents tell us something quite different. They indicate very clearly that the Minister of Culture and Recreation indicated to your department that the Banbury House should either be relocated, should either be relocated or left in its site, but under no circumstances should it be ripped down.

And I know where the impetus is coming to rip the house down. It's coming from you personally. And I say to you that that's unfortunate; that when you make up your mind to go in one direction, you have tunnel vision. You cannot see any alternatives. You can't see the alternative of moving that very historic house, because you're ruining the whole area.

And what I can't understand is how you, sir, who are from that area, can't see that. Because that area with the old Banbury House, and the swinging bridge, and the involvement of the family, who wanted the house to remain as well, is difficult for me to understand. Because you're destroying that whole setting where the court-house is, where the swinging bridge is, where the Banbury House is. And I would ask you: why are you flaunting your power in cabinet over the Minister of Recreation and Culture, and saying, your memos and your considerations, I'm not going to listen to them; I'm going ahead with my own personal agenda and scheme.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well I guess I have one question, simply: have you ever been to Lakeside home? Have you ever seen the Banbury House? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You have. When? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I'm sure you have, and I'd like you to give me a lecture on Wolseley because I'm sure you're the most knowledgeable person.

I am acting in the view of 85 per cent of the residents there that filled out the questionnaire, who look for the long-term comfort and quality of life of the citizens of that area. And I want to say it's more than that area. It's south-east Saskatchewan, where they will have, according to the architects in this province, the most beautiful setting for a nursing home. That's what I want. I want those people to enjoy their lives in the best conditions that is possible, and that's why we're building it.

As far as the documents within the department of culture and youth, I don't know how the member expects me to know what kind of documentation goes between a minister and a deputy minister in another department. And I said we looked at all types of alternatives of Banbury House. And I listened with interest as he read from the document of the person in culture and youth, and I don't like to run down any individual, but we do have individuals that were not too well informed. And I listened, and I think other members in this Assembly listened.

Because the situation that we're building in Wolseley, the structure we're building, is a nursing home. And heard distinctly — and it's in *Hansard* and you can check it — about the new hospital and the residence of the hospital administrator. That's what that document said.

Now, in all due respect to his public servant, if they don't know the difference between a nursing home and a hospital, then I just wonder how credible their document is in entirety. However, if you have questions about what went on between the deputy minister and the minister of culture and youth, you're free to ask my colleague. He will answer them for you when his estimates come up.

As far as looking at alternatives — and you can check with anyone out there — we looked at various alternatives, and I must say I would appreciate if you keep talking because the chapter isn't closed on Banbury House at this point in time, but you go ahead and ask whatever questions you want.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. GERICH: — We have here today a group of students from the Moosomin elementary school in Cochin, Saskatchewan — it's from the north-west corner of the Redberry constituency — grades 7 and 8.

They're situated in the Speaker's gallery. They're accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Ed Merkosky, and Irene Kahpeazsewat, counsellor. Would you please rise? Please make them welcome to the Assembly. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

HEALTH

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

(1100)

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, I want to follow along on your attack on the individual, Mr. W. Dean Clark, a civil servant who is not here to defend himself.

And, Mr. Minister, you remind me a lot of Joseph McCarthy, whose infamous anniversary we celebrated the day before yesterday, because what you do when you find people who disagree with you, whether they're administrators, or whether they are doctors, or whether they are public servants, is you try to personally discredit them. That's what you do.

You're a lot like Joseph McCarthy, in your very soft-soap speeches, until they don't work. And then when they don't work, you become a very vicious person, and you attack an individual who is not here to defend himself.

And I am going to continue to read from this memo that this individual, who knows a fair deal about culture and recreation in this province, and has, I believe, an outstanding record in the civil service — yet another who is being attacked by this government. And you wonder why you're in difficulty in Regina where civil servants live. It's because of people like you, who, out of expediency, and to defend yourself, give a vicious attack on an individual, and they have no opportunity to defend themselves.

But in that memo that he sent, he refers to the survey, or so-called survey that you did, and he says:

The architect conducted a survey in Wolseley to determine local sentiment concerning retention of the Banbury residence, but the architect couched retention of the building in negative terms and failed to include the option of incorporating the residence into the plan. In effect, the question was put in terms of either the hospital, or retention of the old residence, and when considered from this perspective it is not surprising that the popular response was against the retention of the building.

And here again I can see your hand, Mr. Minister. You had made up your mind you wanted that house removed, and I don't know what the reason is why you want it removed. I can't explain that. But you, I can see your hand in this where you would say, I need the results so let's figure out a survey that's going to get me those results, and let's get on with it.

Now you're attacking here this individual, Dean Clark, but I would ask you: when the survey is being put in question, and the residents of Wolseley it's in question, whether or not you would now consider, even at this late date, taking into consideration the recommendation of this individual and either moving the Banbury House or incorporating it into the new nursing home. Is that a possibility at this time?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, first of all, again you said the survey that I conducted. I never conducted a survey at all. The architect did. I believe it was a well-constructed survey. It was very, very well received in Wolseley. The people were exceptionally happy to have their thoughts being taken into consideration. So you know, the member again likes to try and indicate that all things are going in this direction. You know, he tries to make slurs against me. That's fine if he would want to do so.

But if you would look at the situation, and I told you three times last night, and I say this in sympathy to you because I feel sorry for you, over there in opposition trying to score a point, grasping for straws with the weakest research you could ever come up with — if you would have taken the time to look — and I would ask the Minister of Supply and Services when he comes back in the House to get the ad for you — you will see an ad in the paper running right now, asking for people who may be interested in purchasing and removing Banbury House. I told you a few minutes ago the chapter is not closed. but I can also tell you at the same time and the people of Wolseley and the people of Saskatchewan, that there will be construction of a new nursing home starting on that site in the very near future. And certainly if someone wants to buy Banbury House and restore it, the ads are in the paper.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, I listened with interest as you attacked the individual and his credibility, and of Mr. Dean Clark who you said was not a very credible person, and he shouldn't be believed . . . I don't know how many people you just think you can stand up here. You and I can insult each other; that's fair. You do it to me and I do to you, and I don't mind because I can defend myself.

But what irritates me, what irritates me to no end, Mr. Minister, is your approach to other people who work for the government, that you can treat them with that kind disrespect; that you can just stand up and destroy a person's reputation with the immunity of this House. And that is distressing.

And that, I say, sir, is why the civil service in this province has no respect for your government, no matter how many letters the Premier sends out saying what a great job they're doing. People know that's phoney. It's so phoney that on the day that he sent out the letters there were a number of people who were let go and got their letter of dismissal the same day as they got their letter of congratulations from the Premier.

And now you today standing up and just out of the blue attacking this individual's credibility, I say, is unfortunate. I think you owe that individual an apology.

But I have here another letter, and I would like you to attack this individual's credibility because this letter is dated January 17, 1985, and it's from the Hon. Rick Folk, Minister of Culture and Recreation, to the Hon. George McLeod, Minister of Saskatchewan Supply and Services.

Now when I'm done reading this letter, because he says the same thing as Mr. Clark, I would like you to get up and have the courage and the integrity to use the same personal slurs on this individual as you did on Mr. Clark. And I want to read into the record this letter . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it's probably coming from people in his department who are tired of being insulted and slurred by him. I think that's where they come from. Now it's January 17, 1985. This is a recent letter, "Re: Lakeside Nursing Home Development." And it's from the Minister of Saskatchewan Culture and Recreation to the member from Meadow Lake, the Minister of Supply and Services. And it says:

Re: Lakeside Nursing Home Development. As you are aware plans are presently being drafted for the construction of a nursing home in Wolseley. The proposed location for the new home is very near the provincially designated court-house and the undesignated, through historically significant, Banbury resident.

And at that point I would note the words used are exactly the same as those used by Mr. Dean Clark, the one who you say has no credibility.

The early preliminary plans for the new home provided for an only minor encroachment on the provincially designed property and for the retention of the Banbury residence, either through integration into the new site or relocation to the

court-house grounds for use as the hospital administrator's residence.

Here again, I would note the words "hospitals administrator's," the exact same words as used as by Dean Clark who you have the audacity to stand and condemn for saying "hospital." I would ask whether the other cabinet colleague, who uses the same term, is included in the same attack you made on Mr. Clark.

I will go on:

It was on this basis that I gave approval (this is from another minister of your cabinet) . . . that I gave approval for a limited encroachment on the nursing home development on provincial heritage property.

Unfortunately, the architect, W. Kirk Banadyga, has submitted new plans, which provide for a major extension of the west wing of the hospital (and I note, hospital) into provincially designated property and result in a serious negative impact on the court-house. Furthermore, the new plans now envisage demolition of the Banbury residence, rather than incorporation or relocation.

Under the circumstances, I cannot approve the new plans on the following grounds:

1. The west wing of the nursing home is to be built entirely on provincially designated property (that is designated by your government). Previous Department of Culture and Recreation approval for site encroachment was based on minor encroachment on the designated property, but retained a view of the court-house from the reservoir and enabled the development of a landscaped public park area and boardwalk.
2. Early schemes had either integrated Banbury House with the new facility, or relocated it to enhance the historic site and enable its landscaped grounds to support the park and the boardwalk concept. Architects' sketches for these proposals formed the basis for the preliminary design approval.
3. Early design proposals had included restoration of the court-house and the Banbury residence in construction plans.
4. The elimination of the landscape promenade connecting the historic building to the new nursing home.
5. Privitization of the nursing home's use of the previously public landscaped reservoir shore line. (Now that's a new and interesting concept.)
6. Previously public bridge to Quimet Street, used to service nursing home grounds.

He concludes, in the final paragraph, by stating — this is January 17th of this year:

I would, therefore, like to propose further negotiations be undertaken between the Department of Culture and Youth and Supply and Services and Health, in order to develop a revised scheme more sympathetic to the provincial heritage property and Banbury residence, as well as to the needs for public access to the reservoir area.

Now, Mr. Minister, you are continually saying that you try to negotiate, that you make every attempt, whether it's with the nurses or the doctors or the people in Culture and Youth or whoever you're dealing with, or the opposition, and you can't agree with anybody. Everybody wants to fight with you.

But it's obvious from this letter from the Minister of Culture and Youth . . . And I see it's "copy to the Hon. Graham Taylor." So your indication earlier that you had no correspondence was completely inaccurate. You certainly did. You had this letter. You knew about the concern, and you tried to tell the Assembly you didn't have it.

This is why we have such difficulty with you, and this is why the people of the province are saying that you should no longer be the Minister of Health. Very clearly, sir, they are saying that you are not honourable enough to be the Minister of Health because you contribute these stories, and you continue on down this road of confrontation, even with your colleagues in cabinet.

And I say to you: if you're an honourable person you would do the honourable thing and resign. And I think this is the proof we need for it.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well that's a bunch of utter nonsense. But getting back to the . . . you said something about the first letter. I said I have no knowledge of that letter. If you check back, you will see. I said I did not remember any of that correspondence and the first letter that you said.

Now you are bringing up letters between the Minister of Supply and Services and the Minister of Culture and Recreation. You should know to discuss those kinds of situations in which they're making the decisions in their estimates. I don't know how many years you have to stick around this place before you know how it operates.

Getting back to the question of the person who mentioned . . . talks about hospital, and then, in the minister's letter, talks about hospital too. All I can say is, both of them are wrong. Certainly, whoever was providing that information did not do very good research if the nursing home . . . and if there's that great concern, and they still talk about a hospital and a hospital residence. I think that was indication that whoever did that research, and whoever supplied that information to the minister, didn't do their homework.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, you're a very incredible person. Now the Minister of Culture and Youth is wrong. I noticed the Minister of Supply and Services, when we get to those kind of correspondences if they're around, he will be wrong. And you are the only individual in the whole world who is right. That's what it's boiling down to.

You have decided that the Banbury House is going to go, and I guess we'll just leave it at that. Go ahead; rip it down; get your way. But I can tell you that in the end, people like you who are that bull-headed when it comes to negotiating — when it comes to negotiating with the health care givers in this province, when you get to the point that you have walk-outs, when in other provinces like Manitoba they get settlements instantly with no problem, where they pass similar Bills and there's no problem — but you, Mr. Minister, even building a nursing home which should be a positive experience in your own home town, can't do it without a major harangue and dividing the community.

And I say again that an individual who, continually gets in trouble and causes confrontation should not be in cabinet because you're doing a disservice to the Department of Health. And I'll leave it at that. Go ahead, rip the home down if that's what you want to do. I recommend that you don't. The Department of Culture and Youth and Mr. Folk recommend that you don't. I think the Minister of Supply and Services recommends that you don't. I don't know that; he hasn't said. But go ahead and rip it down.

But I'm going to write a letter today to Premier Grant Devine asking him to personally intervene and keep that house because I think it has significant historical value. And the Premier may be wrong, as well, or he may support you. But I'm going to call on him to support the Minister of Culture and Youth, because I think you have had your way in too many areas, too many good civil servants have been forced out of your department, and I think you're doing a disservice to

the health of this province.

(1115)

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you remember being to the good time we had in Lafleche, when we recognized some nurses in some long outstanding duty to our province.

During that time it was drawn to your attention the concern Lafleche has, and this isn't the first time in this Assembly that I'm raising that concern. But since that time they've gotten a go-ahead from your department to draw some plans. They spent money drawing plans. They had an architect do up a nice plan. You go into the waiting room of the Lafleche hospital. You'll see these plans displayed for an addition on the Lafleche hospital.

And I don't know if my copy that I got from you isn't very good or what, but I didn't see Lafleche hospital on that list of yours. Now can you explain what happened there, and what is the deal, and what status this project and this extension is at? These people really consider . . . And there's a long waiting list, and we're not going to go into the needs on why it should be or shouldn't be, but I was just wondering, what is the status of that building there? People are quite concerned about that.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I recall, as the member has outlined, the night we were in Lafleche, honouring the people who had serviced the hospital for some time. It was an enjoyable evening. I know that Lafleche has put in requests and are concerned about getting some type of an extension or integrated facility. I'd have to say that in the five-year plan that I have announced, Lafleche wasn't one of those selected. That does not mean that the book was closed on them. There may be changes. Of all the ones I've announced at this time, it seems that they're all getting their acts together and ready to go. But certainly Lafleche — we're not closing the door on them, and somewhere in the future they will be given consideration.

I looked across the province and decided where I felt, from my visitations and discussions, what the priorities were. I understand there's a need in Lafleche, but you're right in saying that in the five-year plan they were not one designated.

MR. ENGEL: — Well, Mr. Minister, here's an example of a community that has been anxious for a policy that would allow a combination of delivering of medical services in a hospital and a nursing home, with a common facility. Lafleche has demonstrated a need. They have a long waiting list.

And they've drawn plans, a good architect has drawn the plans. You know Mr. Rodham, Clive Rodham, used to be involved in the Plains hospital — knows hospital facilities and plans. He's drawn a nice set of plans. They're on display in the waiting room when you come in there for first-aid treatment or medical treatment or whatever.

The community's all psyched up to have this building done. Lafleche has their money in place. They've done the funding that they need to do. Mr. Minister, I think you're making your decisions on some political pressures rather than the pressures of need, because why would a community be turned down over three years? They were ready to go the year you took office. If you wouldn't be the Minister of Health today, and there would have been a change of government, that building would have been started. That building was on the drawing boards. It was ready to go. That was ready to go, Mr. Minister.

And they've done their lobbying, and I haven't interfered. I've made their presentation and recommendations to you. You know where I stand on it. And we weren't going to take any political pressure for our party at all. We were keeping the politics right out of it. And you had a chance to get in there and do a project. Then you didn't do it this coming year, and that

bothered me when you announced the coming year's projects.

But when I looked at the list and they're not even on between now and 1990, Mr. Minister, where is it at? Where is it at? Why would you refuse? In a situation like this that is imminent, that is ready to go, the people are there, the administration is first-class, you won't find a better run hospital than the Lafleche hospital. The administration is fantastic.

I've been on their hospital board for about six or eight years. I can't remember exactly how long, but I've served on that hospital board. I know what's going on. I know what they're doing and how good a ship they run there, Mr. Minister. And I can't see why you have made up a five-year list and haven't included these people that have everything in place. There's nothing that could be done further. The ground is there. They don't have to move buildings. They don't have to have a community confrontation to build it like you're doing in your constituency.

This was ready to move this spring. They could call a contract tomorrow and it would be ready to go because the documentation of building, the building code, everything is in place. The blueprints have been drawn, the architect has done his work. Why can't we proceed on this project, Mr. Minister, if it's not a political thing you're holding up? Give me one reason why they can't — ready to go.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well certainly it is not on political grounds at all. And I think if you looked at the distribution of nursing homes in 60 communities around Saskatchewan you would see that.

I guess the short answer to your situation is that I have to look at many communities. I have to look at the mix of beds per ageing population. And when you look across that at the demographics, there are other areas in Saskatchewan that the need was greater than in Lafleche.

But I want to say to you here that the door is not shut on Lafleche. The Lafleche people are welcome to come in and talk to me. We'll be looking at ones that we are going to be doing after this plan is over, and probably they may be one of them. There may be the possibility that there could be some more beds. We've made a considerable commitment, as you well know, and if you look through that list, there's been an awful lot of communities have integrated facilities. And that's what Lafleche is looking at. And I concur with them. That's the type of facility that they would need there.

So I guess my answer to you is that looking around the province there were other needs that were greater. And secondly, that the door is not shut to Lafleche. They're welcome to come in and talk to me any time.

MR. ENGEL: — Well, Mr. Minister, I don't know. They're nice people down there and I can see why you'd like visiting with them. And when you come down and talk to them they feed you well and treat you good, and everything is done right. I can see why you'd want to keep them on the hold so you can visit with people like that.

But the same thing applies for Gravelbourg. Gravelbourg did an intensive study, an intensive study, started in '81. They studied their facility and their plant. You have the operating room and the emergency room service upon the fourth floor and the office on the main floor. There's some changes that need to be made in Gravelbourg.

The nursing home, the halls are too narrow and it's not built — and it's not a heavy enough unit to handle level 3 and level 4 patients. They're backed to the doors with level 4 patients and the building was designed for level 1 and 2. Assiniboia has got a long waiting list. Assiniboia has been waiting to have an extension on their nursing home beds. Assiniboia isn't on the list. Rockglen's been trying to get a nursing home and extensions. Rockglen's not on the list. Mr. Minister, I would like to know why these people are being neglected in that part of the province, why their

needs aren't considered important.

If we have level 4 patients, they have to go to Swift Current or Moose Jaw. Why are these people being put on hold? And you tell me there's other parts of the province that need it more. Why don't the old people and the senior citizens in that part of the province, why don't they get some attention? If you say Lafleche hasn't got a big enough waiting list . . . Why didn't Gravelbourg get included? Why didn't Assiniboia get included? Why didn't Rockglen get included?

Mr. Minister, there are four areas there that have been pushing hard for some extensions of beds, and you tell me Lafleche hasn't got a big enough list and haven't demonstrated enough need. Come in and see me. How many times are they supposed to visit with you? Maybe you're not that present. Maybe they've tried hard. Maybe they should just be able to get it on plain basic grounds of needs rather than having to do a little lobbying with you. Mr. Minister, come clean.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — You know, I guess one of the things that I should bring to your attention is that you mention Assiniboia hospital, and we've had no formal requests from them at all. And in Gravelbourg, at St. Joseph's, there's been no formal request for a major capital project, and also in Rockglen there's no request that's been generated by the hospital.

So I would think, you know, it's fine, we can come in and meet and so on, but out of that there should be a formal request from those communities, and if they get those in we'll certainly be looking at them. I think there is some . . . On the Gravelbourg hospital, there's going to be some improvements there. It's in progress at this time, my officials tell me. So they're planning for improvements to the Gravelbourg hospital. So your allegation that there's nothing going into your constituency is not correct. And certainly if these other ones want to come in with formal requests, they will be looked at.

MR. ENGEL: — Well if Gravelbourg and Assiniboia nursing home, and if Rockglen haven't got formal requests, I don't know what a formal request is. Do they have to take you to court and sue you? How far do they have to go to get a formal request? When your staff come down and talk to them and they're working on plans, they're hiring architects, they're doing things — what is a formal request, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well I think the one that the formal request is in from is Lafleche, and we dealt with the drawings and so on, and I told you that it wasn't selected in the five-year plan, but that the book isn't closed on Lafleche. And they're welcome to come and visit with me, and perhaps we can do something. As I say, we have put a tremendous commitment into long-term beds. And you can't deny that. Far greater — and I don't know if you were here last night, but we went all through this with your party — far greater than you ever did, far greater. 1,500-bed, five-year program is a real contribution to long-term care. And I think you realize as well as I do that you can't do everything overnight. Sixty communities are going to get facilities — \$25 million worth of facilities and special care homes. Three hundred million dollars in a health capital fund for hospitals. That is a tremendous commitment.

And I think you realize — you're a just individual — that you can't do it in every community in Saskatchewan at one time, as much as one may like to. So therefore there has to be priorities. And you line these up and unfortunately, and from your standpoint, I suppose, that Lafleche was not one that was included in that first line-up. But that does not mean (and let me reiterate that) that does not mean that the book is closed on Lafleche.

MR. ENGEL: — Well I can assure you there's going to be some new books opened after the next election, and Coronach will be on the list.

Coronach has a wood frame structure that was built and designed for an airport building that was moved in there. Coronach's facility wasn't bad when the town was at 300 people. But at 1,200 people and a mine operation nearby and the power plant there and construction workers

around. Coronach has been talking.

Now I don't know what they need to convince you that they need a formal request. But they have the location; they have the new site; they want an integrated structure at Coronach that includes a nursing home and a hospital — a new site construction on the east side of Coronach. The one they have at the present, there's no room for expansion on the lot they're at, and the building is old. It doesn't pay to fix it. It doesn't pay to upgrade it. It was built in '44 for a wartime use — a temporary-type construction they're still operating out of.

Now they could have got by if they'd been at a population of 300. But they're going to 12, 1,300. Coronach is a fair-sized community and service a big area and a long way out of Assiniboia.

So there's another community that you say hasn't made a formal request. I don't know what you need in a formal request. I just can't understand it because they've been on your tails, and they've been arguing with your officials that have been down there. But when I see how you treat your officials . . . Maybe when the officials make them a commitment and a promise, that's not enough. They'll have to come with a special meeting with you, and make a special formal request, hire an architect, and draw up blueprints, do the whole thing. And it's still not considered a formal request, Mr. Minister.

Something's the matter in your list of who makes formal requests. I think you should use a different word instead of formal. I think you should use a different word instead of formal, Mr. Minister. And I'm sad to say that this morning, you're indicating that they haven't made the proper political request. That's the trouble with you. That's the trouble with you. They haven't given you a political commitment. And so consequently, you're not building in my constituency.

Five communities that need upgrading — five communities, and you're not looking at one of them.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Again I must repudiate that statement. That's not correct at all. And I would say this to you: that as late as February of '85, Coronach came in with a proposal at this time (that's February of this year) asking for an integrated facility and had the support of the community organizations. And this was submitted to the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan on March 5, 1985. So we are working and discussing with Coronach. That's the last . . . that isn't very long ago, March 5, that they came in asking for an integrated facility.

Now, I don't know if they're keeping you informed of their requests. Obviously it looks like maybe they're not. But they have been in talking to us on March 5 of this year.

MR. ENGEL: — You said they haven't made a formal request. That's the words you used. And that isn't considered a formal request, is it, by you, what you just got done telling me? And you make a five-year plan and don't even consider a town that's growing like that and has that kind of delinquent facilities and long waiting lists.

Mr. Minister, I can demonstrate a need in that area of the province. There are shortages of beds. People don't like going 150 and 200 miles away to spend their last days. They want to be near their families. And I think the idea, and I told you so when you were sitting over there, the four seats opposite to where you're sitting now, and when you were sitting in that chair as Minister of Health, I agreed with you and said that that's the way to go — an integrated service is the way to provide services to small communities.

(1130)

And yet in the last three years you haven't considered these communities seriously. You just like to talk about them. You weren't prepared to act. I say it's time for some action. Put up some bucks up front, let alone just talk. In these communities you haven't even talked about it.

Five-year plans and they're still not being considered.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I think in our discussions yesterday we discussed this, and I understand the geography of that area and concur with you that people want to stay in their own communities. And I think evidence and proof of that is that we have approved an integrated facility for Mankota, which is down in that area of the province, in addition to Eastend, because these are rather isolated areas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm talking about that general area of the province where the towns are further apart. And I think that indicates that we are taking those things into consideration. Certainly you said . . . I did not say there was no formal request from Coronach. Coronach went in as of the 5th of March, and discussion are going on.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Minister, you've offered six beds in Eastend, 100 and about 80 miles from Coronach — 180 miles away, six beds. You say in the general vicinity. You say you're familiar with that area. Do you know how far it is from Coronach? It's closer to Estevan than it is to Eastend, Mr. Minister. If you're talking about the general area, you're talking about an area that you aren't concerned with. And you don't know. Six beds for Eastend! How many have you got in Mankota, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — What I was saying to you was for that general area of the province. You said that there were people in isolation. They lived a long way from the cities, and so on. And I said I concur with that, and as proof of this . . . I wasn't saying it was to try and ease the strain in Coronach or anything of that nature. I said, for example, here is Mankota, which is out in that part of the country a long way from major cities or other towns, and they're getting a 12-bed, integrated facility.

And I cited as another example Eastend, which is another area that is quite a distance from any other major centres, as an example of the thing that we were both talking about — the decentralization of facilities so that people can stay in their own communities.

That's exactly what I was explaining to you. I wasn't trying to tell you or anyone in this House that the six beds in Eastend were going to relieve the pressures on Coronach. Surely to goodness you must understand that. I cite it as an example.

I will cite as another example, in Goodsoil, where we're putting another 12 beds in an area that is not close to major centres, and Invermay is another one that comes to mind — small communities that want integrated facilities, that want to keep their loved ones in their communities and let them end their lives there.

Certainly we're doing that. If you look at the map of Saskatchewan, you will see that there's a distribution throughout this province, probably the greatest distribution that has ever taken place — a 1,500 bed spread throughout the province of Saskatchewan, with the concept of decentralization as the main criteria in selection, along with the needs and the number of beds in those areas at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. The member for Saltcoats would like leave to introduce some school guests. Is leave agreed?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. JOHNSON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It gives me pleasure to rise and introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, some 36 students from a great little town called Bredenbury on No. 16 Highway. They're sitting in the east gallery, Mr. Chairman, and they incidentally come from the town from whenever the time is right for the potash industry to expand, will be the grand owners of the newest Saskatchewan potash mine to be built in

Saskatchewan at that time.

So they're all eager, and they come to us today, and there's 36, plus three, of grade 6 and 9's. I don't know who the plus three are, but I do have a teacher's name here of Charlotte Thies.

And I would like to have you welcome them to the Assembly, and I will meet with them at 11:45 for pictures in the rotunda area and have a little talk to them. Please help me welcome them to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

HEALTH

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have a number of questions, Mr. Minister, that I intend to ask today.

I want to first of all go back to the last two years that we have done your estimates. On both occasions I had raised many concerns about the health facilities in northern Saskatchewan. At that time, on both occasions — this is the third time we've gone through your estimates — I've indicated that the way things were going in northern Saskatchewan with health services, that there was going to be some horror stories that were going to take place.

I want to indicate to you today (and I will be bringing them out as we go on in the discussions) that what I have indicated to you in previous years has come to be — some very sad situations.

I want to start off by congratulating one of your pilots and the nurse on the air ambulance, one Ken Lund, and I do not have the name of the nurse that was on duty that night, but I do want to congratulate Ken Lund and the nurse on that air ambulance aircraft who were flying on an emergency trip between Saskatoon and Uranium City and ran into a goose up in the Beauval area. That goose came right through the centre of the windshield of the aircraft. Had that goose been six inches over to the left side, then the pilot probably would not have made it, and that would have been the end.

I want to say that had that happened on the way back, it would have been fatal. It was in the dark of night, in the fall, and of course, with the type of patient they were going to get, it would have been another horror story. But I do want to congratulate Ken Lund and the nurse for being able to bring that aircraft back. And of course, another aircraft went out and did the emergency.

I have a number of questions that I'm going to ask you, Mr. Minister. I want to, first of all, get a small one off. That is: regulations governing health care centres in the province, in particular, in northern Saskatchewan. I want to, first of all, ask you: is there regulations in the health Act that indicate that animals can be treated in the health clinics, such as cats and dogs? Can they be treated in the health clinics?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I thank you, Mr. Member, for congratulating Ken Lund. I knew of that situation, and I think the heroic type of work that he and the nurse did . . . And I concur with you; had there been a patient on board it could have been very serious. But we're all glad that there was no loss of life, and that everything worked out. Thank you very much for that.

Your first question . . . we do not have regulations that say this or that cannot be done in a health clinic. If you have an incident of something of this happening, I'd like you to bring it to my attention because I'm not aware of it. But in answer to your question, we do not have a regulation that says, this can be done, or this cannot be done.

MR. THOMPSON: — Are you saying then, Mr. Minister, that it is right to operate and look after cats and dogs in a health facility in this province?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Oh, I'm not saying that's right. I'm just answering your question. Your question was: is there a regulation that says you can or you cannot do this in a health clinic in the North? There is no such regulation. If you have evidence of cats and dogs, and so on, being operated on, I would appreciate you bring that to my attention because I don't see that as being the purpose of health clinics.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, that's exactly the way I look at it, and I was just wondering if you could indicate through your staff if they are aware of this taking place in any of our health centres in northern Saskatchewan — if it has taken place, or if it has not taken place?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I was just in consultation with my director of northern health services, and he said it did happen once, and he gave the directive that that's not to happen again. But as far as a resolution, there isn't one. But he tells me it did happen, and he said, look it, this isn't what they are for, and that's not to happen again.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. And I would want to ask you to make sure that this doesn't happen again. I know for a fact that it has happened, and I have had many complaints, and I think your department has, too.

I want to now turn, Mr. Minister, to your five-year plan, and I first want to start off with the hospitals. Could you indicate what new hospitals, if any, will be constructed in northern Saskatchewan in the next five years? You talk about a five-year plan. Could you indicate what new hospitals will be constructed?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well I'll answer parts of it as we go along. First of all I will indicate to you, as I think you were here for my opening remarks when I first started my estimates, and if you recall, I said, you know, good ideas can come from anywhere. And I think you, sir, have brought forth a good suggestion to me today indicating —and I wasn't aware — that there was any operation of dogs or cats taking place.

Certainly, I give you the commitment. People from my northern health executive are here. There will be no more of that. The directive went out. And you say it happened one other time. I don't know if that's fact or fiction, but I can give you the commitment that it will not be happening again.

In regard to hospital construction, the major announcement for hospital construction in the North in the five-year plan is the one that has been brought to my attention a number of times, and that is for a new hospital in La Ronge.

You also, I think, in your question, asked for a request from other hospitals, requests for hospitals in the North. I think you remember our discussion of a year ago, and we still have to see where this is all coming down with Uranium City, what we call that, north to the Athabasca Basin. The hospital at this time is in Uranium City. Depending on what happens with that town which has shrunk, and you probably know the figures better than I do now, but maybe 200 residents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I would ask all the members to cease talking across corridors. It's very hard for the minister to answer the questions, and the member from Athabasca asked a

question. Let him have the answer.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — As you know, it may well necessitate a change in the location of that hospital at some time, and I think there has been indications that to serve the area better it would perhaps be wiser to locate at Stony Rapids, dealing with the Athabasca Basin.

You asked for a request that had come in from other areas, and my officials are looking for that at this point in time. So if you have another question, come with it and we will look for that second-part answer for you.

MR. THOMPSON: — Could you give me the year that the hospital in La Ronge will be constructed?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Basically, it's scheduled to go in 1889. But the last time I was up in La Ronge there were some concerns about getting the Band Council Requisitions in place, and I have no indication if that has happened at this time. But what I would like to point out to the member is that I'm quite willing to look at some front-ending of some of these projects if the local communities can get their share in place. And, for example, La Ronge, if they can get the BCRs in place to see what . . . to get that federal commitment of money, we could maybe start construction earlier. There's some leeway we can work in this.

But getting to your question, it's scheduled for 1889.

(1145)

MR. THOMPSON: — The hospitals that you indicate today . . . And thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was having trouble hearing the minister also. Nineteen eighty-nine, if we're looking at another four years down the road, and I know that that has been a priority for my colleague from Cumberland who is not in the House today. And I'm sure that he would be quite concerned that there is a four-year delay in the start of that hospital.

I want to also indicate that I am aware of requests that you have been getting from my constituency; and, of course, that has been coming from the folks up in the buffalo Narrows area.

But I now want to turn to the situation that we do have up in the far northern area, the Uranium City, Camsell Portage, Stony Rapids, Fond-du-Lac, Black Lake area, where you indicate there may have to be some change. And we have discussed this on a number of occasions. Due to the fact that Eldorado Nuclear has closed down their mine and milling operations at uranium City, the population there now is probably close to 150 people now, and at the end of June, when the decommissioning is over, I would suggest that I'm even going to fall below 100.

We know that the main population right now is in the Fond-du-Lac, Stony Rapids, and Black Lake area. And I have asked you on a number of occasions if you would indicate what your plans were. Was it to use Stony Rapids as a service centre and transfer, or rebuild hospital facilities into that Stony Rapids, Fond-du-Lac area? That is where the best airport is right now, an sort of central to Fond-du-Lac and Black Lake, which are both federal jurisdictions.

I will get on a little later to the situation that we had in Stony Rapids. I'm not going to make a big issue out of it, but I do want to bring it up.

But I want to say that I would hope that under your five-year plan that you're leaving that five-year plan open, and the hospitals that you have indicated, or expansions to hospitals that you have indicated, that that's not all cut and dried and nothing goes any further. I would sincerely hope that if Uranium City Hospital — that it looks like you have to make a decision to shut it down, and then maybe Stony Rapids or Fond-du-Lac is the best place to relocate the hospital. And I would sincerely hope that your five-year program would be open-ended enough

to take a serious look at that.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Certainly, Mr. Member, to indicate to you our concerns for that area, I have instructed my deputy to be going up into that area in the very near future; I would hope in the month of May. And that comes out of a meeting (and I think you attended it — I couldn't go that day, unfortunately, but the deputy did) in Buffalo Narrows. And I believe you were probably there at that meeting.

Out of that Mr. Podiluk will be going up and looking at the whole aspect of hospital services up in what we call the west side and the Athabasca basin.

In the Stony Rapids or Black Lake situation . . . and you may be right, we may have to — and, I mean, we both understand this — phase out uranium. We would have to make sure that the infrastructure is in place to support a hospital. And by that I mean the power and the things that are necessary — water, sewage, all these sort of things.

I think those are the situations he's going to be looking at, and visiting those communities and talking to those people because I'm sure you agree with me that health services are a great necessity in that area. But if we're going to build something, we've got to be smart and build it in the right place to give the maximum service.

I think that's what you're asking. I think that's what I'm telling you we are going to be doing. And the first step will be starting fairly soon with a visit by the deputy to the area.

And I ask you — as I said in my budget, in my estimates address — I ask you, if you have time, to go with the deputy, or sit in on these meetings, and from your perspective as an elected representative of those people to give us your thoughts and your viewpoints because we don't have all the right recipes and answers. We don't pretend to have them for that area of the province. You have lived there all your life, and I welcome your input and suggestions to help better health services in that area.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I most certainly agree with the fact that I have lived up there and I know the situation. But I want to indicate to you that I have expressed to you, ever since you have become the Minister of Health, the needs for health services in northern Saskatchewan. And I also attended the meeting in Buffalo Narrows when your deputy minister was there, and voiced my opinions at that time, and some concerns.

What concerns me, Mr. Minister, is that . . . And I would like a commitment from you today that if you decide that the service centre in the Athabasca basin or on the north shore of Lake Athabasca has to be moved from Uranium City to another centre such as Fond-du-Lac or Stony Rapids, that you will maintain the hospital facilities in Uranium City until another one is put in place in another town if that is the type of decision you make.

And most certainly I think you're going to have to address that very quickly, as I had indicated before.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — It's very obvious that we would not be wanting to close down facilities entirely because those people in that area of the province would not have any access to a hospital if that were the case.

Our present plans are to go up, study the area, determine where is the best location, make sure that the infrastructure is there, talk to the local people to see where they feel it should be, and then we have to work things out with the federal government. There's quite a few hoops to go through; but certainly, if we're building one, to keep the other one going until this one is open. We will, in one way or the other, maintain hospital services for them.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I really get concerned, and I expressed this concern in Buffalo Narrows at that meeting when you hired a new group — and I just forget the name of the doctor who is heading it up. The first thing that he indicated to the band councils and the town councils and everyone that was gathered on the west side was that he was going to carry out studies.

First of all, he said in his study he wanted to find out what made people die in northern Saskatchewan, and this type of an attitude — and I expressed my opinion quite strongly that day — this type of an attitude that you want to hire somebody to take a study to see what the needs are. I am sure with the staff that you have in the Department of Health and have senior staff that have been in that department for many years, with the senior staff that you have out in the health regions, with the nurses and the doctors and the community leaders, I don't really see why you have to hire an individual such as you did out of the university to carry out another study, especially when he said in that study: we want to find out what makes people die in northern Saskatchewan. Well I just want to indicate in here today that they die for the same reason as anybody else in any other part of the province. You don't have to take a study on that.

What we need is health services. And I believe that, Mr. Minister, with the type of staff that you have and the staff that you have out in your regions, they can tell you what the needs are, along with the band councils. I don't think we have to study it.

And I say to you in all fairness, the situation up in the Stony Rapids and Black Lake area with the closure of the mine at Uranium City and the population decreasing so fast in Uranium City, that decision is going to have to be made fairly fast. And I would think that you have the expertise within your department and in health staff without carrying out another study to see whether it's feasible.

And I think that can be worked out with the band councils and the town councils of Stony Rapids and Fond-du-Lac and Black Lake, because I realize the uniqueness of the federal jurisdiction and the provincial jurisdiction up there, and the cost sharing. But I would ask you to not go up there and carry out any study for another year or 18 months to see what we should do.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well certainly I think the very fact that the deputy is going to go up there and will be meeting with people, and that isn't a study. That's the deputy minister of Health going right in the communities, talking to the people who will be needing the service.

I should explain about the survey or the study because there's a little misrepresentation there. And I'm not saying that you are meaning to misrepresent at all. But what is happening there is that that package that we were able to put together to supply a physician service for the north-west side — and I think you will agree that's a benefit because since I came in, that was always one of the concerns was the procurement and retaining of medical services up that side of the province — I think we have a plan in place that will address that. But it is a joint plan between our government and the federal government.

The research component that you're talking about — and I agree with you, there's no difference in why people die. You can die from heart conditions, they die from strokes, they die from various other situations. They may die earlier in some areas than they do in others — it is a requirement of the federal government for their funding that his research must take place. Our money is not going for that research; our money is going for the supply of the doctors.

So, I guess, if you have a complaint, then I think you can address it to the Hon. Jake Epp, as you have to me because it is the federal requirement that this research take place.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, I want now turn to nursing homes in northern Saskatchewan, and under your five-year plan, Mr. Minister, could you indicate how many nursing homes are planned for northern Saskatchewan. I want to indicate to you that on

the west side of the province there is not one nursing home north of Meadow Lake. There is nursing homes in La Ronge, but up on the west side.

And you talk about individuals having to travel from Mankota to Swift Current to get into nursing homes, and I would assume that that's approximately 100 miles. But when we take a look at La Loche, which is 210 miles from Meadow Lake, that's quite a distance. And up in that area we don't have any nursing homes, and I wonder, could you indicate in your five-year plan if there is any nursing homes planned for that north-west side, north of Meadow Lake.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, the one that I could point to is that the La Ronge hospital could possibly contain some aspect of an integrated facility. I mean, we have designated that we are going to be replacing the hospital in La Ronge, and it may well be that that would include an integrated facility.

I think in the consultation rounds and in the discussions that the deputy is going to be having up the north-west side, certainly, although there hasn't been any that have been designated at this time, we hope to, by this fall, have a game plan in place for services up through the north-west side and perhaps even the Athabasca basin. But as I said previously, we've got to see about the infrastructure there. But certainly, if we're going to be looking at facilities and expansions in there, there definitely has to be the concept of integrated facilities in that part of the province. And that's what he will be doing, and that's what he'll be sitting down with communities and saying, look it, what do you see your needs are from now to the year 2000 or so, in addressing the care of, the acute care and the chronic care in your communities — the same as we have done with all the areas of Saskatchewan.

But in answer to you, and I'm not that good at geography in that part of the country — but I think the furthest north integrated facility or nursing home bed is Goodsoil. But we are going up there to work out a plan. As I said previously, I welcome you to be a part and parcel of that.

MR. THOMPSON: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I appreciate the fact that you're going to take a serious look at that. I want to go on record as saying that it is of utmost importance that a nursing home facility be constructed in the north-west part, north of Meadow Lake.

You talk about integration. I'm not too sure . . . I'm assuming that you're talking about a hospital and a nursing home all attached together. Most certainly, that would eliminate a number of towns up in there, and especially one town that has been requesting a hospital.

(1200)

But I think it's very important when you take a look at the number of senior citizens or also individuals who have been crippled for life who are now in institutions in Meadow Lake or Prince Albert or North Battleford, there's a large number of them, and it would be nice if they could be situated in a central part, like Ile-a-la-Crosse or the Buffalo Narrows area, because all these individuals who are in there, their relations want to visit them. They want to be close to their, as you indicate, and in your words, "want to be close to their loved ones."

Well let me tell you, when you have to drive 200 to 300 miles one way and then back to visit a loved one, it makes it pretty difficult. I think these are the senior citizens who have developed this province and played an important role in bringing Saskatchewan to where it is today. I think that we owe them that. And I would urge you to continue to take a serious look at putting a nursing home up in the north-west side, north of Meadow Lake, where is the closest one that we deal with now. But a lot of them are in North Battleford.

I'll only take a few more minutes, Mr. Minister. I want to touch on a couple of subjects that I know that are quite touchy to you and to the folks up in northern Saskatchewan. I want to go

back to a couple of incidents that have happened, that I had indicated to you that was going to come, and it did take place.

I wonder if you could indicate to me and to the House why Albertine Roy of Stony Rapids was not flown out before the sad accident that took place. She was scheduled to go into Saskatoon on a Tuesday, but had went to a nursing station on a Saturday and a Sunday and requested that she be taken out. Could you indicate, or have you had any investigation around the situation, as to why she was not taken out before it became so serious and ended up being fatal?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Before answering the question on Albertine Roy, I'd go back to just to indicate to you that we plan to have a game plan in place for services in the north-west. We have already started consultation and discussion with the Catholic health council. Just in the last few days we've had meetings with them to discuss this whole area of services in the north-west. So I think that indicates to you that something is afoot already.

In Albertine Roy's case, what I'm informed is that it was the decision of the doctor as to when she was to be evacuated or brought out, and regrettably the individual passed away before that took place. But my information is it was the doctor's decision as to when she should be taken out.

MR. THOMPSON: — You indicate that the request that was made by the family and by Albertine herself to your health nurse. Was that request relayed to the doctor in Uranium City, and he made the decision that she should not be flown out, hat she should wait till Tuesday to go out on the scheduled plane?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'm informed that throughout the whole treatment, hon. member, that it was a situation that the nurse on site there, in consultation with the doctor at Uranium City, and it was their decisions to go on those time lines. And as I say, I feel bad about this and I'm sure you do. Regrettably the individual passed away before they were taken out, but my information is that it was the nurse and doctor in consultation, and it was their professional judgements that dictated the time lines.

MR. THOMPSON: — Okay. I want to say that I fully agree. It's a sad situation. It's sad enough for the family — a mother with nine children, at 40 years of age, to have this happen. I don't want to make any big issue out of it, but it's something that we can't bring back. But I would sincerely hope that through you, Mr. Minister, and your officials, that this type of thing will never, hopefully will never happen again.

It was a case of a request being made by the family to be flown out. The headaches were just so bad, and she just couldn't stand it. But she was told, no, you wait until Tuesday and go out on the sched. That's what we have our air ambulances for. That's what we have chartered aircrafts for up in that area. And you can't put money, you can't put figures on the health of people. Had it not been that bad, and you'd flown out and wasted a little bit of money, that's not bad. But the sad situation was, she wanted to g out; she was refused; and she's not with her family today.

And I would sincerely hope that in the future that we will take a serious look at this, and when we get this type of situations where you're not sure . . . I know even down in Ile-a-la-Crosse, when Dr. Hoffman was there, and he was in La Loche, if things looked bad, he would fly them out, and fly them out fast. And I think that we have to make darn sure that our nurses up there never ever let a thing like this happen again.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I agree with you. It's a sad situation. We don't want to make a big issue out of it. My officials are telling me, though, that there was a coroner's inquest, and the coroner did not make any recommendations to me about any quicker evacuation. Usually they do. If there's a coroner's inquest, then there would be something that may have been able to avoid the death of the individual. They usually bring a recommendation. In this case, they didn't.

But I say, I don't want to make a big issue out of this. Unfortunately a person lost their life. I take under consideration, serious consideration, the concerns that you're expressing. I cannot, and I think you realize, I cannot give you a hard and fast guarantee that something like this would never happen again. But I can give you the commitment that, certainly, we wouldn't want — we will do everything we can to try and avoid such a situation happening.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Minister, could you indicate, on a coroner's inquest, who heads up a coroner's inquest? And is information gathered from . . . Who is the information gathered from on an inquest?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — In this situation, there is a local coroner, but this one went to the provincial coroner, Dr. Stewart McMillan. And Dr. Stewart McMillan would have, then, access to all of our records and everything pertaining to the case. And he is the man that usually . . . If he finds there is something that should have been done or could have been done, he makes recommendations to me. In this situation he did not make a recommendation. There was a local coroner, and then it went from there to the provincial coroner, Dr. Stewart McMillan, who has been the provincial coroner for some time.

MR. THOMPSON: — So all the information that the coroners, both up there and in Regina, use is professional information. There is no information that would come from the immediate family as to what had taken place?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'm advised that the local coroner probably would have done that. Often, they're the ones that get RCMP reports or various things of this nature. So my information is that probably there should have been some access to the local family and people at the local coroner's report. then, of course, when that went to the provincial coroner, he would draw on that information that the local coroner had brought to them.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, could you give me the name of the local coroner, please, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — It's at the office. We'll provide it for you. My officials tell me it's in the files at the office. We'll provide it for you as quickly as we can.

MR. THOMPSON: — I want to now finish off my remarks, Mr. Minister, by indicating to you that I strongly feel that health in northern Saskatchewan has to become a priority with your department. We've had some situations that have taken place in the last year. We've had a tremendous shift in population up there. As you know, La Loche has now become a community of close to 2,500. I want to say to you, and make this very clear, that I think we have to have some health priorities up in that area of Saskatchewan that are totally unique and totally different than what we are dealing within southern Saskatchewan.

I know you have a hard time keeping doctors. There's a large turnover of doctors in our hospitals in Uranium City. And right now La Loche does not have any doctors. They are serviced from Meadow Lake, I believe, three to four days a week by the doctors out of Meadow Lake. But I think the best possible solution would be to have permanent resident physicians in the communities where we have the hospitals.

I don't know if the new program that you have that's working out of the university has been successful. I see there is still some turnover in Ile-a-la-Crosse in doctors. It seems to me the doctor in Uranium City no longer is up there any more. We've had a change up there. I think the best possible way to serve the needs of citizens in northern Saskatchewan would be to get permanent doctors in there. I ask you to make sure that the nursing stations that we do have always have personnel in there.

I've had reports . . . And I don't want to make an issue out of that, but I just want to have it on

record. I've had reports that nurses, when they have left, have gone to meetings or have gone on holidays, that nursing stations have not been covered by other nurses, and individuals have gone there to find that it was locked up. You could have your staff check this out.

The latest complaint that I had was from Stony Rapids, where the nursing station was not . . . did not have personnel in there for a number of days at a time.

And I want to say that these nursing stations are very important in northern Saskatchewan. The communities are a long ways apart. Hospitals and doctors' services are long distance, so the nursing stations are very important. And I would hope that the personnel is there at all times to make sure that they are serviced properly.

I want to turn for a few minutes to some of the petitions that have come in, Mr. Minister, to your office. And I would ask that you and your officials — not in the House today — but give me a written report on what your findings are on some of the reports that I have, that have come to my office. And I know that you have them yourself.

And number one is the Kim Hanson accident that happened in Buffalo Narrows. And the time span that I was told, or that you indicated to me from your information . . . And I indicated at that time that I felt that the citizens back home were right. We had a difference there.

And I wonder if . . . And I see that you have information on that. If you or your officials could give me a report on just what happened at that accident, and the time — the time between the accident and when he was put into the van and when he was put into the aircraft and so on.

(1215)

I would also like to report on the other ones that I have, especially the Lee Reigert and Marcella Reigert. And you have that. Valerie McCallum . . . All these petitions and letters that have been sent into your office. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could just provide me in writing the information on that and what you have done to try and resolve these problems.

I want to, if that's fine, I could go right through them if you want. But if you would take it and provide me with the information . . .

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'll go back a bit in your questioning, regarding of the supply of doctors on the west side. And you said, still there's a kind of a turn-around on them, and things of this nature.

I want to indicate to you that the northern medical services unit hasn't taken over as of yet. It starts on July 1st. And that is this agreement with the federal government as to supply and manpower in there. So I hope we would be able to see an improvement at that point in time.

In regard to the nurses in the health stations, and we both know the yeoman's service that they give, certainly we will . . . And I understand, other than the situation at Stony, where the nurse was out on a transfer out at that period of time, when there was no manning the clinic, that I say . . . I've been informed that the federal nurse in Black Lake came over.

But we're going to make every attempt to try and make sure that there's someone there. The only time, as I have been indicating, other than Stony, for the last year that they've been not open would be a time that when the nurse was on a transfer out.

But I'll give you the commitment that we will do as much as we can to try and maintain that they're open, because I realize how important they are to supplying medical services in the area.

On the Kim Hanson, that one, of course, you know, I think what I will be giving you pretty well is

all in the *Hansard*, because of last year in question period we went through it and documented it about every five minutes. But I will provide to you the research that we have, or the documentation that we have, surrounding these various cases that petitions have come in. So you have my assurance that you will get that.

MR. THOMPSON: — Yes. And you indicate that, Mr. Minister, and not to get argumental here, that what you have said is on *Hansard* and that is facts, and that the information that I have and the new information that you now have is not factual. I'm not too sure. Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'm saying in the case of Kim Hanson, because that's the only one we discussed in the House that I recall . . . The other ones were not discussed in the House. It was situations sent to me. And I will supply that to you.

And I will supply whatever we have on the Kim Hanson situation. But I don't think there's anything different than what I put out in the House last year. But I will supply what we have for you.

MR. THOMPSON: — Also supply me . . . I believe there were some sworn affidavits that was received by your department, confirming the times. I wonder, would you provide me with them sworn affidavits, if you have any in your possession?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — The officials say they're not sworn affidavits. But we do have letters from the police and from transport and things of this nature that we will supply to you. Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close off now by discussing what I consider and what the citizens of the far northern area consider to be a very important program to them, and that was the food transportation subsidy that cost the provincial government \$250,000 a year to provide fresh food, vegetables, and produce.

I want to indicate to the minister . . . And I have a letter back from the Premier, and he indicates that, "It is our government's intention to make every effort to improve and expand medical services and special supports."

And this was when we were talking about the food subsidy. He relates the food subsidy to health problems. And I say that that is right. That's why that food transportation subsidy was put up in northern Saskatchewan: so that the individuals up there could take advantage of fresh fruit and fresh vegetables, fresh produce such as eggs and cheese, at the same price as the citizens in La Ronge.

That was the way the program was to work, and it was working quite successfully. You have letters and I have letters from individuals up north who claim that it was working well. I was into Stony Rapids approximately two months ago, and I talked to a number of people. I have a study that has taken place by a class in Stony Rapids. And as soon as I have that study in my possession, I intend to make that available to you, Mr. Minister. That study is being taken by a teacher and a class to indicate just how important that program was before and just how much they have really lost now.

It has also been indicated that really the only people that were taking advantage of that program was the tourist operators. Now the tourist association of Saskatchewan has written a letter indicating that this is not true. The tourist operators up in that area also indicate that that is not true, and that's not a fair assessment, and no reason to cut that program off.

Consumption of fresh food, fresh vegetables, fresh fruit and produce dropped dramatically as soon as that transportation subsidy was taken off. They could just see it overnight. You go into

the stores now, and they tell me what it's like. There's just no fresh vegetables to any amount on the shelves because the citizens of that area are having a hard enough time as it is to buy the food at the regular price.

But when you take off a \$250,000 program, you say you're going to replace it with something else, which they have not seen yet. You say you took it off because the tourist operator was taking advantage of it. I want to say that if you want to take it a little bit further, you'll find out that the tourist operators operate up in that area for approximately two to three months out of the year — two to three months. You'll also find that the tourist operators fly most of their fresh vegetables and produce in themselves, when they're bringing their tourist clientele in.

I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to comment on this program. I would also ask you if you would give serious consideration to re-implementing the food transportation subsidy into the Stony Rapids, Fond-du-Lac, Black Lake area. And I, in all sincerity, give that sincere — it's \$250,000. It's not a lot of money. But let me tell you, to the folks up there, it means that the children are going to be able to have fresh apples and fresh oranges and fresh cabbages and all that type of food, and produce like eggs and meat. So I ask you to give serious consideration to re-implementing that program.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I think, my first comment of this aspect of the food subsidy is that I believe that only about 10 per cent of the northern population live in the communities where the subsidy took place. So here we were subsidizing 10 per cent, although — I'm not going to come down hard on the tourist industry — certainly some of those people were taking advantage of the program.

I thought that we could spend that money, that \$250,000, in better ways than just subsidizing for 10 per cent of the population that are in the North. So one of the big issues that I had brought to my attention after becoming Minister of Health, and you have articulated it, the member from Cumberland has articulated it, many people have talked to me, is the supplying of medical services in the North. This was the big problem, and the retention of doctors. The first time I went to Ile-a-la-Crosse I had it brought to my attention.

Now as I explained in my pre-estimate's address, that if we are going to be looking at health care in Saskatchewan it may mean that we have to re-allocate funds in different ways, in different directions. So, therefore, the decision was made to use some of those funds to ensure a constant supply of medical services up the west side. And as I told you, that unit will be going into place on the 1st of July, and I feel confident that there will be a vast improvement in the delivery of medical services.

Secondly, I've had discussion with the Minister of Agriculture on this. I think the way to go in this type of situation is to provide incentives and help people to do gardening and to grow their own produce and things of this nature. We have power and electricity and freezers in this part of the country, and it would seem to me that it made quite good sense that these people could become more self-sufficient in vegetables and things of this nature. I know you're not going to grow apples up there — I'm aware of that. But certainly fresh vegetables in gardens can certainly be encouraged and can help these people out to a great extent.

But going back to my original comment: it was only 10 per cent of the population that were really benefiting from this. And I think if you're expending dollars you want to expend them where you can help a lot more people, and by the \$250,000 you'd be used in the supply of medical services up that west side. I think that's helping more people.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Minister, it's very easy to sit or stand up in this legislation yourself, a Southerner, and talk about what should be done to the folks up in Stony Rapids and Black Lake, and how it is to live up there and to grow gardens and to raise chickens and produce eggs.

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that things are a little bit different up in north-western Saskatchewan. And you asked for my advice before, and I'm going to give you my advice right now.

And I just want to go back to the meeting we had in Buffalo Narrows, which you did not attend for the simple reason that you couldn't get out of your own yard because of a snowstorm and ice. So that's right down here where you have all the good communications and everything at your disposal, and you couldn't even get out to get to the airplane. But that goes to show you how things are different in the North. And they're far more severe up there than they are down here.

Had you had a problem that day when you couldn't get out of your yard to come to the meeting, you most certainly could have got to medical help quite easily, where you couldn't do that in Stony Rapids.

And I want to quote from the Premier:

The results of the program indicate that there has been an increase in the amount of perishable foods going into the communities.

He admits, and your officials admit, that it is a successful program. It was working. It was providing fresh food, fresh vegetables and produce to the citizens up there, and they were taking advantage of that program.

But then he goes on to say that:

There was considerable evidence that a significant proportion was being purchased by private outfitters and other commercial operations.

We know, as I indicated and as the Tourist Association of Saskatchewan has indicated in writing, that that is not so.

But to say that you should put extra money . . . Take the \$250,000 away. Take the fresh apples and oranges and fruit that you're providing, and the fresh vegetables to them folks, and say, look, we are going to provide you with better health. No two ways about that. We have been debating that this morning. We want better health, but not at the expense of nutrition.

And to say that we should encourage them to grow gardens, well, I want to tell you that they're living up there in the shield, and if you ever went in to Fond-du-Lac, Mr. Minister . . . And I don't know whether you've been in there. I don't know. But I'm sure, I know for sure your officials have been in there. And it's solid rock. And it's solid rock in Stony Rapids and Fond-du-Lac, with the exception of the sand that they have.

We know that fall comes a month earlier up there, and spring comes a month later. Fall comes a month earlier up in that north country, and spring comes a month later. We know that. I see the member throwing his hands around there, as the guy says . . . I don't know what he's talking about, but let me tell you it's different up there, and a lot of the citizens up in that country go out to the fish camps in the summer time . . . if you were to grow gardens, but climatic conditions just indicate that you cannot produce vegetables up in that country. And that's why that program was put on — to provide fresh apples and oranges to the citizens of that area.

(1230)

And I ask you once again, Mr. Minister, if you would ask your officials to take another look at the program, to talk to the group up there who have been taking the study. They are going to hold the meetings. And ask their opinions, the local people's opinions of the food transportation

subsidy. And take another serious look at it and maybe reinstating it.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well I have been to Stony Rapids and, you know, it wasn't all rock. There was some sand there, but, you know, I just throw this to you: I know that in the Northwest Territories, which is a lot further north than Stony Rapids, they grow very, very successful gardens — great gardens because they get that long period of sunlight. You can grow a garden in hardly any time at all. You need soil. You need sunlight. And you need water.

And you may be right at Fond-du-Lac. I haven't been there so I can't comment on that one. But I was at Stony Rapids, and I walked around Stony Rapids, and I'm sure that a guy could grow a garden in Stony Rapids. But I'm not here to argue all of that with you.

I mean, from my perspective, the food subsidy program, as I understand it, when it was brought in, was to introduce these types of foods into people's diets, and then to follow it with the Department of Agriculture to give assistance and ways of growing these vegetables. Now we're not talking about oranges and apples because we can't grow oranges and apples in Regina, or we can't grow them at Meadow Lake or at Fond-du-Lac, but certainly it seems to me if they can grow gardens in the North West Territories, they can grow gardens in northern Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Minister, you said that there is a study going on up there that you would like us to consult. We certainly will. When that study is completed my officials will take a look at the findings of that study.

MR. THOMPSON: — Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, I'll conclude my remarks on Health and indicate to you that that study has been carried out in the Stony Rapids School, and it's a study that's gone over a few months to see what the consumption of fresh . . . how it has dropped and what they have replaced it with.

And you say you have been in to Stony Rapids and you feel that gardens could grow there, that everything is fertile up there. and I want to ask you, the next time you go into Stony Rapids, to take a look at the forest. I want you to take a look at the forest at Stony Rapids and I want you to take a good look at it. And you will find out how long it takes to grow a tree 12 feet high, and you're going to see that there's really no forest up in that country, that you are up in the Pre-Cambrian Shield. And I tell you if it takes as long to grow a cabbage in Stony Rapids as it does to grow a tree to maturity you are going to wait a long, long time. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I would just end up the question with you to indicate that had the estimates not been on today my associate deputy minister, Mr. Loewen, would have been meeting with the northern councils to design and implement a package or a way where more local input can be brought about in the delivery of health care in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Loewen can't be there, but some of the officials are meeting today with the northern municipal councils to devise ways of having more local input and listening to local needs in the delivery of health service to northern Saskatchewan.

So, many of the things that you and I have been talking about, the actors in the scene are out there today discussing it right now.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister, if he wouldn't mind, I would, on subvote 1, if we could just go back for a minute, Mr. Minister. It would be just a list of your personal staff and their salaries, and your expenses. I don't expect you to give me that today, but if you would give me the assurance that within two weeks you would send it to me.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I give you the assurance that I'll send that over to you as quickly as I have it available.

Item 3 agreed to.

Item 4

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm sure the questions could be asked on a number of subvotes, and this has to do with the use which is going to be put to for buildings like the old mental hospital at Weyburn, the Souris Valley one, the former TB sans, and the work done by the committee headed by the hon. member for Moosomin, and the report which he presumably prepared. My question has to do with: was a report prepared and is it available for perusal by members of the legislature?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, a report was prepared. It's an internal report to the minister.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I take it that the answer to the latter question then is, no, it is not available for perusal. Will you tell me what the report recommended with respect to Weyburn, North Battleford, the sans at Fort Qu'Appelle and Saskatoon, and if it covered the North Park Centre in Prince Albert?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — The report was an internal report to me. Some of the recommendations may or may not be acted upon.

I think we have discussions going on with the Department of Supply and Services concerning a number of these facilities. I think the one that is probably the most evident, and I'm sure you're aware of that, we're going to be looking . . . It is our intention to try and find some alternate uses — they may not all be in health care; they may be in other aspects of government — for these facilities. But the one that there has been some decision made at this point in time is the Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford where I'm sure you're aware that the Minister of Social Services announced that we will be using some of that facility for the young offenders.

So to disclose the recommendations at this point in time, I don't think I would be doing that because, until we make further consultation and decisions, we don't know if we are going to be acting on those recommendations or not. But I can tell you that we are sincerely wanting to find some type of alternate use, if feasible, for these facilities.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I will talk about several of them, one by one. With respect to Souris Valley Centre, is it your proposal to add additional level 3 or level 4 beds to the Souris Valley Centre, using the vacant accommodation of the old mental hospital at Weyburn?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I, along with the Minister of Agriculture and some other ministers — I can't recall them all at this point in time — visited Souris Valley Centre. At the present time we have not made a decision as to use it for level 3 and 4 beds.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to the san — what I'll call the san property — at Saskatoon, is it proposed to fund or erect a government facility on that site, or to fund another facility on that site, which would give level 3 or level 4 care?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — No. The construction for the new 238-bed, level 4 facility in Saskatoon is not on that site. It's on another site, and that construction will be starting within a couple of months.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to that project for additional nursing home beds in Saskatoon — the one you say will start in a couple of months. Is

that project to be owned in the private sector or in the public sector?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Probably that question would be more apropos to the Minister of Supply and Services, who is certainly building the building. But I mean, the deputy informs me that there are proposals of both natures — both private and public.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you suggesting that a building is about to be constructed in two months to provide for a health care facility, and the Minister of Health does not know who will operate the building?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Certainly. Supply and Services are building the building, and they're the department that's in charge of that, as you well know. And they are looking at proposals from different developers and it's their decision. The Department of Health were very instrumental in indicating the type of facilities they wanted for the best quality of care and quality of life that could be provided for those people. And, of course, we will be paying for the operation of it. But the decision as to who develops that building and who builds it, of course, rests with the other department, as you well know.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm sorry, I didn't make myself clear. I wasn't asking who was going to arrange its construction. I wasn't asking whether it was going to be paid for out of government grants. I was asking: who will operate the facility? Will it be operated by the department of public health, which is reasonably unlikely, or is it going to be operated by somebody else? And who is the somebody else?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — That building, of course, will be operated by a board, as is the situation with the new rehab centre here. Now who that the board will be paying to, I can't say at this point in time. That will be a decision as to who developed it and who runs it. But the administration of it will be by a board, as the same as in the rehab centre, as the same as any one of the other acute care hospitals.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we're not getting very far. Never mind whether it's by a board; so is Esso operated by a board. What we are talking about is whether this facility is going to be run by a private organization or by a governmental organization; whether it be provincial or municipal. I am asking particularly whether it is a private sector business organization or whether it is non-profit or governmental.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — It will be a board appointed by me the same as the board of the General Hospital, the same as the board of the rehab centre, the same as the board of the Plains Hospital, the same as the board of the University Hospital. It will be a publicly appointed board by the Minister of Health that will run the 238-bed facility.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — So that with respect to the operations, the facility is going to be run by a publicly appointed board responsible to the Minister of Health.

With respect to the ownership of the facility, it still might be owned by a commercial firm?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — As I said, those are under Supply and Services, but the options are a private ownership or else a lease-back type of arrangement, one of those. And I don't know which has been selected at this point in time, because they're the people that are building the building. But as far as the administration and the running of it, that will be under a public board as I indicated to you earlier.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, so far as the Minister of Health is concerned, do you have any preference as to whether or not the facilities, which you operate by boards appointed by you, are owned publicly or privately? Do you have any preference as to whether or not the building is a commercial venture constructed for profit and owned for profit,

or whether it is owned by an organization which is non-profit and, accordingly, is directed primarily to the rendering service rather than the turning of a profit?

(1245)

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I think, we discussed this somewhat yesterday, and I think if you look at the track record of the ones that were built, that they're basically all public. We talked about Extendicare and that you allowed that contract to continue, and so have we. I would say in the majority of cases it's public ownership. I'm not ruling out private ownership.

However, I do say, whether it be public or whether it be private, the important thing is the quality of life and the quality of care that takes place in that institution, and secondly, the cost of that quality of life and quality of care to the taxpayers' of Saskatchewan. And you can be very, very sure, no matter which way it goes, that I, as the Minister of Health, will be watching that very closely.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I turn to the facility at Prince Albert, the North Park Centre, the old san. Was that in any way covered by the report prepared under the aegis of the hon. member for Moosomin, and is there any change in the use of that facility contemplated?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — That's a Social Services facility not under my jurisdiction. But the mandate that I gave to my colleague, the member for Moosomin, was not to look at that one. We looked at the two facilities that were previously known as the mental homes, I guess is what you would call them in the early days, North Battleford and Weyburn, and the two sanatoriums, Fort Qu'Appelle and Saskatoon. That was the mandate that I asked him to look at.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Finally, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I turn to Fort San, and ask you whether or not you can say anything about any proposed uses of Fort San different from the current uses.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — No change in plans at the present time for Fort Qu'Appelle.

Item 4 agreed to.

Item 5

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, I believe under the community health services this item would include the grants to groups — grants to some groups.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — They tell me it's item 25 that the grants are paid out of.

Item 5 agreed to.

Item 6 agreed to.

Item 7

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, on the Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan, I keep hearing rumours that the charge for hearing aids is going to be increased significantly in the near future. And I admit to you right now it is rumours only that I hear. What I would like you to give me is a commitment that there is no intent, by you as the minister, to increase the cost of hearing aids to the people of the province.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — We do have that under review, and if there is going to be any change in the cost of hearing aids, I certainly will be announcing it.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister says it's under review. In the budget that you have done here and put to the people of the province and asked us to vote on, was there an increase in hearing aids in consideration in this budget item? That's what I want to know.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — We've made provision for an increase in the number of hearing aids that are supplied because my officials tell me that each year the demand is growing, and that certainly is built into that budget.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — And what about a cost increase? Was there a cost increase built into the budget item?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I said if there's any change, it's under review. We'll certainly announce it. It wouldn't affect the blue book at all if there was an increase in cost to the consumer. That would be a revenue, and not an expenditure.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, you obviously don't know how a financial statement works, which disappoints me again in you, because if you charge more for the hearing aids, you don't need to take as much money out of the treasury to subsidize the hearing-aid program, and, of course, you would have either taken into consideration an increase in the hearing aid, or not.

And what I want to know is whether there is a hidden increase in hearing aid plans in the subvote, similar to the one that was included, but not mentioned in the subvote of nursing home construction; because you will know, under nursing home construction, there's no mention in the blue book of the increase in funding that the local community has to pay. And what I understand is that there will be a major increase in hearing aids for the seniors and other people who use them, that you haven't announced yet, but again will be brought in in the dark of night, and that you're trying to hide right now. So, either come clean on it and say, no, there will be no increase, or yes, there will be an increase.

And this shadow boxing that you do when you deal with nurses and doctors, and now the senior citizens on nursing home construction, I think here again we have the same kind of a tactic by you, Mr. Minister, and I want you to come clean on it.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, as I said, it's under review, and if there's going to be an increase, I will certainly announce it to the people of Saskatchewan. And I think you realize that under the subvote, whether there's an increase or not, it doesn't affect the amount of money in this subvote.

We explained to you that there are more people getting hearing aids, and that's the money that's budgeted in this subvote.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, from your response then, we will make the announcement now for you because you're not man enough to stand up and make it. You're trying to sneak another tax increase on the seniors of this province. We will announce for you that there's going to be a major increase in hearing aids in the province.

And I make that statement and will be sending it out to the seniors and to the people of the province, because that's what you're doing, because you're not saying you're not going to, and you're guilty by association because you won't make a clear statement on it. And we will now take from you, when you won't give a committal that you're not going to increase, and that means that you have already decided to. And this is but yet another smoke-screen, and your consultation isn't worth the time you spend at it.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'll just say one thing to my friend opposite: do your homework because in the past you haven't, and it's embarrassing to see how many times you're wrong.

Item 7 agreed to.

Item 8 agreed to.

Item 9

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Saskatchewan Dental Plan. You will know that this is your fourth year of cutting staff in this area. I wonder, is there any baseline that you have established where the children's teeth can deteriorate to where you will stop cutting staff in the dental program? And I think this is one area where I get more calls from my constituents than any other, is the lack of dental care compared to what it was when you took office. And in your opening remarks you gave a glowing report, and a lot of back-patting of yourself that you did, about how you have encouraged and improved health in Saskatchewan.

What I would like to know is, what is the baseline? I believe that we've lost . . . well here, 20 more people out of the dental plan, and last year it was a similar number, even more. Is there a baseline beyond which you, as minister, will not cut and slash the dental program and in your attempt to make it a non-viable program, and what is that number? Here you've allowed for a decrease from 427 to 407. What do you think the magic line is where you'll quit cutting and slashing?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well again, there was no attempt to slash the dental program whatsoever. The service is continuing. What's happening is that more of the children are being transferred over into the private sector, so certainly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I know you don't like private dentists and it's very, very obvious. I mean he's against the dentists and he's for extra billing, and you know, a lot of the things that he stands for have come out, and I'm glad of that exercise in these estimates because we see truly where he's coming from. And it's very obvious. Just against all the dentists. I believe the dentists can do very good work and do it, and we're transferring many of the children over into the private sector.

It might be interesting to note, it might be interesting to note this: that today if you take the number of employees per child in the dental plan, you take the number of employees per child in the dental plan and compare it with '82, when those fellows got kicked out, we have more. Besides, it's going over to the private dental plan, so you know, when he stands up there and says dental services are being eroded, that's sheer utter nonsense.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The people of the province will make that judgement on you again, Mr. Minister, because they say the dental plan has been eroded seriously by you personally, against the advice of your department officials; that your department officials continually advise you that you are destroying the program and what you do is continually say, no, put your head down and demand more cuts. I think that's unfortunate. But go ahead, Mr. Minister, you're always right. Everyone else in the province is wrong. So continue on. Cut and slash the program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The numbers are here, 100 less than there was when you took over in the dental plan. And he says there's no problem. Well, continue on. You're doing a great job.

Item 9 agreed to.

Item 10 agreed to.

Item 11

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The provincial labs. I have here what is called "Saskatchewan Health laboratory services review," the terms of reference and the study which is being done by Dr. Frank Lone, a pathologist at Thunder Bay, Ontario.

Can you tell me why you would go to Ontario, what connections this person would have with the Tory party, why you would bring him in to do the study and take some more taxpayers' money from the Saskatchewan people? Why wouldn't we do a study and a review, if you have to do a study of the lab service in the province, why wouldn't Saskatchewan people be good enough to do that?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well again, there are no political connections. Dr. Frank Lone is an outstanding pathologist, an individual who has owned a private lab. He's used as a consultant in many provinces throughout Saskatchewan on the role of labs, and has been a consultant to two major hospitals on lab work in Ontario.

So again, it just goes back to show you from whence they come. To stay in the same old rut, and to never try and move out and look around to find the most qualified people who can come in and bring that expertise — probably the outstanding authority on private labs in Canada. And I say if we're spending taxpayers' money in this province to see which direction we should be going in lab services, then I think it's incumbent, if you can get him, to get the best in the nation to take a look at your situation, and that's what we did.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, here again I will disagree with the minister, and many health care givers would disagree with him when he says that there aren't qualified people in Saskatchewan to do the review.

I would ask you as well: how much money is being paid to this individual for the study he is doing?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — It might be interesting to know that Dr. Lone — heaven forbid why! — just moved to Manitoba.

However, the cost of his survey was kept at \$25,000 to look into the direction of lab services in Saskatchewan for the era of the '90s and the year 2000. Another example, just one other example of Saskatchewan Health taking off the blinkers and looking to serve the people of this province with their dollars to provide the best service possible in the years ahead — another example of that.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well Mr. Minister, I wonder why you would go out of province to hire somebody for 25,000 to do this review. I would think there would be people in your department who are qualified. There used to be. There used to be people in the medical profession in Saskatchewan. This belief that everything can be done better by people from the United States or Ontario is the reason that people now look at Saskatchewan differently than they did back in the 1970s.

We used to be the leader in health, and what you're saying now is we have to go to Arizona and we have to go to Ontario to get advice on how to run our health care program. Here again, continue on. You're doing a great job getting advice from people from Ontario, Toronto, and from Phoenix, Arizona, and you believe they know better about health than we do in Saskatchewan.

I say that's the reason you're going to get turfed out at the next election — because people in Saskatchewan don't believe that others can tell us what to do and know better about health. So I say to you, good luck. Get more people in from out of province to do the work and take jobs away from Saskatchewan people. It's a great strategy. I appreciate it very much.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well I would just like to say I think this is extremely insulting. A man of Dr. Frank Lone's capability, who he doesn't even know, never heard . . . Here he stands in the legislature of this province trying to slander this gentleman, a man that's on contract for \$25,000 — can't defend himself — \$25,000 to review and assess a \$50 million cost to health care. That's

our lab services.

And I think that's a pretty good bargain, if you can get an expert who was recommended by the medical community in Saskatchewan here to come in and do this study. Now if you want to stand and talk about this man's credibility, a man you don't know at all, and stand up here and make fun of him because he happens to come from Ontario, a person who is an outstanding leader in his field . . .

You say, well why don't we take a look at it from within ourselves? Surely to goodness, if you're going to be taking a direction and trying to improve things, it seems eminent to me that you should have an independent, a totally independent point of view. That's what this gentleman is bringing to this survey.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — That's right, an independent person who owns a private lab, as you say. I wonder if he doesn't have a slanted view of the way the world should turn. You say we need all of this out-of-province help to come in. And there's no wonder that Dick Collver is writing up here and saying, my program is good and we should come to Saskatchewan and solve your health problems, because you haven't.

As I say, you can continue on. And I say the pathologist that you hired may be a super guy — I don't know. I'm just saying that we have as good people here in the province. You, Mr. Minister, take the option of beating up on your own employees who are on salary for you, and calling them down, who can't defend themselves. I'll go outside and say what I said about this pathologist, but you use the immunity of the House to incriminate your own employees. I say that that is a cowardly position, but what can we expect?

Item 11 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I'd like to ask the House Leader what time it is.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — My best guess is that it's about 10 to 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. It's hard to read these numbers when there's a lot of noise in the Chamber, and I caution the member from Shaunavon to try to keep some decorum . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order. Possibly the member from Shaunavon doesn't understand what decorum is. If he doesn't, I will advise him. If not, I will expect him to keep decorum.

Item 12

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I have a question on psych services which we can do under any of the next items, Mr. Minister, but here again, what you say and what you do are so opposite that it's becoming so obvious to the groups. And psych services, when you came in, you almost brought tears to the eyes of your staff and to the people of the province of what you weren't going to do in psych services.

Here again this year, in adding up the next five items, we find a cut of nine staff in this area. And I just point it out; that what you say and what you do are so opposite, whether it's with nursing home construction or hospitals or psych services, or the dental plan. And I just point it out. I'm not going to take a long time. But I say it's incredible that a man who will stand in this Assembly and announce great programs and then do nothing, and in fact cut back in the dental plan, and now here in psych services, I don't accept it and I don't think the people of the province do.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — That is just another example of this individual not realizing that if you're going to be looking after a department and things of this nature you may change subvotes, you may change the amounts of money, you may change personnel. He seems to think that you have to keep exactly the same old type of delivery, no matter how much it's outdated. That's his

kind of thinking.

I can tell you that we in Saskatchewan Health are looking to the era of the '90s and the year 2000, and you will see more changes because they will be changes that bring about better service to the people of the province.

MR. SVEINSON: — It's past 1 o'clock. I'd just like to bring it to the attention of the Chair.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:09 p.m.