

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the pleasure today of introducing a gentleman from other lands. We have in the Speaker's gallery Mr. Adolph Cameron, accompanied by Terry McKague from STF, who needs no introduction to the members of this House.

Mr. Cameron is on tour at the invitation of the Canadian Teachers' Federation, and three provinces have taken the opportunity of hosting him — Nova Scotia, Alberta, and we are pleased to see that our own teachers in Saskatchewan. I will be meeting with him shortly after to discuss educational matters, and I would hope that the members would welcome him to this Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rybchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, two students and their teacher, Donna Hanson from Cochrane High School, that is situated in the constituency of Regina Victoria. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. I'd like to inform them that I'll be meeting with them at 2:30 for pictures and refreshments, and I hope your stay here is both interesting and educational. And I ask all members to welcome them here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Cuts in Staff and Budget of Ombudsman

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier. In light of the fact that the provincial Ombudsman entered 1986 with a backlog of 800 investigated complaints, and in light of the fact that many people have to wait up to two years to have their complaints against this government carefully investigated by the Ombudsman, can you explain, sir, why you decided to cut the staff and the budget of the Ombudsman in this year's provincial budget?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have had salary increases as low as zero. We have had departments held to zero. We have had some increases at 2 per cent and 3 per cent, as a matter to make sure that we can be as responsible as possible with respect to the public funds. And obviously we had targeted some areas that we thought some increases were necessary — health, education, agriculture, and jobs.

And those, Mr. Speaker, are very important to the Saskatchewan public, and we will obviously be prepared to defend those decisions in terms of what is important. But I believe that the large increases in expenditures in health and education and jobs and agriculture is important, and other areas we've held to zero, and some, in fact, we have cut back.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact that there is this very large and growing backlog and in view of the fact that the time for getting complaints investigated has lengthened and lengthened, and in view of the fact that your budget actually cut the staff for the Ombudsman, can you advise this Assembly whether the decision to cut the staff of the Ombudsman had anything to do with the Ombudsman's strong criticisms of your government's policies, particularly in the area of social services?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the allocation of our budget to various kinds of sectors that we think are important have nothing to do with the Ombudsman and his inquiries — absolutely nothing. And his own staff have nothing to do with it either. We make those decisions on what we believe Saskatchewan people think are important.

In my view, they're telling me, at least, that health and education and agriculture and job creation are the number one issues and that we should be spending money on those. And we have, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact, Mr. Premier, that you well know that the Minister of Social Services has been in a violent dispute with the Ombudsman during most of 1985 with respect to the policies and performance of his department, do you deny, Mr. Premier, that the Minister of Social Services urged you to cut the money that went to the Ombudsman in order that his ability to oversee that department would be reduced?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little surprised at the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that that might be the case. We, and I'm sure as his cabinet operated, we sit in our planning exercises with respect to the budget in cabinet, and we go through what we think the people of Saskatchewan feel are important, and we allocate it to those areas that obviously we think are of the most concern to the public.

So we have allocated them to health and education, jobs and agriculture. And I would venture to say in most places in the province that's precisely where they should be allocated, and in some we had freezes and in some we had less money to spend. And we make that decision because we want to focus and target our money in the areas that are most important.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. A supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you have already confirmed in this House that your government is spending more than ever before in Saskatchewan history on government advertising, something like \$11.5 million two years ago, and no one knows what it is going to be this year because your government refused to tell us, but we know it will be a lot more.

In light of the serious backlog which has been referred to — backlog of investigations at the Ombudsman's office, could you not, or could your Minister of Finance not

figure out how you could cut even \$100,000 out of that multi-million dollar government advertising budget this year so that ordinary people could have their complaints against your government adequately investigated?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I would just share with the hon. member that when you are talking with constituents, and in conversation with people across Saskatchewan, they can raise legitimate concerns that we need money in health care and education and agriculture and job creation, and they said that's where we should be putting our funds. And they've said that. They wanted to see expansions in hospitals and nursing homes. They want to see more money directed in agriculture. And they do want to have good informational programs that shows them how to access those various kinds of programs that we have.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that the most important thing on the agenda for the opposition as far as they're concerned, for the entire public, is this issue that they raise today versus agriculture, economic development, jobs, health, education, new technical schools, new universities, new agricultural colleges, various kinds of programs for farmers, new job creations, paper mills, upgraders, fertilizer plants — all the kinds of exciting things that you can build or, for example, super . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Final supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, the public is concerned about your government not providing adequate funding to agencies that protect the ordinary citizen. Even editorials are saying, "Only a short-sighted, narrow-minded and vindictive government would fail to take seriously the recommendations to reform that Tickell repeatedly has sought." This is what the editorial in the *Regina Leader-Post* says about your actions. Do you not agree that only a government which is indeed vindictive and narrow-minded and short-sighted would not look after agencies which are established to protect the public against wrongdoing or errors of any government?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we take seriously all the recommendations. And, Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure that we put them in the right priority. And we have, Mr. Speaker. We have looked at and we have spent a great deal of money on health and education and agriculture; much more than the previous administration. And we have had many editorials that said yes, our priorities are accurate, and there have been many editorials that say that the opposition was wrong, because they didn't listen and they didn't respond to people when interest rates were 22 per cent or anything else.

So if you want to compare editorials we can compare editorials. I say that we have looked at what's important. The Saskatchewan people are saying health, education, agriculture and jobs are the four things that we should be building on. They say that all across the province. You may be on a different agenda but I believe that the people of Saskatchewan say those four things are the number one issues.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the

Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, Saskatchewan people are also saying that they believe that a government should be fair with them. And they do not see that happening when we see these kinds of cuts taking place. I ask you, Mr. Minister, do you deny suggesting to either the Minister of Finance or to your cabinet colleagues during budget reviews this year that the Ombudsman's office have its budget and staff cut because his reports were critical of your performance and policies as the Minister of Social Services? Do you deny that?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, about the only thing I can say to that kind of a comment is that desperate men say desperate things. And that's a prime example, a prime example. To suggest that I would bring forward to my colleagues the recommendation that a certain budget or a certain department, for which I have no responsibility, should be cut — that is simply a desperate recommendation from a desperate opposition party.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it's very important for government to be absolutely fair, fair to everybody in the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly I, as Minister of Social Services, am concerned that any recommendations which is brought forward by the Ombudsman be fairly considered.

And there are many recommendations that the Ombudsman brings forward that we respond to, and respond to positively. And I want to simply read one to you as an example, so the members opposite know what they are suggesting is not, in fact, accurate, Mr. Speaker. The Ombudsman says:

This is to advise that I have completed my investigation into the above-noted complaint and have closed my file. I am pleased that the department reconsidered their decision to increase the recovery rate after this issue had been discussed by the appeal board. I have closed my file. I thank you for your co-operation during my investigation.

This department co-operates on things that we believe are reasonable to co-operate on, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of the member opposite, the Minister of Social Services, it's not the opposition that's desperately avoiding an election; it's the government members opposite.

Mr. Minister, you were yesterday sent a letter, yesterday afternoon, with a copy of a motion which we will be putting before the Assembly later today. So you're familiar with it. That motion would allow the Ombudsman to appear before this Assembly as a witness to answer questions and to present facts from his investigations in your department.

You have said that you were not afraid of a public review of your performance. Here is a chance to say to the public that you indeed are not desperately hiding something that you should not be hiding. Will you support that motion

and allow the Ombudsman to appear before this Assembly? Will you support that motion, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of supporting a motion that I do not think is a realistic, worthy motion that is in the best interests of the public of Saskatchewan. That is why I was elected, Mr. Speaker, to do what is in the best interests of the public of Saskatchewan. And I have no intention of seeing the taxpayers' dollars spent imprudently or unnecessarily.

And I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, based on what I know of welfare reform, of how it was long overdue in this province, of the kinds of positive things that are being done for welfare clients as a result of the education and the training and the job preparation experiences that are now offered to them, I have absolutely no result of saying that somehow now we need to reverse our course. Because the course that we have taken is the proper one; the people of Saskatchewan know it.

Oil and Gasoline Prices

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and it has to do with her government's inability to force large oil companies to pass on the reduction in world oil prices to consumers such as farmers and working people.

Following your meetings last week with oil companies, you were quoted as being confident that Saskatchewan consumers are not being charged too much by the multinational oil companies. I wonder if the minister can explain how she square that with a statement made yesterday by the president of Shell Canada, Jack MacLeod, that his oil company is charging consumers at least 4 cents a litre or about 18 cents a gallon more than necessary for gasoline, because Shell Canada shareholders want a better return on their investment.

How do you square that with the consumers in the province and with your previous statement that you're satisfied with the multinationals passing on the cut in the world oil price?

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on what Shell may or may have said yesterday. I can indicate to the member that I did meet with all refiners and told them quite frankly that we were not happy with the prices in Saskatchewan. And as we can see today compared to two weeks ago, the prices have gone down. Mr. Speaker, we're not in the business of regulating prices in Saskatchewan like the members opposite would. As far as I know, there's only one province in the country that does it, and that's Nova Scotia. And I believe gas there is selling in the neighbourhood of 60 cents a litre.

We're not pleased. We want to see those prices come down as quickly as possible. And as the Premier has indicated before, the prices are coming down. In Estevan three days ago, farm diesel was 32 cents a litre; in Preeceville it was 34.7 cents a litre. That doesn't include the generous rebate that this government is providing to farmers to reduce their input costs. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is warranted again, if these prices should happen to rise, I

will call them in again and tell them bluntly that we're not happy with what's happening.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well the minister says that she explained to the oil companies that she was not happy with their performance. I wonder if you're then saying that the quote in the *Leader-Post*, and I want to quote it to you:

Duncan recently met with officials from Regina Consumer Co-operative Refineries, Calgary-based Turbo, Shell, Petro Canada, and Esso, and is confident Saskatchewan consumers aren't being charged too much.

I wonder if you can explain to the Assembly whether the story you told the oil companies, or the one you told to the public and to the press — which one of those stories is accurate. Do you think the oil companies are passing on the cut in world oil prices? Or do you think they're ripping off the consumers as is being stated by many people in my constituency, for example, where they're seeing oil prices or gas prices at the pumps almost double what they are south of the border for fuel that's being exported down there?

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I can only assure the gentleman opposite that if he thinks that Co-op Refineries are gouging the consumers of Saskatchewan and the consumers within their network, I don't think that's true.

A refiner like the Co-op Refineries does not publicly announce that they're going to chew \$10 million because of a sudden drop in world oil prices. And we have been monitoring for some time, and for him to make the statement that he just did, that is not true.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, supplementary to the minister who goes off in a tangent and is allowed to talk about something that doesn't have anything to do with the question.

I want to ask you clearly: is your opinion that the consumers are not being ripped off, as you state in the press, accurate? Or is it, as you say today, that they are being ripped off? Which of those opinions is the accurate one?

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when I see prices like 30.9 cents for regular gasoline, I don't think that's a rip off. And as I said, we had visited with the refineries and told them in no uncertain terms we were not happy that prices in Saskatchewan were not going down as quickly as we felt they were, and we see prices going down every day right across the province.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, I wonder if the minister would tell the Assembly whether she thinks 41 cents a litre for gasoline in Shaunavon and Maple Creek is a rip-off when we're seeing it at 30 cents a litre in Regina. Do you think that's a rip-off?

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, we met with the refineries. We informed them that we were not happy — this government was not happy — with the slowness in the downward trend of prices of fuel in our province. In

the last two weeks we have seen those prices move downward, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that consumers are pleased with the removal of the gas tax. That wouldn't have happened under the previous administration. Regina today has the lowest gas prices in the country; the lowest food prices in the country; virtually no inflation in the city of Regina. I think the people here are fairly happy.

Mr. Shillington: — Madam Minister, you claim to have been a fire-breathing dragon when you met with the oil companies when it's patently obvious you were nothing of the such. You said to the *Leader-Post* that you were satisfied with their performance, and you said that in the Assembly when you reported back to us. Instead of acting so kittenish when you meet the oil companies, will you go back to them and do what you told us you'd said you'd done, and that is tell them what you just told us, and that is you're not happy with their performance.

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — If the continued downward price of gasoline does not continue in the province, yes, I am prepared to meet with them once more. After meeting with them, we did see a downward trend in the price of gasoline in the province, and we will continue to monitor, as we have for the past year and a half, and we'll take the necessary steps, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the consumers in Saskatchewan are getting a fair shake.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, my new question to the other lion of the treasury bench, the Minister of Energy, if I may have his attention. To the Minister of Energy: and it has to do with your government's push for higher crude oil prices and lower taxes for big companies. Your government pushed for the elimination of the petroleum and gas revenue tax and promised Ottawa that, if they eliminate that tax, your government would reduce royalties. You're clearly on record.

But in testimony before the Canadian Senate's energy committee, the small oil companies have suggested that's the wrong approach. Lambert from Coho Resources — a small company, but one listed on The Alberta Stock Exchange — stated that such a move would increase the cash flow of the majors by 50 per cent, but of the minor oil companies like his by about 1 per cent.

In light of those figures, Mr. Minister, can you explain to this Assembly why your government wants big oil companies to benefit so handsomely and why you won't do something for small oil companies?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, we clearly recognize the make-up of the Saskatchewan oil patch and that it's predominately the small, independent, almost family owned and operated producers — unlike Alberta, for example, where it's the majors. The approach that our government has taken on this is to sort of . . . is deal with the short-term realities of low world oil prices and use the same recipe that we used in years past — consult with those in the industry so that we come with a program that will work.

And what we're after in this province, Mr. Speaker, is to

maintain jobs out there in the service sector. That will be our total focus. And I'll tell you, when it comes to standing up for jobs in the oil patch, we will stand up for them, but not at the expense of the consumers or the farmers of this province — not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Unlike the NDP, Mr. Speaker, who question who stands up against Ottawa . . . The Alberta NDP have now joined their colleagues in Ottawa in calling for a minimum oil price, Mr. Speaker, which would clearly raise prices to all and does not make much sense, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, certainly.

The removal of the PGRT we see as part of that package to helping the cash flow problem . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Agriculture Land Leasing Policy

Mr. Hampton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Premier, a certain parcel of land in the Arcola area was leased on a long-term basis. Due to circumstances, possession of this land is in question and it's presently before the courts. My question to you, sir: is it a new policy of the Department of Agriculture to short-term lease these parcels of land while they are before the courts?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has said, this matter is before the courts and everything is sort of a stand pat situation until it's resolved. So I can't make any further comment with respect to the case because it is before the courts.

Mr. Hampton: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in your capacity as Minister of Agriculture . . . And if I may, a new question. Your deputy minister today informed the party concerned that, in fact, this land had been short-term leased, the persons had paid a deposit, and their cheques have been cashed. Now, Mr. Premier, what you're telling me, and what your deputy is telling those persons — which is correct?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of the question and provide the information to the hon. member.

Sale of Prince Albert Pulp Company

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege. I want to address a question to the minister responsible for the Prince Albert Pump Company. I believe it's the Deputy House Leader. I ask, can the minister confirm that the final approval has been given by both the Saskatchewan Crown Management Board and Weyerhaeuser Canada's parent company to the memorandum of agreement, or of understanding, announced in March respecting the sale of the Prince Albert Pump Company and the related assets?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the initial agreement announced some time ago between PAPCO and Weyerhaeuser, an announcement, I might add, that was very well received in Prince Albert and much of the

province, was subject to ratification by the U.S. board of Weyerhaeuser. That approval has been forthcoming. It has also been approved by Crown Management Board. I think that's very, very positive news for Saskatchewan, and particularly for the area around Prince Albert, the area involved in the forest industry.

In anticipation of the supplementary question by my hon. friend from Quill Lakes, the headline in the *Leader-Post* today is clearly misleading. I have taken it up with the *Leader-Post*. They acknowledge the headline, "Papco deal falls through," is, in fact, a false headline and should be that, "Papco deal is going forward."

Mr. Koskie: — Supplementary. Mr. Minister, can you confirm that the final agreement was based entirely on the terms and conditions stated in the original memorandum of understanding, or were there, in fact, changes in the terms and conditions incorporated in the final agreement?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, so the hon. member understands, what was in fact ratified was the memorandum of understanding. At this stage, between now and over the next few weeks, the lawyers on both sides will be rendering the entire agreement, dotting the i's and crossing the t's, at which time, as we indicated in the initial announcement of the Weyerhaeuser project, that we would then be able to move from that stage into the building stage.

So with regard to the actual agreement that is in the hands of lawyers from both sides, the details are being worked out just as they were with the NewGrade project in Regina, and just as they are now being done with the ammonia plant, and as they are done with all other major projects — whether it's Key Lake, whether it's any potash advancements or any other type project. So that's the normal course of it's being done.

I think the message is very clear and very simple. Weyerhaeuser is going forward; Weyerhaeuser is good for Saskatchewan; Weyerhaeuser is good for the forest; Weyerhaeuser is good for Prince Albert.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Wills Act

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Justice, I move first reading of a Bill, An Act to amend The Wills Act.

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

MOTIONS

Attendance of the Ombudsman Before the Assembly

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I rise to seek leave of the Assembly to move a motion regarding a very serious problem within the Department of Social Services that has been brought to light by the Provincial Ombudsman.

Unfortunately, the disagreement between the Ombudsman and the minister are being conducted in the press without an opportunity for members to question the Ombudsman, without an opportunity for him, an officer of the legislature, to respond to allegations made against his report. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if leave is granted, I propose to move a motion along the following lines:

That this Assembly, pursuant to section 19 of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, command and compel the attendance before the Assembly of the Ombudsman, Mr. David Tickell, to assist the Assembly to understand the serious problems he has noted in the Department of Social Services.

And, Mr. Speaker, I seek leave of the Assembly to move that motion.

Leave denied.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. On this kind of motion, if leave is refused there is no vote.

Attendance of the Ombudsman Before the Continuing Select Committee of the Legislature

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day I rise, pursuant to rules 39 and 88 of this Assembly, to seek leave to move a motion regarding the very serious problems in Social Services noted by the Ombudsman. We've just seen this arrogant government use its huge majority to prevent this issue being discussed before the Assembly with the Ombudsman. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if leave is granted, I propose to move the following motion:

That this Assembly, pursuant to rule 88 and section 19 of The Legislative Assembly Act, refer to the Continuing Select Committee of the legislature the matter of the Ombudsman's report, the serious problems he has noted in the Department of Social Services, and recommend the desirability of summoning the Ombudsman to appear before the committee.

I therefore seek leave of the Assembly to move a motion along these lines.

Leave denied.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Health Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask just a few questions of the minister on a subject which we have not yet had an opportunity to address, and it deals

with — and I may have the title not quite correct but I think it is. There is, and has been in the Department of Health over the years, a system called the global budget review system. Is there still such a process in the department, Mr. Minister, as I recall it to have existed in previous years? Is there a global budget review system, and if so, what is its purpose and what does it do?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, the global review is still in place. It is a process by where basically the base hospitals, which are the six bigger hospitals in the province, sit down with the government and, through discussion, address the priorities of the hospital and also of the government in regard to the operation of those hospitals. A consultative approach; no change in it from what previously took place.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, is this done on a cyclical basis. Is this done on a cyclical basis, Mr. Minister? As I recall, I think it was done on a regular basis every so often, every so many years, plus the normal consultations that go on under normal circumstances, but is that the way it usually works?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's done at various times. There's no established period of so many years and then we're doing it. We're undergoing one right now. An important component of the global budget this year is the \$100 million patient care program and the placement of staff into the hospitals, not only the base hospitals but other hospitals in Saskatchewan. But that certainly is part of the global review. It's going on at the present time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, are you saying that this is the first time that a global review has been done in the last four years because of the enrichment program which is obviously something that has to be considered. But is this the first global review — the normal global review — that your government and your department has undertaken since 1982?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — This is the first global review since we became government.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well that's rather interesting, Mr. Minister, because a global review of the base hospitals was due in 1982. That was the next regular and normal review of the base hospitals that was supposed to have been done. Can you explain, Mr. Minister, why the normal global review which was due in 1982, when you took office, was not done?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I think the member opposite will realize that — and I can go through this again — I mentioned many times, but just to indicate to him, when I came in as Minister of Health and saw the priorities and the needs that existed in health care in Saskatchewan, we instituted on a number of priorities.

The first one was the special care home construction package, a five-year package. That was a priority of the Department of Health, and I believe has been very well received. And we're in the third year of that program, and there are going to be 1,600 beds built around the province.

The next initiative, of course, was in the upgrading and construction of acute care hospital facilities, the \$400 million capital project.

The third initiative of the Health department in addressing the needs out there that we inherited — and we've been through this discussion many times — but I think what we are discussing today is what we're doing at this time, is the \$100 million patient care enrichment program.

As the member opposite will realize, a significant portion of global review is staffing components and certainly, when we said we're addressing this, I said let's have a global review of the operations of the base hospitals. That's going on at this time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — So that I have this correct, Mr. Minister, so you are confirming, therefore, that you made a conscious decision that the global review of 1982 would not be done? That was a policy decision, obviously. You're saying that that's the decision your government made. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — You're correct in saying that I made a conscious decision along with my colleagues that the priority, as we saw them when we became government in this province, was nursing home construction across this province. We've constructed, or are in the phase of constructing, 1,600 beds in 60 communities. That was our number one priority.

There are other priorities such as the introduction of a chiropody program. There was a priority update and equip our base hospitals — a \$300 million program. I remember within about five or six months of becoming the minister, the priority that was brought to my attention was the sad state of diagnostic equipment at St. Paul's Hospital. We reacted with a million dollars to improve that diagnostic equipment. So we looked at the issue that was out there and we addressed those with five-year plans, some of them coming up immediately, as I say, with the diagnostic equipment in St. Paul's; plans that had been promised before, that we introduced, such as chiropody; and certainly the most recent, our patient care enrichment program of \$100 million.

So if you want to say we made a conscious decision, certainly we made a conscious decision, and that conscious decision, I believe, Mr. Chairman, was in the best interests of Saskatchewan health. It was addressing problems that people have been crying out for some time. And I believe they have been addressed and will be addressed more so in the future with five-year commitments which have been very well received by the health community.

This year I said it's time we did the global review as we do the patient care enrichment program. That is taking place at this time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, it is interesting how you have again fallen into your defensiveness, as you have when you find a question which you know you cannot legitimately answer because of the errors of the ways of you and your government. The construction nursing homes has got nothing to do with the global

review of the base hospitals which was a regular process established to identify ongoing problems that may come up as the years and the months go by.

The whole component of nursing homes and nursing home construction, Mr. Minister, was in the Department of Social Services when your government took over. All of the expertise, all of the excellent staff that was necessary in order to be able to do that work, was already there. When you transferred the function of nursing home construction and maintenance and grants to the Department of Health, in order that your Health budget may look bigger — and that's why you did it, and maybe you will argue that you did it because it's a better way to co-ordinate. Well I will argue that if it's a better way to co-ordinate, then you should establish a central agency that dealt with all senior citizens' programming and problems so that it's not confused and scattered all over the government as it is now.

You cannot argue, Mr. Minister, that just because you had a so-called priority on nursing homes, which is questionable when you look at the waiting lists, that somehow that prevented you from going on with the global review that was scheduled to take part in 1982, because a simple transfer of those positions and that function from the Department of Social Services to the Department of Health had nothing to do with the global review.

An Hon. Member: — A little order in here, Mr. Chairman.

(1445)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, as the member from Saskatoon Eastview decides to yell from his seat, it's difficult to be able to make comments and ask questions when that continues on the government side of the House. I'm quite prepared to continue when he has settled down, so that the minister can hear what I have to say.

Now, Mr. Minister, all of your arguments on this are incorrect and only made in order to defend the mistake you made. Even if you did not carry out the global review, Mr. Minister, one of the things that the Department of Health should have done — and you know that it did not do — is monitor the situation in between to find out what cracks were developing in the health care system. That monitoring was not done. There was a failure and you know it, and some other people know it.

I submit to you, sir, you did not . . . you cancelled the global review that was supposed to take place in 1982 for one reason, because you knew that if you undertook that global review you would be forced to provide increased funding to those hospitals and increase staff because problems were beginning to show up. And you and the government had decided you were not going to provide that funding. And you were not going to provide that increased staff, and the result of that has been what you have been confronted with in recent months: growing waiting lists, understaffing of bedside care, situations in some hospitals that some of the nurses who work there every day say have been dangerous situations, because you failed, sir, to do this global review. You have said it in

this House. You conscientiously decided not to do it. That was the wrong decision. It was motivated by political reasons, and not motivated by the need to look after the health care needs of our base hospitals.

And so now you're faced with a problem. You decide when you think you're going to have an election that you're going to announce \$100 million grant or enrichment funding which the hospitals are still wondering where it is, in spite of all your consultations. You refuse to indicate in this House how much staff have now been allocated under this enriched funding. And the reason you do it, sir, is because you know that when that news is out, and the final information is given to the hospitals, many of them are going to be extremely upset.

I have heard that one of the major base hospitals has been told that the increase in their staff component will be 5.5 positions, and all of them are not bedside or nursing care positions, as you have said they were going to be. And I know you will say, oh but we're going to go back and we're going renegotiate that. Well I say, stop playing your games. And I say the reason you're now in the difficult situation you're in is because you didn't have that global review, because you were too busy negotiating with the oil companies how much money you were going to give them. You and your government weren't interested in negotiating with the hospitals under the well-established and perfectly good and well-functioning global review system. You were not interested in negotiating with the hospitals to find out what their problems were because you had a different political agenda. That is your government.

And so here we are . . . here we are faced with some crisis situations for which no one can be blamed other than yourself and your cabinet. You have said in this House, global review was not undertaken because you decided you weren't going to do it. And I say no amount of excuses on your part can make up or defend that position. You cannot say that your priorities had changed, because if you say your priorities were changed to some other issues — and they may have been the good issues; I will not argue that — but when you decided that those other issues had a higher priority than hospital staffing, then you were admitting that you are the cause of the problems that hospitals are now facing, sir.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I listen with interest to the member opposite. Mr. Chairman, over the past three weeks I have noticed in this House, every time that we mention the nursing home program that this government instituted, it touches a nerve on the other side. And rightly it should, because they placed the moratorium on nursing home construction, and they know they neglected a priority in health care delivery in this province.

The member makes much that it was under Social Services. I challenge him to go out to any parts of the health care delivery program and ask them if they don't believe that moving the special care home construction into Health was not the right way to go. Unanimously the people across this province say it was.

The member also questions the need for a \$300 million capital program in acute care hospitals. I want that on

record. He said, you made a conscious decision to do that. He believes that was the wrong decision, from his remarks. I stand here in this Chamber, and I say to you and my colleagues and the members opposite and the people of Saskatchewan that I do not believe that the 300 million capital construction program in health care, a great part of it going to acute care facilities, was a mistake. It was simply addressing a need that had not been addressed in the previous 11 years.

The member likes to let on that there has been no financing going into the hospitals. He believes the only way that you can improve and address situations of hospitals is with a global review. That simply is not correct . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That simply is not correct.

If the member from Pelly wants to continue to shout from his seat, as he is accustomed to do, let him do so. When he is quiet, I will answer the question.

Mr. Chairman, for your information and for the information of the members opposite, since 1981-82 where there was \$344,329,540 expended in the hospitals of Saskatchewan, compare that to 1986-87 — there hasn't been a global review, but compare these figures — where it is \$500,413,690 expended in the hospitals of Saskatchewan, an increase, Mr. Chairman, of 49 per cent — of 49 per cent.

Where the member gets his figure of 5.5 positions from, for one of the base hospitals, far be it for me to know. I tell you, I tell the member opposite, I tell the members of this Assembly, and I tell the people of Saskatchewan that may be watching: whoever misinformed that member of that figure, I can tell you, it's sheer nonsense, simply not correct. The member may have been subject to bad advice. So be it.

I want to tell you that over the years, irregardless of a global review, we have put in initiatives into the hospitals of Saskatchewan to address what I believe are types of care; they're in the betterment of Saskatchewan health, and are keeping pace with the new technologies and the new deliveries of service that we see in our hospitals.

I will cite two, just as examples. Number one, the improvement of staffing components in neonatal care. Today, Mr. Chairman, we can take premature babies in our neonatal wards, and with the type of care they're given, given these little people who, for no fault of their own, have been born prior to the time when normal delivery would have taken place. You understand as well as anybody else that these little people are born with certain aspects of development that need to occur, which normally under normal circumstances would occur within the womb.

We are capable, in our base hospital and the University Hospital and in the General Hospital, of providing an environment in the kind of care that those young people, little babies, can develop and can mature and develop to the way that they were designed to do. I visited many of those. I see that happening and I think that is in the best interest of health care, and that's where we put additional staff, without a global review.

Another area — and I think the member will agree with me, and I hope he'll stand in his place and support what I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, you know, and we've talked about this. You have mutual friends that I have who have undergone heart bypasses — situations where 10 years ago these gentlemen that I'm referring to, who are perhaps 55, 60 years of age, would have succumbed, would have died because of heart failure.

Today we're able to do bypasses — single, double, triple, up to five bypasses. That takes more staff. We have addressed that over the years. So for the member to stand in here and say, because you haven't had a global review you have neglected the needs of the hospitals, is simply not correct — simply not correct.

I've cited two examples. I could go on and describe what we're doing presently in the barter system for CAT scans, so that people who are requiring operations for tumours may have it zeroed in to the exact area where that tumour is. Sophisticated technology. Those things are in place.

And in some cases, by the use of a CAT scan, the type of exploratory surgery that people were subjected to previously may not be necessary. Those are all advances; those are things that I believe, Mr. Chairman, are advancing health care in Saskatchewan, and those have all been done without a global review.

This year, as I've said, when we look at a patient care improvement program of \$100 million — and \$100 million in my language is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, a lot of money, a heck of a lot of money — in keeping with that we are doing a global review of the base hospitals.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I've indicated to you and to the member opposite that there have been considerable improvements in the base hospitals over the past four years — 49 per cent increase in the budgeting, and also, more important than that, the development and the keeping pace with new technologies, new operating procedures, new methods of saving lives that are benefiting all the people of this province.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the minister had to take 15 minutes to answer a straightforward question would indicate . . . Was it Shakespeare who said, methinks the lady protests too much? Every time the minister has gotten up in this House during these estimates and has felt the need to make a big speech, that usually has reflected that he has been feeling uneasy about what some people are thinking about what the actual results have been, Mr. Minister.

But I was interested in one comment you made. You said in your comments . . . And you referred to staff allocations under your enrichment program. Therefore you must now know . . . Previously you said you did not have that information because consultations were taking place, but you now have indicated in this House that you now have concluded those consultations in many of these hospitals and so you have the enrichment staff positions available to you.

I want to simply ask you a straightforward question: can

we now, today, receive the staff allocations under your enrichment program for those hospitals in which that has been done? And I know it has been done in the base hospitals. Can we get that today in that we have not been able to get it in the past because you have said that the process was not complete. You have now said, this afternoon, the process is complete. It's on the record. And I would like you to tell us if you can give us that information.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't feel uneasy about improvements in heart bypasses, neonatal care, and in CAT scans. Member opposite may not think those are important. I believe those are very, very important to health care in this province. The member, because I said that 5.5 increase in a base hospital was simply incorrect — simply incorrect — surely the member opposite who was at one time a Health minister, I believe, and a minister of Finance, must realize, must realize in a \$100 million program that certainly there would be more than 5.5 per cent increase in a base hospital . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 5.5 positions. That even makes it worse. That even makes it worse, sir — 5.5 positions. I mean, where is his lack of understanding? Surely he must realize, in a \$100 million program, that a base hospital, one of the six big hospitals in this province, would only get 5.5 positions? I mean, that simply is incredible.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I told the members in this House on numerous occasions that we are working with the hospitals to work out the staff enrichment position, what portion of the 300 nursing positions that will go into the hospital this year — will be allocated to various hospitals. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do those hospitals are autonomous boards, and until those figures are worked out in my department, taken to the boards, confirmed, I don't know what the final figure will be. It may well be that the board says, no, we don't want to see that deployment. Go back and rework those figures and see if we can put some staff here and some staff there and change the pattern.

(1500)

That is the mandate that they're given. That's why we have boards. I listened with interest to the member's questions a few minutes ago. He said, why don't you establish a central agency; a central agency to control this or that.

That's where that member and I vary at philosophical views. He may believe that the world runs better when a central agency directs local people to what a central agency, in all its great wisdom, thinks should happen. I disagree with that. I believe that the role of the central agency is to divide up the money that the people have, as to the best way it can possibly be used, in consultation and in co-operation with those local groups. And I believe that it is the mandate and the responsibility of those local groups, hospital boards, to deploy those dollars, once agreed upon, into placing positions in the best possible areas of their hospitals to deliver top quality service.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well it's quite regrettable, Mr.

Minister, that you have to take things that are said and twist them around and put meanings on them that obviously are not the intention.

When I talked about a central agency, I was saying to you, sir, that senior citizens of Saskatchewan and senior citizens' organizations have been telling us . . . And they've been telling you, although you do not want to admit it — they've been telling you through your officials because you don't have enough time to meet with most of them, as is the record that you have had. But they are saying, we are finding it very difficult to go to one department to deal with one kind of program for senior citizens and go to another department to deal with another program and go to Health to deal with another component of senior citizens' programming. And so they say, why don't you somehow co-ordinate senior citizens' programming so that they could go to one place, one place in government, and be able to get the answers?

There is no need for the kind of confused disorganization that presently exists. And you know, Mr. Minister, I will even go so far as to say that it wasn't well enough co-ordinated prior to 1982. I mean, let's put aside the partisanship and let's be honest about it. I happen to believe that that kind of a co-ordination which senior citizens' groups and organizations have been asking for makes a lot of sense. You have said you don't agree. Well, that's fine. We'll agree to disagree because the policies of your government and the policies of our party now clearly on this issue have been established. You're saying, scatter it around so that there is confusion and no co-ordination of senior citizens programming. We say, it should be co-ordinated. And if it means establishing an agency or one department — which it may be an existing department or it doesn't have to be a new one — but where all senior citizens' programs can be co-ordinated, we say that makes good sense, because senior citizens have told us that makes good sense. And we agree with them.

When I asked you the question about whether you would table the information, you somehow decided that you had to talk about information about staffing. You decided that you had to go and talk about heart bypasses and CAT scanners, all of which had nothing to do, as good as those things might be, with the question.

Well, you know and I know and so does the world know out there, because people talk to each other, believe it or not, that the decisions of your department on allocations of staff components under your enrichment program have been made. Your officials have indicated to the base hospitals what those positions are.

You announced that program in February. We have been here through a good part of March. It is now the end of April. That's a three-month period, and give or take a few days because you probably announced it not exactly on the 1st of February. Are you saying that after three months in which you've had an opportunity to consult with the hospitals, you've still not been able to tell them what their allocations on staff enrichment is going to be? Are you saying you have not given that information? One question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well in regards to senior citizens, and he made reference to that, I can tell you, senior citizens across this province have responded to this government time after time, saying, thank you for putting continuing care under Health; saying thank you for establishing district co-ordinating committees so that they have access to those facilities, be they home care, be they acute care hospitals, or be they special care homes.

And furthermore, and he may not be aware of it, but my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, myself, the minister of Justice of the time, put together a seniors' directory. Senior citizens across this province have that directory, indicating where they can access various services from this government. That has been well received by seniors.

He asked specifically about the tabling of information regarding the patient care enrichment. I have told him, and I will repeat the answer, that we are in consultation with the hospitals. Certainly we are. But before, until the allotment of staff have been approved by those boards who run those hospitals, I can't give a firm figure.

It may well be the board will take the administrator's figures and say, no, we don't agree with those; go back, discuss with the department; see if we can put more staff in this area; change the staff ratio here; and so on. That's what hospital boards are charged with. That's the responsibility that is given to them as a board member.

And until they have firmed up and approved whatever staffing components will go into their hospitals, I couldn't and shouldn't indicate what those figures are. Because until they have been totally adopted, sanctioned by those boards, they are not firm figures.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, have none of the hospital boards met and considered the decision of your department? Are you saying none of the hospital boards have met to date?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, they haven't met and considered those at this time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Not any of them? They haven't met and they haven't indicated, Mr. Minister . . . Well, he's obviously preoccupied; I'll wait so he can hear the question. Is that okay?

Mr. Minister, you're saying on the record that none of the hospitals have met, and none of the hospitals have indicated to you whether they are satisfied with the allocation that your department has indicated that they are going to be getting. Two things for the record: they haven't met; and none of them have indicated that they agree or disagree with the initial allocation your department has provided.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That's correct. Not at this point. They haven't met to give the final approval to it.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Okay. I just wanted to establish that. I won't pursue that any more, other than my discussions with hospitals. But I just wanted to make it clear what your answer would be.

Now, Mr. Minister, let me go back for just a moment and then I'm going to be through with this. I'll go back to the whole question that I began on, the issue of the global review, because it is of some concern.

The reason why the global budget review system was implemented several years ago was so that the total operation of the hospitals could be considered together. That's what it was done for, so that some people could sit together from the Department of Health and the expertise you have, and the perfectly capable people in our hospitals could sit together and do a review of the whole hospital operation so that you would avoid ad hoc-ery, which you have now carried out in the last four years, which may have looked after some crisis situations, but neglected other aspects of the hospital operation. And because that global review was never carried out, that's what's happened.

Because you refused to carry out a normal and established practice, which made a lot of good sense, and you agree — you've agreed to it earlier — because you cancelled that global review in 1982, your approach has been one of ad hoc-ery. And the least you could have done is that you could have had a monitoring of the hospitals' problems in between that period of time when you cancelled the global review and the present time. You could have had a monitoring. As a matter of fact, because this monitoring wasn't done adequately, I happen to know that there was a great deal of embarrassment by some people, and that is well-known.

So I simply conclude by saying this, Mr. Minister. When you cancelled the global review system which is intended to look after the global operation of the hospital so that it operates and functions in all of its aspects — when you cancelled that, you then undertook an approach of ad hoc-ery, and therefore some sectors and some components of the hospital system have been breaking down because of your ad hoc approach.

And that's where your failure has been, and that's why you have some of the problems that are facing you today. And that's why you have a deathbed repentance, \$100 million, as you say. And I'll never believe it until I see it, and you refuse to tell us exactly what it is — enrichment program — because you knew the problems you created. And now as a deathbed repentance before an election, you think you'll save your hide by trying to fix up some more of the holes.

One last question and then I won't ask any more . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I'll take that back because depending on your answer I may have to ask some more. But the question is: is this allocation of the enrichment staff positions, plus your whole allocation of your present budget for health care in the hospitals, is it being done by a complete global review as was done before? Is that what you're doing right now? Is that what you're doing or are you just patching up the holes?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I must go back to the figures again — because it's obvious the member opposite missed this — that I believe going from 344 million to 500 million, a 49 per cent increase, certainly

augurs well over that period of time without the necessity of a global review.

He indicated, is a global review going on. I said, and I've told him time after time, that certainly we're looking at staff enrichments. Those things are taking place now and a complete global review is taking place. There will be more following the appointment of the staff, or the allocation of these staff. We're in a global review this year.

But I just want to read into the record so that the member opposite realizes some of the initiatives that have taken place during this period of time. And I'm not going to talk about the capital construction. That's well understood by the people of Saskatchewan. But since 1982 there's been over 400 new nursing positions have been allocated by this government to hospitals throughout this province. Since 1982, major increases with cost implications exceeding 800,000 per year have been authorized to expand open-heart surgery in Regina; and 125,000 for extended operation of the CAT scan unit at the Plains Health Centre. That doesn't even include the new CAT scans that are coming into place at a million dollars each — six of them.

A new pediatric intensive care unit has been developed at the University Hospital with costs exceeding \$700,000 per year; 1.2 million beginning in '85-'86 to double the CAT scan capacity in Saskatchewan — and that's more than double — now it is six; 500,000 additional funding for clinic services fund to provide an income supplement to staff positions; 152,000 to provide improved pediatric assessment and treatment services in Saskatchewan; a developmental assessment unit for high-risk infants has been developed at the Regina General Hospital for southern Saskatchewan residents.

One that I was personally involved with — and if the members want to discuss it I'd be glad to; I think it's in last year's estimates — where I talked about the provision of apnea monitors. So special funding has been provided to the Regina General Hospital and the University Hospital for the purchase of apnea monitors.

Just so that you understand, Mr. Chairman, what an apnea monitor is, it's a device that if a young child is in danger of being left alone and perhaps succumbing to what we call SIDS or sudden infant death syndrome, which happens to many babies, and we don't know the reason why, then these monitors are . . . The best I can describe them as are kind of electronic mattresses, cushions, that the baby rests on, and should the baby stop breathing an alarm is sounded. We provide those now on a rental basis through the hospitals. Those were not available previously.

I could tell you a long, very personal story about that, but it is in *Hansard*. And I can tell you, for parents that have lost a child, certainly this is an initiative that they feel very strongly about because I've had letter after letter from people who have accessed these apnea monitors. And a baby who may have otherwise died to SIDS is alive and strong and well and kicking and going to school and carrying a lunch pail and playing hockey and doing all the things young boys should do in this province. And without that kind of device, they may have been an infant

mortality.

(1515)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I just want to respond to your argument about adequate funding, and here's some evidence of why the ad hoc approach has worked so badly. Because I will just make one reference, and I will read it to you. It deals with the Regina General Hospital, and it goes back to 1985. And I think it's a good example of what's been happening across the whole province. But in 1985, there was a request for financial assistance by the Regina General Hospital presented to the city council in Regina. And it is not an insignificant amount of money. The proposal, Mr. Minister, by the Regina hospital, forced upon them because of your government's inadequate funding, was this, and I read from the memorandum presented to the city council at that time:

Regina General Hospital has requested a 1 mill levy on the equalized assessment per year from the city of Regina for 1987-1989. This approximates \$440,000 per year, using 1985 equalized mill values. In addition, Regina General Hospital also plans to approach various Regina corporations for donations.

And I won't read the whole thing because in fact it's too lengthy. But it also goes on to say:

Approximately \$7 million of new equipment will be required by the Regina General, and the bulk of the funds will have to come from various fund-raising efforts of the Regina General Hospital.

Coupled with that is the fact that the city of Regina, currently, at that time, was paying \$800 million annually as a hospital operations levy.

Now the only reason I raise this, Mr. Minister, at this time, is because it points out very clearly why there's so many people in the public — as us — have difficulty believing all your government's boastings about the great work it has done in the health care field. And on paper it looks good. But in reality, there are failures, the numbers of which cannot be counted. And you have just made it very clear that you have done such an excellent job of providing funding. If that's the case, why have we now, in our health care system in Saskatchewan, been led to this kind of a situation?

I submit to you for this reason — and I will do that when we talk with the Minister of Urban Affairs later. We have had in Canada the federal government reneging on its commitments and its agreements for certain national programs, health of which is one of them. What the federal government has done is shifted the burden of costs to the provinces, with your quiet acquiescence. They have shifted those costs; what you, in turn, have done is you've taken that shift of the cost and you've transferred it to the property tax payer, as is evidenced by this. And this is not the only place it's happening.

The reason why some hospitals have been able to

maintain a reasonably adequate program, and in fact in some cases quite a good one in most cases, is because what's happened is that they've asked the property tax payer to make up your short-fall. That's what's happened.

You may talk about the increased funding you have provided, but that's not a good enough argument, because the problem is there and so therefore you have not provided enough funding. And if you, a government, or your Minister of Finance, the former one and the present one, and your Premier, hadn't decided that it was a bigger priority to give the oil companies \$300 million a year than it was to provide some additional funding to the hospitals and do the kind of planning and global reviews which would solve the problems, then we wouldn't have this kind of a situation.

There has been a major tax shift. The tax shift comes from the federal government to the province, who in turn has loaded it on the property tax payer. And you look at any newspaper today or over the next several weeks and the past several weeks, you will see every day in the newspaper another headline saying this community or that municipality has increased the mill rate simply because of inadequate funding on your part.

The taxpayers had to make up the difference. Even though you may talk about the money your spending — and that's where you've gone wrong. And even when you spend your money, because you don't know how to look at the whole program, you do it in an ad hoc way, and some parts of the system are showing cracks. And now you've had a price to pay for it — for sure, that's it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I can hardly see, when you fund 100 per cent of capital construction and 100 of operating, that that's ad hoc-ery. I think that is a well-established system of financing.

Certainly hospitals indicated to me that they had been approached by individuals, by charities, by philanthropists, indicating that there were people out in society who felt that they would like to be able to contribute to hospitals as a very worthwhile way of expending some of their club moneys, some of their personal moneys. So we have, since taking over government, allowed hospitals to establish foundations.

I think, if you talk to University Hospital, St. Paul's Hospital, and various other ones, hospitals here in the city, you will see that the foundation concept is going over quite well. I remember not too long ago where the Mitchell family of Saskatoon gave \$1 million towards University Hospital through the foundation.

So I just have to say to you that I think, with that, it is not a shirking of responsibility. It's certainly allowing individuals out there in society who say, I want to help out, I want to give something of the money that I have made or that our club has made to what we think is a worthwhile institution, an acute care hospital — we have, through the formation of foundations, facilitated that opportunity.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I want to take a few minutes to go over some routine questions. As we are

winding down the Health estimates, I want to do some routine questions on your personal staff. If you can give me a list of your personal staff and their salaries and any perks that they might get, if they have an automobile, if you have that information here, if you'd sent it over. I have a couple of other questions to ask based on the information you'll give me.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I will provide it for you as soon as I can. Certainly there are no perks; there are no automobiles or anything of that nature. If the page is here, we could send this over.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I missed what you said about automobiles. Did you say they have . . . They don't have any assigned. Do they have access to the CVA fleet of cars? I would imagine they do. If they need a vehicle, what do they do? Do they use their personal car and you pay them mileage if they're going out of town to do some work, or would they use the CVA vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Very rarely it is required, but if they need to use a car to go to a government function with me that they would have to drive, they have access to a CVA poor car. But it is very seldom it is ever used.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wanted you to tell me, as well, on the issue of executive aircraft, how does that work? I believe there's been a change in policy and that the department now pays directly to the Central Vehicle Agency the cost that the Minister of Health would use. Have you got that number with you, what your department paid for the use of the executive aircraft in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I can provide that for you. It isn't all completed for this year. Perhaps on the use of executive air, it's better to ask the Minister of Supply and Service. But basically the policy is that the Department of Health will pick up the tab for myself and whoever I would authorize to fly with me.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, I will be asking the minister on the overall. But what I'm talking about here is your spending estimates, is the amount that you would pay for air travel and use of the executive aircraft, and that number, if you could get it for me. I would also like the list of trips that you're paying for, and who else is on the flight, so I could have that from your department. And I'm just wanting now not the complete list from CVA, but as it would apply to your department. Because this would be, I believe, in the first subvote under general administration that that money would be paid out. And if you could give me the commitment that you would get it for me, let's say, a reasonable time, two weeks, then we could maybe go on to another topic.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I will give you the costs of my travel and the number of people that travelled with me, and I will provide that to you. I should be able to have that in two weeks.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister has indicated that he will give the number of trips, the number of people. But what I want — and you will know why I want it — is the individuals who rode with you. And those are legitimate,

and I don't want to get into a harangue about another minister and his travel with the executive aircraft. But I would like the minister to realize before we get into a harangue that, if he refuses to give that list, then he understands why he won't give it.

And I'm sure that there's no reason why, if you're taking your executive assistants with you — perfectly legitimate; absolutely, perfectly legitimate. If you're flying to a conference in Saskatoon and your family go along — perfectly, absolutely legitimate; that if it's at no expense to the taxpayers, there's nothing wrong with that. And the only problem that you would have, and I don't believe the minister has that problem, would be if it's being used inappropriately. And I would like the names of those people who went with you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly, I think, when you get into Supply and Services estimates you'll be able to find all that information out.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, the Minister of Supply and Services never has it when we come to his estimates. And every year I've asked him that question, and he doesn't give it to me in estimates. Every year he doesn't give it to me in estimates, and that's why I'm trying to get it from you. Because I think that you give out information a little better than the member from Meadow Lake, because he's very secretive about what he gives out.

An Hon. Member: — You've always given it to us before.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Pardon? Well that's what I'm saying, but I'm talking about the minister who I have been dealing with. Well if the members all want to yell at the same time, Mr. Chairman, it's going to take us a long time to get finished. And this massive majority continues to do this, yell and holler from their seats so we can't work, and I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

(1530)

Well the member from Maple Creek is yelling that we lie. Well I . . . besides . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you didn't. Well I heard you say it, and I'm sure that the chairman did. But I say it's unbecoming of members to yell from their seats and now swear and now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I challenge the member from Maple Creek to say that one out loud. I'll bet she won't, because there's an old former Prime Minister who got in trouble saying those kinds of words.

Well the hollering keeps going on, but we'll try to carry on in spite of all the noise, Mr. Chairman. And I want to ask the minister if he can give us a complete list of who was on the aircraft that you paid for. That's a perfectly legitimate question. And to say that somebody else is going to answer that for you only leads one to believe why you would not answer it and depend on another minister to tell us who is on the aircraft that you paid for. And I was hoping that estimates would get done quickly. But this is an important issue, and I'll tell you we're not going to be moving very quickly if we can't get this answer.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly, as I've said, I will give

the number of flights I've taken, the number of people that have accompanied me on that flight. That is tradition in this House that that be given. It was the same information that the members opposite gave us when we were in opposition, and I'm quite willing to supply that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, if it is the information that we gave you when we were in government, it was because that's what you asked for. I am asking for the people who were with you on the flights, and we'll get into it then. If you're not willing to give the names, then we'll get into it about the member from Wilkie and reasons why we're concerned about it. And I'll tell you that we'll get into it for a few hours, because we have a minister, or had a minister, who was using the aircraft improperly. You know that. You know he got his fingers burnt and is no longer a resident of the province and has moved to Alberta, and one would wonder about . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. You know full well, the member from Shaunavon, that that has nothing at all to do with the estimates of Health at hand, and I would ask you to refrain from going into areas that are outside the realm of Health.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Using the executive aircraft in the Department of Health, and the minister's use of aircraft, has everything to do with Health estimates . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Please be seated. I tend to agree wholly with the member from Shaunavon that the use of aircraft by the Minister of Health is within the purview of these estimates, but reference to use of aircraft by another minister, other than the one being questioned in estimates, is not in order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, it's an interesting opinion that the chairman takes, that use of the aircraft by ministers isn't an issue with the public. But I . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The member from Shaunavon full well knows what I stated — when I stated that the use of an aircraft by the minister in question during his estimates is within the realm of this committee. And that is what I stated, and that's what *Hansard* will show. And I also indicated that use of aircraft by other ministers and other departments that are not at the time being taken up in estimates are out of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, we're going to take some time to go into detail if this is how we're going to operate in this committee. I'll say this is the reason that we've been here for almost three weeks, because of cover-up and trying to sweep under the rug important information. And the minister continues on trying to hide answers from the committee.

Now why, Mr. Chairman, would a minister not tell you who was on the aircraft with him? Why wouldn't he want to tell it? Mr. Chairman will be suspicious, I'm sure, and if he isn't, I question why he wouldn't be, when a minister would not give a list to the public of who was on the aircraft with him. Do you think the public who bought the aircraft for you to use are impressed when you say — when we ask on their behalf, who is using the aircraft? You say: I don't have to tell you? To the public of

Saskatchewan the Minister of Health says: I don't have to tell you who went with me. Well I say that it's important that you do, because let me tell you that there have been instances in the past where people have not told the whole story about the use of the executive aircraft and got their fingers burnt, and I . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Please be seated. I've already indicated that any references outside of the estimates of Health, in terms of aircraft, are out of order.

Mr. Shillington: — A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, arguing by analogy is scarcely a new tactic. It's as old as Aristotle, if not a good deal older than that.

I listened to the minister with some interest. What the minister said is, his argument was going to be it has been given by other ministers, why not you. That's a perfectly relevant argument. And I think, though members of the committee and the public can make up their own minds, I think it's a rational one. How on earth can that argument, which is the one my colleague was making, be out of order? I really ask you for a ruling.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I really find it rather unusual that all of a sudden, although as my colleague from Regina Centre has indicated that in the process of debate and in the well-honoured tradition and rules of debate one is able to make a point and ask a question by using examples from other aspects. And that's what is happening here, Mr. Chairman.

My colleague, the member from Shaunavon, has ask a question about travel on government aircraft by the minister, and he has used the example of another such incident of travel to support his argument that this minister has an obligation to provide the answers.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with using that kind an argument to support his position and his question? I submit that that is allowed under the rules. It always has been, and I think it should be still, otherwise we are rewriting the rules, and we are not mandated in this committee to rewrite the rules.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, I believe the practice of this House over the 11 years I have been here is that the flying portion is usually government services or the responsible department, but if a minister so wishes to answer about his own flying, that has always been accepted. But the purview that the members are going to is a new area that has never been allowed before.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On the point of order, I would just like to explain the feeling that we have about why this point of order is important, because it severely curtails what an opposition can do if you can't relate from one department to the other.

For example, if in the Department of Health, as we have in the past when a transfer was occurring . . . Let's say if nursing home funding from Social Services to Health — and you will remember the debate that went on at that time, and we were making the point that when nursing homes were transferred to Health — we referred to Social Services many times and how much money was coming

out of the department of Social Services and moved into Health. And at no time did any chairman say, you can't talk about Social Service's budget while we're talking about Health. There was never a comment made.

I think it's interesting that you would take the opinion that in talking about the member from Wilkie and his dismissal from cabinet because of wrongful use of the executive aircraft . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's what he's doing. He resigned from cabinet over the issue of use of the executive aircraft — the issue of the use of executive aircraft, that you would refuse to allow us to make that analogy. That simply doesn't make any sense, and the committee can't function if we can't refer to moneys and things that happen in other departments, and you're going to stick strictly to the issue that you can only mention health in Health estimates.

Well I'll say that we have a difficult time. And I think that it's totally proper for us, when we're asking the Minister of Health about travel on executive aircraft, to ask him for the list of people who were with him. Because if this were the issue, that would mean that comparing . . . The minister who used to be the minister of transport or the Highways minister, the member from Wilkie, and the reasons that he was stepped down from cabinet, were properly dealt with in this Assembly. We were able to talk about it. And we can make the analogy of what will happen if ministers aren't accountable for the use of executive aircraft and what would happen if this minister is allowed to hide this information.

That's what he's trying to do. He's saying to the public, clearly, he's saying clearly to the public that he's not going to give the information about who was on the aircraft with him when he used it.

And I think he's going down a wrong track. I think he's taking his lines, not from his deputy, not from the people that are paid to advise him, but he's listening to other cabinet colleagues on this one. I think that's what's happening.

I think that we're in a difficult spot if I can't make the comparison between the former minister of Highways; inappropriate use of executive aircraft and his subsequent stepping out of cabinet, and making the analogy with the Minister of Health and why he should be giving the list.

Why in the world would you try to stop that process from happening? Well I'll tell you, I think I know. I think we have a massive majority government into the fifth year of its mandate, and they're afraid to let the people . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. You are speaking to a point of order and nothing else. If you wish, continue.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well the point of order was what we can discuss in this committee. And what I'm making the point is that I should be able to talk about a former minister of Highways who inappropriately used an executive aircraft, by his own admission . . . And I respect the man for admitting that; I respect him for admitting that and stepping out of cabinet. And now we have a minister who refuses to give us information on the use of the executive aircraft.

I say to you that we should be allowed to do that. And that's why I'm supporting the point of order made by my colleague, the member from Regina Centre, because the minister has said here that he's not going to give us that list. He's not going to give us the list. He's not going to tell us if it were — who knows? — it may be some Conservative president who is riding on the aircraft with him. I'm not saying that, but why doesn't he give us the list? Why wouldn't he give us the list? I mean, the public will be suspicious, as they have every right to be.

Who was on the aircraft with him? That's the question. And if there is no one except executive assistants, and if there is no one except his family when it's on a legitimate trip, no one is going to argue; no one is going to argue.

All we want is a list of who was paid for by the Department of Health . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. You are now stretching beyond the precepts of the point of order and going into questioning of the estimates. I will now take a moment or two to determine your arguments, and I will give you a ruling on the point of order. I'm sorry. Member from Kindersley.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I think the ruling that you made that is being challenged by the members opposite is as follows: you made the ruling that when questioning in the Department of Health estimates you have to stick to Department of Health issues. This is what you've indicated. This has been a long-standing rule and it's a discretionary call by the chairman as to whether or not it's Health-related or into something else related. And that becomes a discretionary call, obviously of the Chair.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, he can speak. You can't cut us off.

Mr. Chairman: — Are you impugning I would? Are you impugning that I would?

Mr. Shillington: — I wish to comment what was said by the member from Kindersley. We've always, since time immemorial, got information with respect to ministers' expenses. That has not ever been in the Department of Health estimates; it's always been in Executive Council or somewhere else. We have always got it.

This is the first year it has ever been off limits, if that's indeed what it is. Well that's your argument. That's your argument. Your argument is that because the money isn't spent . . . because the money doesn't appear in the Health estimates, it is therefore off limits. We've always got this information. There's nothing new about it.

I won't repeat myself, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the argument itself, but it was merely an argument that this is information which is in the public interest to get. That's all his argument was; nothing more than that.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, the way this has always been dealt with in the House in the eight years that I have been here — in the eight years that I have been here — is to deal with it when it comes up in Supply and Services with regard to CVA, and you provide that information. That has been provided when they were in

office, when the opposition were government, and it's been provided that way when we were in government. And that's always been the case.

The point of order raised by your ruling, Mr. Chairman, was this: they said you have no right to tell them that they can go off into other fields. Well certainly the Chair has the right to bring members back into line to deal with the question of Health estimates.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — On this point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite has just said to you that you as a chairman, or anyone else as a chairman, can say to the members of this Legislative Assembly what they can or cannot ask . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's what you said. That's what the member from Kindersley just said, and he protests now.

This is not the function and the role of the chairperson. The function and the role of the chairman is simply, Mr. Chairman, to uphold the rules of this House. For the member from Kindersley's argument, if we were to uphold that argument, it's like saying that when you're considering the estimates of the Department of Health, you can talk about . . . you cannot talk about the policies of the Department of Finance which provide the funding to the Department of Health. That's what the nature of this point of order is.

The questions that are being asked here are perfectly in order, because by asking the questions, we are using evidence that has come up . . . that has come to light on previous occasions in this House to support the questions we're asking. And I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, if you would ask your Clerk and your Assistant Clerk to follow through on that, they will tell you that we are perfectly in order.

Any opposition or even members, private members on the government side, are perfectly in order to use those kinds of analogies in order to support questions which are asked, which the minister may or may not choose to answer.

We perfectly agree, as we've said before, that he may choose not to answer them. He will have to face the consequences of that and so will his colleagues, the consequences of refusing to answer questions which are legitimate and which the public has a right to know the answers to.

(1545)

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, not to lengthen the discussion, but I would suggest that 11 years of being in this building and watching this question over eight years when I was in opposition, and the replies from the gentlemen that are now in the opposition, the statement and the policy of this House became that under government services you could ask about all flying. It became also that only did the minister answer when he flew and when he flew . . . And the policy of the previous government was, you didn't give names, you gave — there were so many passengers. The precedent has been set in 11 years. Now the members on the other side wish to change the precedent . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

And all I'm saying to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, is to ask the question on this estimate, on the Minister of Health — how much he flies and the amount of bodies that were in the aircraft with him, has been the precedent and the history. To ask more than that has never been allowed before in precedent.

Mr. Chairman: — I do believe that both sides of the House have had ample opportunity and latitude in discussing this point of order. I will read through the rule book and in a few moments I will give my ruling on that matter.

I have determined as my role as chairman that there is merit to the point of order if and however it pertains to the ministry at hand. The ministry at hand this afternoon in the committee of the whole is the estimates of the Minister of Health. Analogies to another minister and the types of activities that that minister had involved himself in does not pertain to the Health estimates.

At the same time, I will remind the members of a ruling and a caution that I did make in this House two days previously regarding rule 494, which I know that you are all aware of, pertaining to what can and should not be discussed during estimates of a particular minister. Therefore, I find the point of order not valid.

An Hon. Member: — Well I'm going to challenge that ruling.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Order. Regarding my ruling and anticipating your question regarding the challenge, I would ask the member from Regina Centre to please take note of rule 471, item (1) in *Beauchesne's*:

The Chairman maintains order in the Committee of the Whole, deciding all questions of order subject to an appeal to the Speaker. No debate (no debate) is permitted on any decision.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm amazed that any chairman was able to find a ruling to keep order. There's been no order in this House . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I would hope that the member from Regina Centre is not impugning the role of the chairman to bring order back to this House. I for one take my position seriously and my position of neutrality seriously as a chairman, and I make a point of learning and looking up the rules.

Mr. Shillington: — I wasn't suggesting that you didn't take your job seriously. What I was suggesting is there hasn't been order in this committee during this session of the legislature, Mr. Chairman. I challenge that ruling.

Mr. Weiman: — Mr. Speaker, during consideration of Health estimates, a point of order was raised by the member of Shaunavon to the effect that questions regarding the travel by the former minister of Highways should be acceptable.

I ruled the question out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm not sure that this is a debatable

motion. One moment, please.

Mr. Weiman: — Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a correction, during the time of consternation I inadvertently wrote down the wrong member's name who raised the point of order, and I would like to correct that now. The member who raised the point of order, Mr. Speaker, was the member from Regina Centre, rather than the member from Shaunavon.

Mr. Speaker: — There is no debate on this question. The only question before the Assembly is: shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

Ruling sustained on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 26

Birkbeck	Klein
McLeod	Currie
Andrew	Martens
Taylor	Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Duncan	McLaren
Katzman	Young
Pickering	Hopfner
Folk	Weiman
Smith (Swift Current)	Rybchuk
Myers	Caswell
Hepworth	Baker
Dirks	Sauder
Embury	Gerich

Nays — 7

Blakeney	Lusney
Tchorzewski	Shillington
Thompson	Yew
Lingenfelter	

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Health Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I wonder if the minister has reconsidered and whether he will now give us a complete list of people who were on the flights with him that were paid for out of the estimates of the Department of Health. I understand you will give us the trips and the flights, where they were to and from, the number of people. And what I want is who was with you on each of those flights.

If you could prepare a list for me and agree to send them. I know you don't have them with you because you have told me that. But if you would give me the commitment to give them within two weeks, and I think that's perfectly reasonable, Mr. Chairman, and I don't expect him to have all of that right here, but I wonder if you could give us the list with the names.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, I will provide the member, in keeping with tradition of this House, I'll provide him with the number of miles travelled, the cost, and the number of people that accompanied me. And just to indicate to you that we are keeping with tradition, I would refer all members to page 1982 of *Hansard*, April 8, 1981, and I quote from the debate at that time from Mr. Thatcher:

As you provide us with that updated list to February 1981, I certainly don't want to trouble you and send you back in the intervening years. Perhaps you could provide us with the names and the updated list of not only the individual who booked the flight but the names of the people who accompanied him on the flight.

Response by the Hon. Mr. Robbins:

No, that's not government policy. It's just the number recorded on the flight.

So in keeping with tradition of this House, I will provide the same information.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister will know full well that what we are asking for here is the flights out of his department, the flights that were taken by people out of his department. And what he is telling us very clearly that he's not going to give them to us.

And what I'm saying is that, for a government who is talking about opening up and freedom of information, this is an interesting approach to take. And the case they refer to is the same government as they say didn't give out information. We're going to do the same thing, is what he's saying. That's the analogy they're making. We're going to do the same thing as you did. You were bad. You didn't give information. We're going to do the same thing. That's what they're saying to the committee, Mr. Chairman.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that with the experiences that we have had in the past with executive aircraft, that there is a suspicion out there of what cabinet ministers are using it for. It's in the public's mind. And I say to you that we would like to have that list that would include the names of the people who were with you, but you've refused to that. You've refused to do it, and let the record stand that the minister here is stalling us and stonewalling on information that the public thinks they should have. And we will leave it at that. It's one of the reasons we've been on Health estimates for almost three weeks because it's very difficult to get information out of this minister. And I would like it if you would give me the list of your out-of-province trips, if you would give me the out-of-province trips that you have made, and who accompanied you on each of those international and out-of-province trips that you have made in the past year.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We'll provide you with that information.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if you could as well

indicate what the salary of your top officials, a list that is traditional, I think you agree, to give me a list, names and titles of your officials — who are traditionally given — the deputy, ADM, and whether you will give me that commitment.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We'll provide that information for you.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister has sent a list of his staff across and you have here a list that I will read out: a ministerial adviser, \$4,000 a month or 48,000 a year; a ministerial assistant 2, \$3,179 a month or \$39,000; ministerial assistant 2, for 2,670 a month or 32,000; and a ministerial assistant B, 1,894 a month or 22,000 a year; and then two ministerial assistants A, one 1,514 a month and one 1,611 a month — for a total of 14,868 a month or a total of \$178,000 a year for personal staff. I wonder if the minister can indicate what that number was last year for that staff. Does this include all of your executive assistants or do you have some that would be in the department as well?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That's my executive assistants. There's one less than last year.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Can the minister tell me what kind of pay increases . . . Have they had a pay increase of any type since January 1 of 1985?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We'll provide that to you. There has been an increase for some; some have not had an increase. I'll provide that to you, though.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if you could give that to us now. I have some questions that I want to follow up on on pay increases. Can you give me, for each of the individuals you've listed here, what the pay increase was. I know this was traditional in the House last year. That information was given on each of the executive assistants and secretaries, and I wonder if you will give it to us now.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'll have to ask for a photocopy of the paper I gave you so that we can work it out.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I had wanted to ask a question too on the minister's own salary. Can you give me, in the last year, what is the salary now of a minister and what were your total expenses? Do you have that handy?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I believe that's in *Public Accounts*. I don't have it at the tip of my fingers. I think if you would check *Public Accounts*, you will see that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister will know that there are some who feel he's getting paid too much, but I do realize that . . . I believe that cabinet ministers have not had an increase in the past year, since '82. And that's not the point I want to make right now. But if you would get that for me, and what your expenses were for the past year, we can move along here.

I want to say as well that in the committee, the one point that I would make that we appreciate is being able to deal with all the points under subvote 1 because we have had an opportunity to cover off a good number of these

already — northern health services and dental plans and construction, which has now moved out, but we had our go at that. And I think without very much time being spent, we may have a couple of questions as we go down. Mr. Chairman, we are ready to move off of that subvote 1.

Just before we move off, there's one small item, and that is on other expenses. Can you tell me what the increase has been there? If you look at personal services, that has stayed relatively the same. But there has been a relatively big percentage increase in the other expenses. Can you tell me in general what those are?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's a new computer accounting system, government-wide. Our portion from Health is paid for under the admin subvote.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Who would that money have been paid to? Does it go to a private company or who would that go to? Is that a central . . . Would that go into the provincial computer operation or what is it?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mainly to SaskCOMP is what I'm informed.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Would you give me a breakdown of that portion of the increase. I know you may not have that with you today, but if you would send that to me, of what the proportion would be. SaskCOMP would get some of it, but obviously you would be paying some to some other computer company. And obviously, if you're just setting it up, some of it may be newly purchased equipment. If you make a commitment to send that to us.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I will give you a complete detail of our expenditures in the other category under admin services, subvote 1.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, just one question, Mr. Minister. Your department will have an advertising budget. Is that to be found under this subvote, or number 4? If it's another one I won't ask here.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Under subvote 4.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3 agreed to.

(1615)

Item 4

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is the item that I was looking for. Mr. Minister, can you tell us how much you have budgeted in here for advertising of all forms that the department will be doing in the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Approximately \$400,000.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And can you give me a breakdown

of what this will be spent for? Is it a program similar to Aware, or educational programs of various kinds or promoting programs of the government? Could you give me an idea — or if you have it there send over the paper and we won't take the time of the House.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I do have some figures here. The Safe Grad, we expect to spend about 85,000 on that; about 140,000 on Christmas alcohol; about 40,000 on the non-smoking program; and the other components may be advertisements for access for seniors, things that we were talking about a little earlier; maybe some other life-style type of advertising. We haven't got it all put together at this point in time. But to give you a general idea, I suppose it would be basically life-style and some for seniors.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, is this the subvote under which you would pay any expenditures incurred because of polling that your department may be planning to take?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, as I explained to you previously, say if we want to do a tracking on Safe Grad, and the impact, it would come in this subvote. I explained to you how we had tracked the Christmas advertising — the alcohol advertising — previously. That would come under this subvote.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Can you tell me how much has been allocated for those purposes in this budget?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, I couldn't. That would be part, as I say, of the remaining balance where I said seniors, other life-style things, and so on. We haven't allocated a specific amount for tracking.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, can you tell me, what is the name of the polling organization, or company, or agency that you will be using? Is it the same one as you have used in the past, or have you changed, or are you planning to change?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, we have no commitments to anyone for this year.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — But you may very well be doing polling. When you decide the kind of polling you will be doing to assess the impact of your advertising program, or whatever, will you name a polling agency, or will you be issuing a tender?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I suppose, like we do in many other things, I'll look for whoever can give us the best deal. We'll explore all kinds of companies and see what delivery of service they'll give us and what it will cost. At this point in time we haven't entered into any type of investigation of that nature. Until then, I can't say who it will be with, but I can tell you that we'll be looking for the one that we can get the best results for the cheapest amount of money.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well that's fair enough. If you do not have any particular polling that you have decided to do, then that's okay. But I guess you're telling me, therefore, because you're going to be looking for the most

economical agency or the agency that will do it for the best price and give you the most value for your dollar, did I hear you say, therefore, that you're going to issue tenders so that everybody will have an equal opportunity at it?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's rather hypothetical because I haven't decided whether I'm doing it yet, or not. So how would I say when I'm issuing a tender? I can tell you the way I do business: I look around for who's going to give me the best deal, who can provide the best service, and who can do it the cheapest. And I'll do that, and I think that's what one should be doing.

So to say, are you going to tender — I don't even know if I'm going to do any tracking at this point in time. I have some money set aside in case we do. But I can assure you, and I can assure the member opposite, that whoever I select to do it, or my department selects to do it, we will be driving a hard deal with them.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I'm asking you a question on government policy as it applies to your department. It's got nothing to do with what you decide to do on a whim or whatever reason you may decide to do it later. And surely you must know what your government's policy is. When you do polling, do you or do you not have tenders and give every polling agency in the province — let's us just stay within the province — an opportunity to get an equal crack at all? If all you're saying is that you will go out and you will ask certain people, what you're saying is that you will ask maybe the Ken Waschuk firm, which happens to be a high profile Conservative, to give you a bid or to tell you that this is the price he's going to give you, and then you may decide on that one simple discussion.

Well if the member from Meadow Lake wants to interrupt, I shall wait until he settles down, Mr. Chairman. I can't hear myself ask the question because the member from Meadow Lake yells across the floor, and when he settles down, I'll ask the question. Thank you.

Mr. Minister, if all you do is meet with some friend of the Conservative government and say, what kind of deal will you give me when we want to do this polling, for whatever reason you may do the polling . . . It may be legitimate, it may be not. I'm not going to question that. Then you're not really driving any kind of a bargain on behalf of the taxpayer, which is paying big taxes, to get the programs of the Department of Health under way. I mean, it's a question of policy. It's not a question of what you might or might not do. Are you saying that you do not issue tenders for these kinds of projects but you just simply pick somebody on whatever terms you decide? And I know you will say it's because it's the most economical. But if that's what you say, that doesn't give everybody an equal opportunity to get at it.

And that's what the public is concerned about and I think it's a legitimate thing for me or my colleagues to raise. People want to be treated fairly. Business people want to be treated fairly, whether they're architects or construction people or whether they're polling agencies or advertising agencies. I mean it's a question of fairness. Everybody should have an equal opportunity to offer the kind of business deal that they can give you. Nothing is

unfair about that.

I guess you're saying, therefore, you're not prepared to say that your government has a policy of issuing tenders for these kinds of contracts.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister will see the number of person-years has increased from 15.4 to 17.5. You had explained that a Michael McCafferty, I believe, was the name had been transferred into this area. Would that be one of the new positions?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I have some non-permanent staff in there. And as I indicated earlier, the other position is Michael McCafferty.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — There's one other position. Can you tell me, is that position now filled and if it is, who's in that position?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — As I said, those were non-permanent secretarial positions.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, can you tell us what firms you had doing the advertising work for you last year and the amount of advertising?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, the firms I had were Roberts and Poole and Dome. I don't have the figures here, but I will provide them for them as quickly as I can.

Mr. Lusney: — What was the total amount, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I just indicated I don't have the figures here. As quickly as I can get them, I will provide them for you.

Mr. Lusney: — Those were the only two firms that you used for any of the advertising within the department?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes.

Mr. Lusney: — Did Brigdens photographics or Brown and Associates Advertising do any work for you?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think Brigdens is our printing company, and I think Bridgens did some printing for us, but they're not an advertising company.

Mr. Lusney: — How about Brown and Associates Advertising Limited?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Continue on with some questions. We'll check into that for you.

Mr. Lusney: — Could you check all of those then, Mr. Chairman, and provide the information for us, please?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I will do that for you.

Item 4 agreed to.

Item 5 agreed to.

Item 6

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The Minister, can you . . . is this where the community clinics in Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Regina, and others, would be included in the budgets?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, they're not under that subvote.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Just indicate to me which one they are.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Saskatchewan hospital services subvote.

Item 6 agreed to.

Item 7

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister will know — and I don't want to take a great deal of time; we're not intending to get into a long debate here — but you will know our concern about the nine-month waiting period that many seniors and other people are having to put up with in this area. And that time period is growing and has been growing for the four-year period. And I would just say to you that it's impossible to make a program work when you have senior citizens who have to wait nine months to get their hearing analysed and assessed, and then to get hearing aids. And I would just say to you and encourage you to make every attempt that you can to bring this up to speed, because it's just not proper that our seniors would have to wait that long.

This plan in the past has worked much better than it is now. And I don't want to ask a lot of questions or to get into a big debate, but just to reiterate that anything you can do in this area will be gratefully appreciated. And I can't for the life of me understand why it's taken so long to turn that waiting period around and get it down to a proper length of time. It simply isn't right that they would have to wait nine months to have their hearing impairments assessed and then to get their hearing aids.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier in my estimates that we are recruiting extra audiologists. We're using nurses as a screening; it's a point of entry. The member knows that we had a fire. The waiting lists were coming down; the fire in the SHAP area set us back a bit on the waiting list. But I think within the next few months we'll see some initiatives that will start to decrease that waiting list.

Item 7 agreed to.

Item 8 agreed to.

(1630)

Item 9

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well here again I just want to make the point that it's disturbing to the people, especially out in the rural areas, to see these cut-backs in the dental plan program.

And here again we have discussed this already, but a number of times now with you as minister we have seen cut-backs in a program that everyone had believed was

firmly in place. And I say to you, one of the first things you did was to exclude the four-year-olds from the dental program, and since that time you have systematically gone about a process of getting people, young people, to quit using the dental program. And the way that you're doing it is not right. What you're doing is making them wait so long for dental check-ups that the parents are going back to using the private dentists.

And I hear this when I go around to the various schools and when I'm travelling around my constituency, that the children are having to wait longer and longer periods of time for dental check-ups. And if you look at the number of children enrolled in the dental plan for the last number of years, you'll see a trend that is starting. And that is that less and less are using the dental program and more are using the private dentists, and that's because the service has been curtailed. And here again we see a staff cut of 18 in that area, and this isn't the first time you've had staff cuts in the dental plan.

And I find it unfortunate that you would choose children's teeth as the place to cut back — at a time when we have money for Peter Pocklington and money for everyone, money for international travel, money for polling in your department — that you would choose children's teeth as an area to cut back, and say to the people in the province that this is one area that is expendable.

And I just make the point that, if anything can be done to increase staffing in that area rather than cut back, that's what we would be doing, and that's a commitment that we would make to the people of the province: that as soon as you people have the election and we're back in there, the dental plan will be put back to the . . . on the pedestal it was back in the 1970s; and that the cut-backs that you've instituted in this area would quickly come to an end.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Certainly there's no attempt to decrease the dental services to the people of Saskatchewan. The referral rate of the students has been constant over time. No one's going to hit the street employed in the dental plan. The majority of those positions are vacant positions, that you see are deletions. But I indicate to you that dental health of the children of Saskatchewan is at a very good standard and as good as it ever was.

Item 9 agreed to.

Items 10 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Item 13

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if the minister would explain here on the staff reduction. I notice the asterisk would indicate that a portion of this is included in the vote for Supply and Services. In terms of numbers of staff, how many will be transferred and how many are actual cuts in that area of mental health services?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Basically, that deletion or transfer breaks down as the following: 24.8 person-years go to Supply and Services; 11 psychiatrist positions transferred to contract on their request; and there's 2.8 person-years

in the net change and those were just some temporary, short-term type of positions.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — This contract by their request: what is the issue there? Can you give a little explanation of what has taken place there?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — There is two ways that we hire psychiatrists. One is under salary and the other is under contract, and being members of the medical profession, they prefer the contract type of arrangement. So these are 11 that have elected to go the contract route.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister, I wonder if he would give me a list of the 28 positions that are being transferred to Supply and Services. If you've got that with you, can you give that to me? I would just like to see which ones they are.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I will provide that to you. I can assure you that they're all physical plant and grounds type people.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — If you can give me a commitment — what, a couple of weeks? — will you give me that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Sure.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The reason that I want that list is because there is a — and it may only be a rumour — but there's a rumour around that what is happening here is we're transferring 28 people out of Health to another department where it's more legitimate to be laying them off. Now I'm not believing that rumour yet, but when I travel around the province — North Battleford, Prince Albert — this is what they're telling me. Be leery of these birds who will be transferring people out of Health to Supply and Services and then laying them off as staff out of Supply and Services, because the politics of laying them off when they're in the Department of Health isn't great.

Now I will give you the benefit of the doubt, but we will be keeping track of those positions. I appreciate the chairman allowing me to talk about Supply and Services here, because I think it was an important point that I wanted to make. Thank you.

Item 13 agreed to.

Item 14 agreed to.

Item 15

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I think the minister indicated the community clinics were involved in this. Can you give me an indication of the increase in funding for the coming year in each of the community clinic operations?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I will provide that to you. We're on the wrong subvote at this time but we'll work on it for you. It's item 23, subvote 29. I think we're in administration SHSP now. So we go down to the next subvote

Item 15 agreed to.

Item 16 agreed to.

Item 17

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes, I just want to . . . On 17 and 18 there may not be a connection, or there may be. But can you tell me whether the reduction in one vote has anything to do with the increase in the other? Is there staff being transferred from continuing care to Wolseley? I don't think that's the case, but if it isn't, what positions are being cut back out of the continuing care administration? Can you indicate that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No transfer from continuing care to Lakeside.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Could you indicate then the reduction of four in continuing care administration? Can you tell me what positions those would be?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We have one research officer that transferred to the drug plan. We deleted an accounting clerk. So that's two positions. And then there was 1.5 non-permanent positions that have been deleted. So that gives you the deletions in continuing care.

Item 17 agreed to.

Item 18

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Can the minister indicate who the director or administrator is at the Lakeside home in Wolseley? I don't think there's been any change, but can you confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Same as it was last year — Sandra Hextall.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And, Mr. Minister, has there been an increase in her salary since January 1st of 1985?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's the same increase as the general public service increase.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And can you indicate what that increase was?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Same as everyone else, in the neighbourhood of 3 per cent.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, that was — I think you responded to whether there was an increase in this particular year. Was there an increase in 1985?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The increases have been the same as anyone else in the public service.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — So this position is in the regular public service agreement provisions. Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's out of scope, but the same raises, the same ground rules as all the rest of my officials.

Item 18 agreed to.

Items 19 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

Item 22

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, this is the point that the minister said that he would have that information on the increases to the community clinics in the various places in the province, if you would give those to us now.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I understand they're undergoing the same global review as the hospitals to see what their programs are and to ascertain what their global assessment would be. So there's been no decision at this point in time. It's under a global review process.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — There's one issue on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission that I would just like to ask about, and it has to do with an air base that is being considered near Yorkton as purchased by the provincial government and used as some sort of an abuse centre. My colleague from Yorkton, if you could just answer — or from Pelly — would like to ask a couple of questions on that, if there's anything you can tell us about that to enlighten us on the issue of if there are any plans in the works for that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'd be pleased to. The property management Crown is looking at taking over the White Spruce, I believe it is, air base which is located about 8 miles out of Yorkton. There has been no decision made as to the use of the facilities that will be there, just simply that the new property management corporation will be taking it over and will be looking at whatever positive uses it can be put to use for.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, under the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, do you fund some privately run alcohol treatment centres? Under this subvote, do you fund or provide funding to privately operated alcohol treatment centres?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — All board operated facilities, if that answers your question for you.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Can you explain what you mean by board operated? Are they set up by individuals who then have a board, or are they non-profit organizations?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — They're all non-profit. I'm informed that some are individuals who have formed advisory boards, so that they have that advisory board to help them operate it. But they're all non-profit.

(1645)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — In the case of an individual who will take the initiative to set a treatment centre up and then ask some people to be an advisory board, how does the salary of people involved determine — for example, this individual obviously would be getting a salary. How is that determined?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We go through a line by line budget review with the commission.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Is there such a treatment centre in

Indian Head or in the vicinity of Indian Head? And what is it and who are the principals in it?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — There's nothing operating at Indian Head at this point in time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Has there been in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No.

Item 22 agreed to.

Item 23

Mr. Lingenfelter: — One other short question on this. When you say it's a global number for community clinics, what exactly are you saying, that all of them — you put a number in there and that it isn't broken down?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — They each have a global budget. They're each independent from each other and each have a global budget review.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And I guess my question was: on that global budget that you had last year, what is your estimate for an increase in that global budget for this year for each of them?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We won't know that until we've finished our discussions with them and I think we're in those discussions at this time.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I understand how negotiations carry on — it carries on for nurses and for your hospitals. But there is an overall number written into your estimate for each of those areas. And I'm not asking for your final number. What I'm asking is for an estimate of what you have estimated when you were planning the budget for the community clinics. And I will accept it as an estimate. I don't want to hold you on any of these numbers to the dime because I very clearly understand how negotiations take place and it may be different. But the overall negotiating . . . And maybe here, Mr. Minister, you would like to give me the number for all the community clinics put into one package and that would be acceptable as well. But what are you estimating that increase to be?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I hope you understand, and I think you do from your comments, that it would be an estimate, but I would estimate in the neighbourhood of 5 per cent.

Item 23 agreed to.

Items 24 to 30 inclusive agreed to.

Item 31

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Just a moment. Under grants to special care facilities, I wonder what increase will there be to an individual nursing home — and here I'm not naming one — but what kind of an increase in direct grants to a nursing home are you planning for the coming year? You will know that in the nursing homes there are many things that are fixed. Is there a formula that you tie it to the power rates and staff increases in salary and that

sort of thing, or what is the formula that you base this on?

Vote 66 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Again, estimated figure, they take the labour settlements and add about 3 per cent for overhead.

Item 31 agreed to.

Item 32 agreed to.

Item 33

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, have you now concluded the negotiations with the pharmaceutical association, and has a new fee schedule been settled? And if so, has the formula changed, or the proportion of payment from government and from the consumer?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We have concluded the agreement temporarily. The pharmaceutical association are ratifying it at this time. So I couldn't indicate to you what's in it until ratification is completed.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We had a discussion on this earlier. Can you tell me if the concern I had raised with you about senior citizens who have been able to get, in some cases, some discount, are being protected in this proposal? I'm not going to ask you details of the proposed agreement, but in the proposed agreement is there going to be some method by which senior citizens, who used to get a discount, now may lose it because of some proposal where pharmacists would be penalized if they discounted? Are those senior citizens being protected?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We don't feel that the agreement is going to affect discounts negatively in any way.

Item 33 agreed to.

Vote 32 agreed to.

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Health Health Capital Fund — Nil Vote

Mr. Chairman: — The next item before the committee is the Health capital fund, subvotes nil. I'm just giving you the opportunity to ask any questions if you have any.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I find it a shame that there's no money for capital expenditures in the Health budget. The minister will explain how it will be moved somewhere else, but I think that anyone reading the book will see that there's been a drastic change in construction grants here.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I would just say, Mr. Chairman, anyone reading the book, please turn to page 134, and they'll see 75 million under the property management Crown.

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Health Patient Care Fund — Vote 66

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates 1986 Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Health Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32

Vote 32 agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates 1986 Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Health Health Capital Fund — Vote 62

Vote 62 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Minister, would you like to thank you officials.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank my officials for the support they gave me during this rather long and tedious set of estimates, and thank them very much for their . . .

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I just would like to say to the staff as well, that we appreciate their attempt to pass on information to us. It's a difficult job, and it has been relatively long, but we appreciate the information and also look forward to getting the information we've been promised. I'm sure the minister will make sure that happens.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.