

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Health
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'd like to direct your attention to the area of mental health, and I have a few comments that I want to make in this regard, things that have been expressed to me over the last few months.

We notice that this year's figures, that the allotment for mental health represents a decrease of 6 per cent over the actual expenditure for 1985-86. Although it may show a 2 per cent increase over '87-88, it is actually still 6 per cent less than what was allotted in '85-86. And in terms of staffing, we also notice that 708.1 person-years represents an increase of 24.5 person-years over last year but still a decrease of some 75.9 person-years over the two-year period, Mr. Minister.

We have been advised that there has been a substantial increase in the demands on the system resulting from the continued emphasis of de-institutionalization. Now we are not suggesting that de-institutionalization is not an appropriate policy. We basically agree with this policy; however, funding must be provided by the government to the non-governmental agencies to continue to provide services outside the institutions. Otherwise we end up in a situation where people will be looking for services in the private sector, and then only those who can afford them will be able to obtain them.

We understand that there are fewer professionals in the system and greater demands being placed on their services, Mr. Minister. In the Saskatoon Mental Health Clinic alone, there was a 25 per cent increase in clients last year. We were told that there are waiting lists of up to three months for psychiatric services, and that's simply not good enough — a three-month wait for psychiatric services is totally intolerable, Mr. Minister.

When people require these services, they require help immediately. We have been advised that there has been a noticeable change in the state of clients. Their situation is such that they are generally much closer to a crisis before they can get help. And I am told that the crisis intervention service had an increase of — which is in Saskatoon — had an increase of one-third in clients last year, and apparently there is a much greater reliance on these emergency service throughout the province than what there has been in the past. The costs for these very necessary services are but a drop in the bucket, Mr. Minister, compared to the cost of institutional care. But if these services are not available, then the dislocation in costs, both financially and personally — especially for people in rural Saskatchewan — are going to increase and increase dramatically, Mr. Minister.

There is a second problem with the funding and that is the

uncertainty of annual grants and department allocations, Mr. Minister. It is virtually impossible to do any long-term planning within this area. This results in a lack of co-ordination between the organizations involved and an inadequate, ad hoc, patchwork system.

There are other problems, as well, concerning rehabilitation programs for those affected by mental illness. These clients require assistance to help them get a foothold in the vocational job market. But the response to this by the government has been the traditional question of jurisdiction, Mr. Minister. The province claims that the job creation is a federal responsibility, I understand, while sheltered workshops are an inappropriate vehicle of this group. Their needs are not being met by this program, Mr. Minister; their needs are not being met.

I am advised that some 58 per cent of community mental health nursing positions were affected by last year's budget, and I believe that comes from the health care associations' brief to the minister on page 13. And several rural mental health clinics have been discontinued. I have been advised of that, Mr. Minister. Some areas have been left without any mental health expertise — a situation which is forcing individuals into utilizing more costly in-patient services or going without such services altogether. The out-patient/in-patient ratio, I'm told, is something like 4:1, with the obvious indication of continuous demand and increasing demand but, roughly, the allocation of current funding is 50-50.

So, Mr. Minister, what we have been advised — and much of my information comes from the conversations with people in the area and also from the Crocus Co-op brief, of which I'm sure you've received a copy — is that the whole sheltered workshop concept is not working for mentally ill patients. They need special kinds of jobs. You can't just put them into the ordinary job market. It's absolutely crucial that they have meaningful employment. They may not be able to work from 9 to 5. They may only be able to work two or three hours a day when they're starting out, and these jobs are essential and crucial to them getting back on their feet and back into the regular work-force and into the regular world.

They require training on the job and this sort of transitional employment, as I mentioned, and I believe there's a reference to that on page 22 of the Crocus Co-op brief, Mr. Minister. And I want the Minister of Health to recognize the need for the special employment programs for people suffering from mental illness.

I think it's also important for the minister to recognize that people suffering from mental illness need food and they need a balanced diet. And the Minister of Social Services recognizes that people suffering from diabetes need a balanced diet and there's special allowances made, Mr. Minister — special allowances for people suffering from certain kinds of illnesses having a balanced diet. But the allowance, as I understand, Mr. Minister, is not there for people suffering from mental illness, and people suffering from mental illness have a crucial and immediate need for a balanced diet. I therefore ask the minister to pressure

his colleague, the Minister of Social Services, to include that as a heading under which people can get special assistance for a completely balanced diet.

We need a network of front line staff with a high degree, I am told, of multi- or trans-disciplinary skills to deal with these people on an out-patient basis, Mr. Minister. And I understand that the support is not there from the government in terms of funding.

Now the costs, for example, if one compares the cost between what it would cost to institutionalize someone and what it would cost to have them in a group home on an out-patient basis, it becomes readily apparent that the saving is overwhelmingly great and that it is important to have people out on an out-patient basis not only because of the saving, but because it puts them closer to the community and aids in the curing of their illness. And I believe the minister will recognize that that saving's there. And because that saving is there, we have to start funding these group homes and we have to put the funding in the out-patient services at a higher degree than what has happened in the past. Now I want to know, in general terms: is the minister aware of the Crocus Co-op brief? Is he aware of the comments made by the Saskatchewan Health-Care Association? Will he insist that the Minister of Social Services will ensure that people suffering from mental illnesses will be able to get a balanced diet; will he recognize and promote the fact that meaningful, flexible employment programs are necessary for people suffering from mental illness; and will his government give this area a higher priority in the future.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — If I could just give some general comments that relate to this first and then make a more specific referral to the brief from Crocus Co-op that the member was referring to.

First of all, as it relates the budget — and I know that you've said it this way, that there's a 2.2 per cent increase over last year but that doesn't tie in in terms of going back two years. I want you to know — and I think you do know — but when the early retirement program came into being last year, one of the areas most affected across all of government in the most global sense was the mental health services area of the Department of Health. And that's because there was a very stable group there that had worked in that area for a good, long time and came up through the system for a long time together. And when the early retirement program came about, there were a whole series of these people that were eligible at the same time. And they chose, a good number of them chose to take advantage of it, and so this area was hit, you know, harder than most areas across the government; there's no question that that's true.

Since then, you know, you made a couple of statements here that I just want to correct a little bit. You say that there are decreases in the in-patient volumes in the hospitals through the de-institutionalization and the movement toward that, and that's not the case. I mean, we don't see any volume decrease there. But we do believe, as you have stated you do as well, in terms of moving people from the institutions and into the community to the extent that that's possible, while recognizing all along that it's . . . And there's no question

that anyone would argue that you don't need the support services in the community in order for these people to be able to cope outside of an institutional setting.

You talked a little bit about rural health clinics. And I would say, last year, based on that circumstance that I just outlined, in terms of some of the people that took early retirement and so on, and just being able to cover the province in a not altogether ideal sense because we were short of people . . . And we've been recruiting since then and have had some successes, but maybe not to the extent that we would like to.

In terms of dropping rural locations, that's not the case. I believe there were one or two where we had people going no more often than once a month, where the demand itself didn't suggest that that should carry on. But other than that, the rural settings in the rural communities still have those rural mental health clinics.

You made some comments regarding . . . I believe you said, sheltered workshops, and I just want to make the distinction here. The sheltered workshop system is very much tied to people that are mentally handicapped or involved with the . . . with being mentally retarded and so on. What we try to do in the mental health area is to deal with some sheltered employment circumstances where we can bring people in this transitional time, when they're in the circumstance of having some difficulty with mental illness, into sheltered employment rather than this very structured workshop environment. And we've had some, I'm told, good success with that across the province, but certainly in some of our larger centres. So it's not all gloom and doom. Certainly we have more recruiting that must . . . that is going on, and we need to have some more success in recruiting some of these professionals.

(1915)

And now to turn to the recommendations that came out of the study that was done by Crocus Co-op of Saskatoon, basically two broad recommendations, which are on page 2 of the study. We received this study in about, I believe, February or March. I'm just going on a bit by recall here now, but two broad recommendations that:

1. Government should examine the need for more affordable and supportive housing, food, medication . . . (and they go through a series of things) . . . educational, social and vocational opportunities, individual support, professional services, public education, and advocacy.

I mean, everything that's ever been stated, almost, about mental health services is covered in that very broad recommendation and that we should be aware of those things. I would say to you that we are aware of the need for those things. To a large degree, there is significant work going on in terms of trying to ensure that more and more of those various categories are there for a growing number of people who need this service.

And the second broad recommendation, which I certainly don't disagree with either:

Research priorities should be assigned to:

- (a) strategies for optimum patient care facilitating the transition from hospital care to community settings;

And that goes hand in glove with the concept that has been developed over a number of years of moving from institutional care out to more of a community setting and more of a realistic way of life for these people. And I think that we don't disagree with that — and there probably does need to be more research, and there can be.

And the (b) part of that second recommendation was:

- (b) investigating the very high . . . rate of involvement with the courts by persons with a history of mental illness.

And there's truth in that as well, just on an historical basis and a statistical basis, that's the case. So we're very aware of those. We appreciate the work that's been done by Crocus Co-op, and frankly by other groups in terms of identifying some of this, and it's the same identification that's done by our people within the mental health branch — I might add that under the difficult circumstances I've outlined, has worked very well and has some excellent people in it. And the other thing that I wanted to . . . Well I had another point that I wanted to make, but I'll get back to it in a moment if you have other questions.

As it relates to the relationship between Social Services and the Department of Health and the recognition by my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, and others about, you know, the need for a particular diet and so on, I mean, I think that's true and our people work on that all the time, back and forth, and there is, despite some of the conversations we might have, back and forth here, and so on, there is good co-operation that goes on — not to say that there can't be better co-operation or better structures for that co-operation to take place in between the Social Services department and specific social service workers, and the people in the mental health branch.

So there can be more done in terms of that co-ordination, but Social Services, I believe, are very aware of the need here for these people that are sometimes different needs than what are required just in the mainstream of society.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, with respect to the balanced diet, it's not a question of whether or not your department co-operates with that department. I want you to urge the Minister of Social Services to allow, to provide financial assistance for people suffering from mental illness to receive a balanced diet in the same way that people suffering from other illnesses receive balanced diets where that need is identified. And that need is clearly apparent for people suffering from mental illness. That's what I'm asking you to do, Mr. Minister.

With respect to the fact that early retirement has caused a lot of these employees to no longer be employed by the government, with respect to that allegation, then I suggest, Mr. Minister, that that's very bad planning on the part of your government, where we have such a

substantial drop in the number of employees in an area, so substantial that I am being told by people working in the mental health care system that patients are suffering as a result of that. I think that's bad planning on the part of your government, and I'm glad to hear that the government is looking at ways of recruiting people. But obviously it's not doing enough because we're still 75.9 person-years down from two years ago, Mr. Minister, and that's not acceptable; we need more recruitment.

But I wish to make once more the point that the people . . . people suffering from mental illness have advised Crocus Co-op, in the form of a questionnaire, that the thing that they require the most is more and better employment programs, Mr. Minister. And that's on page 22 of the Crocus Co-op report. I direct your attention to it, and I'm urging your government to put more emphasis on employment programs for people suffering from mental disabilities.

Now because we are running short of time and for the sake of winding up the estimates, I want to move to the question of AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) in the province of Saskatchewan and just ask the minister a few questions about that.

I understand that there's been a sum of money allotted for the control of AIDS . . . or the treatment of AIDS patients in the province of Saskatchewan. My statistics — and I just want to outline what my statistics are, Mr. Minister, to see whether or not you are in agreement with it and to put some perspective on how serious the problem is in Saskatchewan.

I have been advised there's 22 actual cases of AIDS in Saskatchewan, and that for every case, there's probably 30 carriers, and that would be a conservative estimate. I think nationally or in some areas it's considered 100 carriers, but in Saskatchewan we feel 30 would be an appropriate estimate. That means there would be approximately 660 cases in Saskatchewan, since the evidence seems to be clear that every person who is carrier eventually ends up with the illness. By 1991 we are then talking about figures somewhere between 51 to 91 — I've been told the minimum would be 51 actual cases and maximum would be 91 — meaning we would have, if there's 30 carriers per each case, 1,530 minimum to 2,730 either actual cases and/or carriers in Saskatchewan.

I'm also told that it costs approximately \$80,000 for the government with respect to the treatment of every person who suffers from the disease of AIDS — \$80,000 per case, Mr. Minister. You can see that that would be a substantial amount of money by the year 1991.

Now I know the government has put aside some funding with respect to AIDS. I'd like to have a breakdown from the minister as to how that money is going to be spent, and I would also like to know what his long-term strategy is with respect to the AIDS problem.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I just say to the member that I share the concern that you've expressed as it relates to this disease and what its ramifications may well be for . . . well not only for the health care system but for this society as a

whole.

We have 23 cases — just an update now that there's another — 23 cases in this province. Just to put that into a little bit of perspective, I will recall just that a relatively short time ago when I became Minister of Health, I remember that the number was nine. And that's — what is that? — about a year and a half ago, or whatever it is. So certainly there . . . and these are clinical cases I'm speaking of now.

You ask, what are we doing, and . . . well first of all, let me, before I get into some of these specifics, let me just say that some of the stats that you raised are statistics that I have seen, that our people have seen as well, in terms of the number of potential carriers that there are out there as a relationship or a ratio of the number of clinical cases in a given population. There's no real definite . . . There's nothing really definitive on that. So I would not want to say that that's what the best research says because there are some varying points of view on this.

There's no question that all of us who are in positions of responsibility as it relates to . . . well, to the care of the health care system, the care of the public at large and the health and well-being of our society, all of us have to be taking this pretty seriously because as you know, the most important statistics and the most important fact about this is that there is no cure. And there's no known cure, and all of the best information that we have is that there isn't likely to be a cure in the very near future, not one on the horizon that anyone has been able to define. So that's the dangerous part of it and that's what makes it all that much more frightening, I guess you could say, for the society.

What we have believed for some time, and what we have done here in this province of a million people . . . I know there is at large out there a bit of a view that says we are a population here in the middle of the continent of a million people and this disease is one that we see from the large centres of the continent and other places in the world, and it's something that's in San Francisco and in Vancouver and in Detroit and in other places. I think it's clearly the case in this very mobile society that we live in that it's part of us and it's here with us in our society as well.

What we have decided to do is to say, we'll take it extremely seriously. The drug which is administered to clinical cases, AZT, is provided for in the drug plan of Saskatchewan. You know, and I'm just getting into some more specifics in terms of where you say the money is being spent specifically for this disease. There are significant costs in our laboratory, obviously, as the number of tests, laboratory tests and so on are conducted here in the province. They are a significant cost there.

We have costs to the department as it relates to — and I would be willing to send over . . . I want to go through this a little bit, but I could send over a breakdown in terms of how much is on the various literature and curricula for schools and all those kinds of things, which is important information for you to have as well. But we have media campaigns, or we've carried on some of that in terms of educational campaigns to talk about prevention and the kinds . . . some measures that can be taken to try to

prevent this disease.

We have, as you know, a committee. We're the first province in the country to set up a committee of professionals to deal with what our response should be and what's the most appropriate response for this province. So we've done that a number of . . . well months ago now. What else could I . . .

We have a speaker's bureau in the province where we have more than 100 people around the province and spread throughout the province who are available to speak to any group that's interested, or whatever. So that's been co-ordinated. It has not been easy to do, and they have over 100 people now.

We have an individual who's an AIDS co-ordinator in the province, you know, just to co-ordinate this effort. We have, as I say, pamphlets and videos and films, and our library in that area is trying to keep up to date with the most up-to-date information available across the world, and as quickly as possible. And as you know, the information changes from . . . you know, almost on a weekly basis there's some new and more definitive kind of information — seems to be anyway.

I should say that our curriculum in division 3, our grade 7 to 9 health curriculum in Saskatchewan has been recognized across the country as the best curriculum in terms of dealing with this in the most balanced sense. And we have requests from across the country and various departments of education for that curriculum because it is a curriculum that's based on various modules, and a module can be inserted into that curriculum dealing with this specific disease. And I would just want to say that for the information of all the members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that that program has been regarded very highly by the federal government and all of the provinces, frankly, and it will be copied by most in the country. So that's something that's been developed in the last while.

(1930)

We also have new public education. I'm just looking at a note here, we have a newer public education program which is being developed now and it will be used in the fall.

We also, as well, have a — and I'll send this in the breakdown — we have had individual grants to two groups in the two largest centres: AIDS Saskatoon and AIDS Regina who have individual grants of money for them to deal with. I believe it's \$7,000 in each case, if my memory serves me right, that's what it was in the . . . and for them to carry on their public educational programs, most specifically, to within the at-risk community and within their own area.

So we've done a very, I guess, what I would call a strategy which covers all segments of the society and to the extent that our committee felt was appropriate, and I don't know what else could have been done. The long-term strategy is to continue with education to the extent that we can and make sure that we maintain that in front of the people in terms of the scourge that this disease is and be sure that prevention measures are taken by the sexually active

citizens.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, with respect to the funding to AIDS Regina and AIDS Saskatoon, I'm going to suggest, I believe they would like to see funding more in the vicinity of \$25,000 a year, and I'm going to suggest to the Minister of Health that he consider that. And the reason why I'm going to suggest that is that I believe that these non-governmental agencies that are at arm's length from government are better able to promote proper practices, for example, with respect to people who are sexually active than the government is.

In media campaigns, for example, governments tend to want to dwell solely on advertising campaigns that deal with loyal relationships and the family, and that's good; I believe in that as well. But I think the advertising campaigns that are out there also have to be talking, Mr. Minister, about safer sex and individual responsibility for protection during sex. And what we tend to find is that governments don't want to identify themselves with that form of advertising in public education, and therefore I'm going to suggest to the Minister of Health that he reconsider the \$7,000 that he has referred to as being the funding for AIDS Regina and AIDS Saskatoon and consider a larger portion of that \$400,000 going to these non-governmental agencies.

I had said it costs some \$80,000 to treat a person who actually has AIDS until that person dies, but I don't believe that figure includes the home care, long-term care beds costs necessarily, or what it will require the government to build extra facilities, extra long-term care facilities. I'm not sure that it includes dental care, and I'm wondering if the minister has looked at dental care for people suffering from AIDS. The mental health costs that will be there. We note a substantial drop in the mental health budget from two years ago, and this obviously is an area where there will have to be some consideration given with respect to treating AIDS patients and their families, Mr. Minister, because there's a considerable amount of emotional stress associated with this, I'm sure.

I'm wondering if the minister has considered the costs with respect to social assistance that will be engendered by the province and the people of Saskatchewan in helping people who have the AIDS illness and are unable to work and also the cost of alternative housing and palliative care for them, Mr. Minister. There are numerous costs, and I don't believe that they have all been calculated into that \$80,000 figure.

And, Mr. Minister, I think that \$400,000 is probably not enough. I can't give you a figure; I can't tell you how much you should be spending, but my instinctive reaction to this is that \$400,000 is not enough because the long-term costs it's going to cost us with respect to looking after AIDS patients is going to be substantially more than that. And if we prevent one AIDS case today, we save ourselves \$80,000 down the line.

Now I'm not simply talking in dollars and cents, Mr. Minister, because it's not just a dollars-and-cents issue; it's also a question of human costs and human tragedy, as you mentioned yourself, Mr. Minister. And therefore I

urge you to take a closer look at the problem and to consider providing further funding to AIDS Regina and AIDS Saskatoon and to determine whether indeed you are spending adequate moneys to prevent these cases that probably will occur if the statistics bear out.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well you mentioned a whole series of areas where there can be implications on into the future as it relates to the, you know, this disease and what it can mean to the society and certainly, in a more specific sense, to the health care system. I don't disagree with any of the suggestions that you've made except to say that we are addressing those, and recognize that they're there.

You say, and I just wanted to be clear on this . . . The two groups, AIDS Regina, AIDS Saskatoon have got some money both from us and from the federal government to carry on their programming in terms of their education. The committee that we have is a very excellent one and goes across the professions in terms of people involved in this from the . . . It's their view, and a view that I concur with, is that the public education, in the widest sense in terms of getting information to the widest possible public, is more appropriately given from a variety of sources than it is necessarily to be given, because I know that the two groups that you refer to believe — and I think believe quite strongly — that they could be, and maybe perhaps even think that they should be, the lead agencies in terms of the dissemination of broad public information. And I'm not sure that I agree that that's correct.

I believe they have a role, and I believe that that role is recognized in the grants that we've provided. Although, you know, the level of those grants will be subject to some debate and obviously subject to some review by us in terms of saying that, I say it's now 7,000 and as time goes on, and as there's a greater demand . . . That's not to say that those can't go up. I don't want to say that at all.

I know it's difficult for you, and I understand why it would be. It's difficult for any of us to know what is an appropriate number in terms of the total dollars to spend in this area. I believe there are people that are monitoring it as well as is being done in this country. I know that when I meet with my colleagues, the other ministers of health of Canada, that it is an issue that has all of us and our officials in our departments very concerned. And I think that the work that's being done in terms of, well in terms of research, in terms of public education, in terms of some of those things across the country, reflects that concern.

As it relates to the kinds of ads that we've had, for example, the public education programs that we've had here, you will know there was a little controversy at the time when CBC, for example, wouldn't play out ads because they didn't believe they were appropriate. We did that because we believed that they were . . . It was the kind of information that the public needed to have even though it may have offended some sensibilities. It shows how seriously we're taking this in this Department of Health and in this government. And we will be developing more ads for the future to be able to deal with this issue as . . . Because it's, as you have said and as I agree with you, it's serious for our society.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, with respect to the question of midwifery — now I'd like to move on to that and ask you one brief question — is the Department of Health seriously looking at the possibility of developing a midwives program in Saskatchewan in order to introduce midwifery legally in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Let me just say that I've met with a group in the province who has some interest in advancing the midwifery across the province. I suggested to them --- and I believe it's the appropriate place — that they make a substantive recommendation to the commission and I believe they are going to do that. In fact they've been working on that for some time prior to the commission even being announced. I know, and I know you're aware of, some of the problems that arise in terms of what the medical profession will say as it relates to the advances of midwifery or whether midwifery be recognized. I'm also aware of a very large-scale study that was done in the province of Ontario as it relates to midwifery.

And I guess that's really all I can say now, except to say that we believe that it's important that they make their case very well and that the commission perhaps could — now I'm not sure if they will or won't — but if the commission sees fit to come forward with some recommendation as it relates to the potential for midwives or the practice of midwifery to be involved in the health care system into the future.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you. Mr. Minister, I want to refer now to the children's school-based dental plan and ask you some questions that we had discussed earlier about the possibility of you sending some of these answers over to me in correspondence, and I think this is a case where it may be appropriate.

The questions I would like answered are: in detail, how many children are eligible under this particular plan? My evidence says approximately ... or the information I have says 140,641 under this new plan, which apparently is a 25 per cent decrease from the old plan. I would like to know, with respect to the enrolment, how many have enrolled. I understand, under the new plan, it's been 105,482 as of March 1, 1988, which is 14 per cent decrease of those who are eligible, and a 37 per cent decrease of the Saskatchewan dental plan enrolment. In other words, it's 37 per cent down on what the old plan was in terms of actual enrolment, but 89 per cent ... or 75 per cent as of March 1, 1988 as of the new plan.

The utilization, I understand, is at 73,837, and I assume those statistics are as of March 1, 1988, as well, which is 23 per cent of those enrolled, Mr. Minister, with an overall decrease of 53 per cent of the old plan in terms of utilization Mr. Minister. In other words, the new dental plan is being utilized at approximately 53 per cent of the old plan. And I would like those ... And I'm talking in terms of not just comparing those who are eligible, but comparing the ones who are eligible now against the ones who were eligible before, and we're looking at something like 53 per cent utilization.

The other information I have is that there are some rural practitioners who have dropped out of their practices in the satellite clinics. I would like the minister to, in

correspondence, to advise me whether that is correct, and just who they and how many there are. I've been advised there are some. I don't have the specifics on it, but I'm sure the minister will be aware of the situation.

I also want the minister, when he talks about utilization, and now I'm talking utilization as opposed to enrolment — there's enrolment, utilization and completion, Mr. Minister — I would like to know the rate of completion under this new dental plan, because I understand that there has been a drop in the rate of completion as well because people don't go back for the second visit, for example.

I would also like the minister to outline for me the services that are not covered with respect to the new plan. I understand there are a number of services that are not covered, like the six-month recall exams for high-risk cases and some preventative services, some limited scaling and fissure seals.

So, Mr. Minister, I also want to know from your department the cost of the storage of the dental equipment, the cost of retraining these dental therapists, the unemployment costs with respect to these dental therapists, and an estimation on how much the extra costs are to patients who have to travel to see a dentist and take a half day off work and a lunch. And if the minister can send me that information in correspondence, I would be very appreciative of that because we have debated this at some length in this legislature and I would like to see what the minister's facts are on this matter. I'm sure his department has now had an opportunity to take a very close look at it and would have the information for us.

(1945)

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — You know, I was making notes to the extent that we can. A couple of us were here ... But I will undertake to provide the information that you've asked in a definitive way, and I'll send it to you so that you can have ... And what we will do is go through Hansard to the exact questions and then give you the answers to the extent that we can on all of those things.

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Minister, I would like to take some time now to question you about both nursing homes and home care, the continuing care division of the Department of Health.

Regarding the special care homes first, you've built many homes across the province in the last few years, and the comments that I've been getting from people both in the rural areas and in the urban areas are that that's fine, having all this fancy construction — and some of it is quite fancy and has upset some of the seniors in the terms of the amount of money that's spent on it. There's nursing home construction, but they're not adequately staffed, not by any means, especially since more and more people that are in the nursing homes are requiring heavier care. And I think that you'll agree with me that in 1975, the average age of people in nursing homes was 68, and that now the average age is over 80; and that in 1981, about 50 per cent of those in nursing homes were in level 1 and 2 care, and that in 1987, levels 1 and 2 was only 20 per cent of the people in nursing homes, and level 3 and 4

is 80 per cent of the people.

Now, Mr. Minister, I would like particularly to focus on some specific questions. One regards the Salvation Army Eventide Home in Saskatoon, which is an example of an institution that's been level 1 and 2 from the time it was built. And they made a presentation to you last year pointing out the fact that many of the patients in that home and in many other homes — Pioneer Lodge in Moose Jaw is another one — where people have aged and now require level 3 and 4 care.

And they did not get a satisfactory response from you last year as to how much support you were prepared to give them to care for level 3 and 4. And they have made the same presentation to you this year, Mr. Minister, and they still haven't heard what your plans are. So my question to you is: what are your plans for all the nursing homes that have level 1 and 2 care, that are certified for 1 and 2 care and now are dealing with 3 and 4?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well the statistics as it relates to the ratio of the people in level 3 and 4 as now being 80 per cent versus 1 and 2 are correct, and that's as it should be in terms of the heavier care people having the access to the facilities that are there.

I hear what you're saying in terms of . . . And I appreciate the acknowledgement of the hon. member that we have been building nursing homes even in some difficult times and building a good number of nursing homes beds across the province, and that's fair. That's fair that you should acknowledge that even though I . . . And there are times when I may tend to agree with you in terms of the nature of some of the buildings, and that's a thing that we've been trying to deal through SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), with the architects of this province in terms of some of the things that go into them, but that's another issue.

Let me just, for the specific questions that you ask: the Salvation Army Eventide Home, as you say, is a lighter care facility, and I'm informed that it does not have the kind of plant that's required to be able to upgrade it to heavier care. And we would be willing . . . Because we recognize very much the kind of work that goes on within the Salvation Army, and not only this denomination but many others, in terms of these denominational homes that provide a lot more than just for the physical needs of the seniors that are placed in their care, but provide a very . . . care in terms of the physical needs and the spiritual needs and so on, and they do an excellent job of that.

But the particular physical plant of the Eventide home in Saskatoon, there is some significant difficulty, or would be significant difficulty with upgrading that particular place, and we would be willing — and in fact I think they know this — but we would certainly be willing to speak to them or to talk to them and get into negotiations for a replace of heavier care kind of a place. That's number one.

As it relates to Pioneer Lodge in Moose Jaw, their plant, I'm told, would be not only eligible, but would lend itself to upgrading to a level 3 and 4 type of home. And in fact, even in last year's estimates, I remember saying that here

and at that time, they've been offered the possibility of having that done. And the funding was offered even before I was the minister. Under my predecessor, the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, they were offered that and did not choose to do so. But we continue to encourage the Pioneer Lodge in Moose Jaw, and others that are level 1 and 2 places, to upgrade to be able to handle a heavier level of care because that's obviously where the emphasis must be.

Ms. Smart: — Well the nursing homes, Mr. Minister, are caught because they have the patients there already who need the more intensive care, and yet the kind of funding formula that you offer them for replacing their nursing homes requires them to come forward with quite a bit of cash as well as the Department of Health putting forward the money. So what you're doing is, you're saying, we'll help you build the nursing homes, but you've got to come up with a lot of the money yourselves, or else we're not going to do anything.

And meanwhile they've got patients in there that require a lot more care than you're prepared to fund at this point in time. And so they're caught, and they're very badly caught, and the people in the nursing homes are caught. It's a very serious problem which I think is not answered by the requirement that they upgrade those facilities in the way that you've said because they're going to have to have the funding support to do that, and the way you're funding the nursing homes means they have to get a lot of money from the local communities.

And my worry is that they can't do that or they're not able to for whatever reasons and that the people aren't going to get the care. And the nursing home, the Salvation Army nursing home has said that there's a long time between the people being defined as needing more than level 2 care — there's a long time between the time that they're defined as needing more than level 2 care and the time they can get it. So a lot of people are getting caught in that situation. And I put it to you that I don't think the funding formula is good enough for the provision of level 3 and 4 care if these particular nursing homes, which are run by churches or by other community groups, have a problem with getting the money together themselves. There's a certain percentage that you require and a certain percentage that they have to come up with.

But I'm not here to talk to you specifically about the facilities. I want to talk to you more about the staffing, Mr. Minister. And I want to know . . . You said your annual report in 1986 to '87 that the department was funding 148 new positions for existing special care homes. And I want to know how many new positions were there in 1987-88 and how many are estimated for 1988-89.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Just while the people in the continuing care branch are putting those numbers together, let me just say that I understand what you're saying as it relates to the need to upgrade these homes and that there are particular residents that are in the homes now, but that does not diminish the need for these homes to be upgraded to the extent that it's possible. And obviously it takes a period of time for that to take place. But there has to be the will, and in most places, there is.

Moose Jaw is the one that you mention, and Moose Jaw Pioneer Lodge is one that we have been discussing with for some time, and it's not for the lack of the funds, I'm told, even by some of the civic leaders of Moose Jaw, from the mayor on down. It's just sort of an unwillingness to change the character of the home in terms of a level 1 and 2 place. So I just say that in terms of . . . that there is a need to change that.

In terms of our funding of new projects, it's 15 per cent is the local cost and 85 per cent is the cost to the provincial government in all of those cases. And as you said before, we're doing many of them across the province, and that also includes the operating cost, which the provincial government bears the brunt of . . . or bears that operating cost.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Minister, you can give me the answers to the question about the staffing in writing, if you will, because I would like you to break it down into full-time registered nurses, certified nursing assistants, and attendants, and also how many of those positions that you create are part-time positions. And if you could give me those answers in writing, I could go onto the next question because I want to ask you specifically about your government's plans for staffing the new integrated facilities. I understand there's a problem there because of the integrated facilities are nursing homes and part are hospitals. And I want to know how you are working it out with the administration of those integrated facilities as to how many qualified staff, how many staff are in the nursing home facility and how many are in the hospital facility?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I will undertake to provide in writing to the member the nursing positions and so on. What I have, just so you know this year is an estimate, and what will I provide you is an estimate because we don't have all the mix out there from all of the nursing homes yet, but we're estimating an increase of 70 full-time positions, full-time equivalents. So an increase of 70 this year over last year.

And all I'm saying is that . . . but I will characterize that in the letter that I send to you. I will put the asterisk there with that explanation of what . . . that this last number will be an estimate and the others . . . and I'll give you some background on that as well.

Ms. Smart: — I'm interested in the qualifications of those positions and when you say full-time equivalent position, does that mean two part-time jobs that are counted as a full-time job, but I want . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's what that means.

Ms. Smart: — That's what?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Full-time equivalents, as I understand them, are, yes, positions . . . if there are two half time, that means . . . that makes up one position.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Minister, I asked the continuing care to tell me how the operating budgets for the nursing homes were set, and I understand that there's not a formula funding arrangement between the Department of Health

and the nursing homes as to how they establish their budget; that the nursing homes just come forward with a budget to the Department of Health and then they are either approved or rejected. Now it seems to me . . . and also if their budget is approved, that they're meant to stay within that budget. So I would like to know what the criteria for approval of a budget for a nursing home is? If you're not operating on a formula funding, how are you working out the operating grants for the nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I think what the member's referring to is we have homes which have come on stream after 1981. You know, there's certain staffing standards set and so on, and that's how the budgets are determined.

We have other homes which were in existence prior to, and we've been trying to add . . . on an annual basis we've been trying to add enrichments to those homes, those previous to that, at the level of . . . well since '83-84, up to and including this year, an addition of \$11.4 million as an enrichment, bringing those on.

So while we are not at the stage yet where we can say that those standards are up to where the others are, but the gap is . . . we're making attempts on an annual basis to continue to close that gap and hoping at some point into the future to be able to have that gap completely closed.

I know it's not a totally acceptable situation for some who are either administering or working in some of those other homes, but I must say that it's a major stride forward from what was in existence prior to 1981.

And so, I mean, it's not something that was . . . I'm not saying this because it was something that was done by us or anything. It was something that came into being in 1981 at the same time that continuing care set the standard resident rate, and there was a whole series of things done. It was really by your government, and we've continued that practice and continued to try to close that gap that was begun in 1981, and we continue that now and are having some success, but maybe not to the extent or as quickly as some would like us to do.

(2000)

Ms. Smart: — Well I appreciate what you're saying, but I don't get a sense of how you judge a budget, how you approve a budget for a particular nursing home. And you don't have any requirements on the nursing home that they only have a 2 per cent increase from last year.

Or how do you work it out that you say, this budget is working and it's an operating budget that you'll approve of and one that you won't approve of? And are you making a judgement on each individual nursing home?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well just let me just run through it very quickly. We have these kinds of staffing standards, the kind of bench-mark, I guess you could say, that are used. And let me . . . I'll just read this to you.

For purposes of comparing staffing needs among special care homes, requirements are calculated as follows: for level 2 — and it's a certain amount of time required per day sort of thing, and it's care time required per day is 45

minutes; level 3, it's two hours; level 4, three hours. Those are kind of the bench-marks that are used.

I want to make a couple of other points here. It's important to note that a mathematical calculation showing a staffing shortfall does not indicate an inadequate level of care provided, any more than a calculation showing a staffing surplus would indicate a superior level of care. I think that there's not a direct correlation and that's why it's very difficult to get into these staffing standards in terms of, you know, exactly how much time is spent and so on. But you need to have some bench-marks and that's what this is an attempt to do. In continuing care they've been attempting to do this as they, over the period of years now, that they've been trying to bring this shortfall up in the 81 homes.

The key point is whether the home is providing adequate care to its residents. And that's maybe an obvious statement, but I think that is still the key point. Our consultants monitor the care in special care home facilities, in the individual facilities, and it's our view that homes are making excellent use of existing resources and they are meeting the needs of their residents. And I think what we have to do is put this into perspective. Not to say that there can't be, you know, more care or more staff and so on, and I hear this concern being raised. But as I see the statistics from every other province in this country, I believe that our folks are cared for, in terms of having the staff available to them and so on, better than any other place in the country. But that's not to say that it's the best that it could be and it may well be better as time goes on.

Ms. Smart: — Well, Mr. Minister, there certainly is a correlation between the number of staff that are available and the quality of the staff and the kind of care that the patients get. I mean there really is a direct correlation in spite of you saying that you don't see that there might be. There is, and when you have a nursing home that's defined as a level 2 actually trying to take care of level 3 and 4, and getting funded at a level 2 — 45 minutes or whatever formula — you've got a nursing home in stress and you've got staff in stress and you've got patients in stress and you've got a bad situation that you need to do something about.

And the operating funds are the main concern, now that you're building all these nursing homes. Because people are saying to me over and over again, it's not enough to have the homes themselves, we have to have the staff; we have to have the care. And people are having to go in and care for their families in the nursing homes because they aren't getting the proper care from the paid staff that are there.

And there's also lots of situations, as I discovered going around the province and door to door in Eastview, both in the rural areas and in the urban area. I met women who work in the nursing homes who are registered nurses, who are saying that they have to get called out in the middle of the night, that they're on call 24 hours a day. Sometimes they have to come in, if they live outside the community, they have to travel in the cold in the middle of winter to go into the nursing home to deal with an emergency situation because in the nursing home, particularly at night, there are only attendants on duty.

And there are people at level 4 care with Alzheimer's disease who really need help 24 hours a day, and the staff is not adequate — it's not adequate at all.

And, Mr. Minister, I want to question you a bit more about the operating budget. The operating budget for each nursing home that's submitted to you, does that include the interest that they have to pay on the capital that they've been given to build the nursing home or to replace and renovate the nursing homes? Is that included in their operating budget?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The money that's advanced through . . . I just want to get this clear now. You're asking the question that the money that's advanced through the Department of Health to pay the SPMC, the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation payment schedule? I went through that with the Health critic a while ago, as it relates to hospitals. Is that the same question?

Ms. Smart: — My question regards the operating budgets for each nursing home. And I want to know, when the nursing home submits their operating budget to you, does that operating budget include the money that they have to pay on the interest on the capital expansion if they've had a replacement or a new facility?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — For the homes which were built under the arrangement between, you know, a number of years ago between CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) and SHC (Saskatchewan Housing Corporation) and there's interest on those mortgages provided by CMHC and so on — yes, their budget provides for that and their payment from us provides for that interest.

Ms. Smart: — And what happens to the ones that are built now under your new arrangement? Where's the interest rate paid? Is that paid out of the operating budget?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — It's paid out of . . . if you look to the blue book on page 48, subvote 61, where grants to special care facilities repayment of principal and interest on capital loans in the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, yes, interest is paid from the Department of Health for both principal and interest on that repayment schedule that's set up.

Ms. Smart: — Well the reason I'm questioning you about this is because I would like to sense of what's involved in the operating budget that the nursing homes have to submit to you. Because one of the things that's happening is that, as I understand it, when the resident fees go up, every three months, so much money is taken off the old age pension, that the amount of operating money that goes to the nursing home from the government is decreased equal to the amount that they are increased from their residence fees. And I'm trying to find out how much is paid out of that operating budget. What particular costs are involved?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well the budgets that are approved on an annual basis . . . There's an annual budget approved for a particular nursing home and there are two sources of revenue, basically, for that nursing home: one, the major

source, from the government; and, two, resident fees. And as those resident fees go up as they do on the formula that's set there, based on the pension and so on, then that revenue is treated by the department as offset revenue and in order to meet the approved budget, the department's grant to them would be decreased in the similar amount, depending on the number of residents.

Ms. Smart: — Well, Mr. Minister, that seems to be a very unrealistic way to fund the nursing homes when their costs are going up and they're getting more and more patients at level 3 and 4. You're actually reducing the operating grants that the government is giving the nursing homes and making them pick up more and more of their costs based on that increase of residents' fees.

Now this has got the seniors very upset, the ones that are in the nursing homes, because more and more money is being taken away from them each three months, the money that is increased to them from the federal pension — and we've gone through this issue in the House before — that money is taken away to pay for their fees in the nursing homes. But they are not seeing any improvement in service, and one of the improvements in service that they particularly want to see is more adequate staffing. But if you are reducing the operating grants at the same time as their costs are going up in the residents' fees, you are basically making the residents pay for more and more of the operation of those nursing homes. And that, Mr. Minister, is another move towards the privatization of the nursing home and the lack of government support to the people.

And these are seniors who have paid taxes all their lives and who are entitled to see some basic income come back to them and to see some increases in services when they are charged for it.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well first of all let's be clear here. What we're doing and what the nursing home does and what we're trying to do even in these estimates is to set a budget for an annual budget, whether it's for the government, the Department of Health, or whether it's for nursing home ABC — whatever it is. So that budget is set out for the year according to the need that's there and whatever, and there will always be a debate in terms of is the budget adequate and so on. But I submit to you that the budgets are adequate, although I know that there's some strain there, based on some of the points that you raised earlier. And I recognize them, those points being that the demands for heavier and heavier levels of care are coming on to us faster than we can respond, even though we have responded in a major way, coming into a circumstance where nobody was responding for a long time. And that's something that's, you know, that's always an issue around the province is that there was so long when none were being built. But that's . . . Leave that aside for now.

In terms of the revenues which come from the residents, it still remains that that revenue is about 30 per cent of the cost of the operation of the nursing home. The residents pay about 30 per cent, the government . . . the taxpayers through the government pay 70 per cent. And that ratio is a very legitimate one, I would submit, especially given that the standard resident charge is set based on what's

available to the poorest of our elderly through the various pension schemes that are available to them. So that formula's set on that basis, and they are required to pay 30 per cent. And I understand, I mean, I understand that individuals living in there when there's an increase in their standard resident cost will say, well my services aren't going up and whatever. I submit to you that the services are continuing at a very high standard across this province, and that the government still continues to pay 70 per cent, as we've done for some time now.

Ms. Smart: — Well, Mr. Minister, the people in the nursing homes are having to pick up a lot of costs that are not included in the resident fees, and they're only left with \$100 to pay for those costs.

One of those items that is causing a lot of stress for people are things called incontinency pads, which can cost as much as \$300 a month. And people have to pay that out of their own money because the nursing homes seem to have not had a proper supply budget to be able to provide those resources to the patients in the nursing homes. And again, I remind you, if more and more of the people are at level 3 and 4, they're going to need more and more services. And if you're reducing the operating budget and trying to pay for these increased services out of the increase that's given to them in their old age pension, you haven't got enough money to provide them with the intensive care that they need at level 3 and 4.

So, Mr. Minister, one of my questions — and I'm trying to rush through this because I know the time has come up, but I have a lot of questions about home care and nursing care. One of the more important questions regards the budget for supplies for the nursing homes. Now it was at zero per cent last year. And the question is: is it going up to 5 per cent this year? Are they getting a 5 per cent increase? Apparently the nursing homes have not heard what the increase in their budget is for supplies.

(2015)

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Could I ask the member if . . . I'll provide that information to you. And if you have several questions, do you want to just ask them and I'll undertake that I will, in each case . . . If I can provide it, I'll undertake to provide them. This one I will undertake to provide to the member in writing.

Ms. Smart: — Well when can I get that answer because it's fairly serious for the nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Within the next day or two.

Ms. Smart: — All right, Mr. Minister, that's fine. I do have a question. We just had a report come out, the two-year study released on the unmet needs of the off-reserve Indian and Metis elderly in Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister. It's a very important report, and one of the things it deals with is the need for assistance and care. And it says that the continuing sensitization of the provincial system of long-term care to include the special concerns of the native elderly is also a need which is very much in evidence.

It's a very important report, Mr. Minister, and I would like

to just question you particularly about the very great need in La Ronge for a nursing home. This need in La Ronge has been expressed to you for some years, and since 1986 I understand there's been a promise of the nursing home. There's still no sign of a nursing home on the horizon, Mr. Minister. What are your plans for a nursing home in La Ronge?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I can provide the other answer that I said I would undertake . . . The medical supply budget is an increase of 4 to 5 per cent this year, so that's that answer.

And the second one as it relates to . . . And I saw the report that you referred to in terms of the elderly among our Indian and Metis populations, and you will know that I represent an area of the province with a large percentage of people of Indian and Metis ancestry. I know exactly what the report is saying, and I agree with some of the cultural things and some of the expectations and some of the way that those . . . some of those folks have been thinking about being in institutions and so on prior to this date in our history. But I think there is also a need, that it's coming at us just as the need of a more elderly population across the widest sense of our society is there.

And we get to the specifics of La Ronge. I hear what you're saying. We've heard of this request, along with the request for the hospital in La Ronge, and both them are being looked at together, to be very frank with you, the hospital and the need for nursing home, and I just . . . The next question as it relates to the North is on the west side, what we call the west side in the North — Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Beauval, La Loche area. There is an increasing need for nursing home capacity, heavier care for seniors, in that area as well, and I'm aware of it.

Ms. Smart: — So there's no particular plans for a nursing home in La Ronge in the next year or so?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — It's not on the list for this year or next year, but as you will know we have the five-year program that's been there, that's on now. Two or three years of it have gone by. It is our intention to add new projects to that list so that we can maintain a longer planning horizon because it's well accepted that we have that longer planning horizon out there across the province, and we'll maintain that. And we will be adding other projects with agreements in principle with some of these regions and areas . . . well, in the fairly near future. Let me just put it that way.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Minister, turning to home care, I would just like to clarify the setting of the fees for home care. I have in front of me a press release from the Saskatchewan Home Care Association reporting the following changes. This was passed out last year:

. . . reporting the following changes in the home care client fee system which have been imposed by the provincial government on home care districts to become effective May 1, 1987.

And a brochure that your department puts out, Mr.

Minister, on a client guide for home care programs, which says your district boards set the fees for home-making, home maintenance, and meal services. Now is it the government or is the district boards which set the fee systems?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well the government sets . . . And what we have said to the home care board, that we set the charge for each unit of service, you know, whether that's a meal or whatever it is, there's a certain charge for each unit of service. And then what the board sets is the board takes the applications from clients based on . . . which is an income-tested thing in terms of how much of a subsidy is the individual client eligible for if in fact they're eligible for any subsidy of some of the service that's provided, and depending on the number of units of service per month.

Ms. Smart: — Well I think the brochure is misleading, Mr. Minister, because it says that the district board sets the fees. And in one sense you can put it at arm's length from your department, but the service fees for home care going up such a lot have meant that many people haven't been able to afford it any longer, and it's definitely the responsibility of your government, not the district boards, as to how much money is available for those fees.

Mr. Minister, I'd like to question you about the target funding, target grants for home care which have decreased in the last couple of years. Target funding is necessary for . . . is provided to home care districts for high-need care, respite care, palliative care, and/or other means of supporting individuals at high risk of requiring institutionalization. Now you, yourself, in the continuing care *Exchange* magazine said that, "Let there be no mistake; institutionalized care must be the last option."

But in reducing the target grants for this particular kind of care — reducing it by 5.7 per cent from 1986 to 1989 — you are reducing fees for home care services which could prevent the need for more people going into nursing homes. And I want to express my disagreement with you in reducing those fees. I don't think I particularly need to hear your justification for it. It's just a sign that the home care is not valued as it should be by your government as a way of keeping people in their homes and perhaps not needing the kind of institutional care which is a lot more expensive.

Mr. Minister, I also just want to point out to you that in July of 1987, a letter went out to the community clinic from Phil Gaudet, the executive director of the Saskatoon home care district, saying that your department had discontinued the funding for the Fish transportation program. Now that was a program using volunteers to provide transportation to people in the community, and they had supplementary funding from the Department of Health, and you discontinued that funding.

As I look at the home care, I see a lack of support for volunteers doing work in the home care program, and that when you require volunteers altogether to fund things like transportation, instead of giving a grant to a program that was providing that, what you're actually doing is requiring healthy seniors — because they're the ones that are around to provide things like transportation — you're requiring healthy seniors to finance frail seniors

out of their own pockets, Mr. Minister. That's the kind of home care that you seem to be supporting.

You're saying there's no money for these supplementary programs. You cut the funding from Evergreen Neighbourly Services last year, and I've already expressed my concern about that kind of program. And yet you're turning around and requiring volunteer work within the home care boards by healthy seniors who have to use their own money to support frail seniors. And I think that's hard on them.

Every one of the seniors is living mainly on a fixed income, and for you to require that kind of support from healthy seniors for frail seniors in an ongoing way, is, I don't think, a strong enough support for that very important need of transportation and the other services that seniors provide for each other, and I think that their organizations should get the kind of support from you and through home care that they deserve, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — A couple things, quickly. The targeted funds that you refer to is gone up by half a million dollars this year, a \$500,000 increase. Most of that, frankly, is for the two cities of Saskatoon and Regina.

You make reference to transportation, some of the small grant organizations that were there, last . . . that was done in last year's budget. And frankly, while you say that some seniors are being asked to do this on a volunteer basis, I have talked to a number of them who believe that it's . . . that they feel good and they feel fulfilled by being able to do some of this in a community on a volunteer basis. And it's not, you know, it is not done in any kind of an onerous sort of thing for any of them.

You know, I just . . . if we took your logic to its logical conclusion, I would suggest to you that we'd end up where the model for some of these things — the nation of Sweden — which I know was, for some period of time, was raised by members opposite as the model for some of the care areas.

At the present time in the nation of Sweden, they are trying to work out a way across that country to reintroduce the concept of volunteerism — a sad testimony on that whole process. And the way in which they are attempting to do it is through conscription, because it's something their citizens understand through the military.

Now that's some kind of a system if we have to . . . And it certainly does not fit the spirit and the whole essence of Saskatchewan that we would ever get to the stage where we have to try to reintroduce, through some government program, the concept of volunteerism.

The concept of volunteerism is, to a large extent, very alive and well in this province and I don't want to be part of, nor do I think should you try to be part of, breaking that down in any way.

And I just say that the programs that you were referring to a large extent were duplicated by home care. Home care is the umbrella under which they should and they do operate, and it's working rather well. I know that there's

some debate as to, with the large bubble coming through the system here in terms of our ageing population and in much more need of heavier care, there always will be a debate for a number of years in terms of the level of funding. And I'm cognizant of that and attempt to increase that as the need continues, and I know it will increase inevitably.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Minister, just a final comment. I don't want you in any way to insinuate that I'm not supportive of the volunteer groups. I was very supportive of Evergreen Neighbourly Services. They needed some funding from the government to give them a base, to give them a paid co-ordinator to do the kind of work that they were doing, which was very much seniors helping seniors, working directly in the community. There's another example in Regina, with the Senior Citizen's Services.

And what you have done by taking the funding away from the volunteer groups — the support funding — is that you have made volunteer work a lot harder on people than it was before. And there was a lot more support for it in the past, Mr. Minister, so don't give me this business about Sweden and the military. I'm talking about Saskatchewan; I'm talking about the seniors that were organized here to provide volunteer services; and I'm talking about a decrease in the funding for home care that would have provided more support for those kinds of volunteer efforts.

And, Mr. Minister, I'm also talking about the decrease in the target grants to cover palliative care and respite care — two things which have been articulated as a very great need in this province. You have reduced the money; you've increased it a bit this year but it was down a lot last year from the year before, Mr. Minister, and the total is a decrease of 5.7 per cent.

(2030)

Mr. Goodale: — I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have a few matters that I would want to pursue with the minister this evening, and first of all, Mr. Minister, I'd like to discuss with you an issue that you and I have discussed in the House before — we've exchanged correspondence on it — and it has to do with the ambulance service at Assiniboia, the Wald Ambulance service.

And the precise issue that I wish to raise with you tonight, Mr. Minister, has to do with the method by which or the circumstances by which officials in your department became concerned about certain practices and procedures being followed by Wald Ambulance, which, of course, led to some rather controversial changes in the rules affecting that particular ambulance service. And tonight I don't want very much to debate with you the controversy; I'm interested in pursuing the procedure by which the issue arose.

And I gather from what I've learned from you and from the College of Physicians and Surgeons that there is within your department an auditing procedure which is undertaken to monitor what ambulance services are doing in the province, and that the practices being conducted by Wald Ambulance, which your department

found to be questionable, were discovered, as I take it, during this auditing process conducted by officials in your department. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could simply confirm for me that that is the procedure by which this complaint came to light.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I'll just go through the process as I understand it here. Each ambulance service in the province is visited twice a year, one on annual inspection and one on annual visitation, I guess. And during the course of one of these visits, the inspection folks found . . . There were some drugs found in the kit, there were some drugs found there that were questionable, certainly, in terms of what they find in a normal process around the province. So it was brought back to the attention of the ambulance unit on the advice of the medical director, who's the medical director to the department under contract. It was then raised with the College of Physician and Surgeons with whom these protocols, you know, are signed between the ambulance services and the College of Physicians and Surgeons in terms of what are appropriate drugs to be administered by the folks running the ambulance service with the people at whatever level of training that they have. So that's basically the process through which this came to light as it relates to the department.

As it relates to my own, I knew there was something happening, and the hon. member will recall that he and I had a discussion about it and so on. He brought it, as is legitimate, from concerns raised in his constituency by, I guess, both patients and, I believe, the ambulance service operator.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Minister, what I'm curious about is the time-lag involved here, because as I understand it, the procedures and practices and the carrying of the drugs that you referred to and so forth, has gone on, or had gone on, prior to this controversy for a matter of two or three or four years perhaps. And it was only very recently that your department discovered there was a problem or a perceived problem.

I'm just wondering how this ambulance service could have been going about the normal, legitimate conducting of its business, thinking that it was perfectly within the rules and everybody seeming to be totally satisfied and happy with the situation — indeed, letters of commendation being written to the ambulance service — everything seemed to be just fine over a period of two or three or four years, and then all of a sudden on some kind of a visitation or audit being done, a problem is discovered. I just wonder how this situation could persist for so long without your department seeming to regard it to be a problem until just the last two or three months.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — It was not two to three to four years. It was about a year and a half ago that there were some protocols signed or some protocols entered into, let's say, between the college and the ambulance services unit, and then for the various ambulances around the province.

Prior to this visit, our people were out to visit the Wald service at Assiniboia. The protocols had been reaffirmed in terms of exactly what would be allowed when the . . . I

think the circumstance, really, in Assiniboia was that the local physician, or one of the local physicians there, had taken it upon himself in arrangement with the ambulance operator to allow certain drugs to be dispensed by the ambulance operator and that was beyond what the College of Physicians and Surgeons were allowing. And that's where some of the controversy . . . Well it's pretty well the basis for what the controversy was following that. Since that time I think it's been . . . whether it's been cleared up in everyone's mind or not, but I think it's been very clear in terms of what is allowed on into the future.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Minister, just before I leave this subject, I'd simply want to confirm with you and seek your response to the point that from every report that I have heard, and I suspect every report that you and your officials have heard, this particular ambulance service that we are discussing this evening, Wald Ambulance at Assiniboia, is a very excellent service.

The controversy that has developed in the course of the last several weeks, as difficult a situation as that has been, I think the record should show in fairness to this particular ambulance and ambulance operator, that despite the controversy it is very clear in everyone's mind that this is a very excellent service, one of which the Assiniboia district can be very proud and of which the province of Saskatchewan is very proud. And I think it would be helpful in terms of reassurance on the point, Mr. Minister, if you would be in a position to comment on that.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I was just in consultation with my officials involved in this more directly, but I confirm everything that you've said about that service. Just here on the record tonight, I'd confirm that. There's no question about that. They are a very excellent service who have tried to upgrade the level of standards of their employees and so on, and do provide good service and continue to provide good service for that area.

So there is no question and nor has there been throughout this controversy ever any suggestion or any contemplation within the department or anywhere else that they don't provide a good service. It was just a matter of this misunderstanding with one physician and the ambulance operator going beyond the protocol that had been set out. And I know that the hon. member knows the need for those kinds of protocols to be in place and that they are now, and everybody understands it. But I'm very readily confirmed what you have said about Wald Ambulance service of Assiniboia.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Minister, could I ask if there are plans within your department to provide legislation which would, in future, authorize ambulance services, like Wald Ambulance, in a large rural area a long way from base hospitals, to provide the kind of service and the administration of procedures and so forth that Wald was previously providing, where the equipment and the properly trained personnel are available.

As you will know, in other jurisdictions there is legislation providing not just for ambulance services, not just for advanced medical or advanced emergency technicians and attendants, but actually providing for a full-fledged paramedic system. I wonder if anything like that is in the

plans of the department for the future, where you're dealing: number one, with a very large rural territory, where that territory is a long way from a base hospital; and where, as is fortunately the case with Wald Ambulance, you have particularly well-trained people and good equipment to work with. I wonder if that's in the department's plans some time in the future.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The system under the newly clarified protocols of the college and ourselves and the ambulance operators provides for that now. But in each case, the ambulance service will need to apply in a very specific sense for what it is that they . . . You know, for every transfer function, what I call a transfer, from a physician to someone who is not a physician, to be able to administer these drugs. There would have to be some very specific sort of guide-lines set out. But the flexibility is there in the protocols that we've been discussing now, and, you know, they would be . . . And I'm sure that if they haven't already, I'm sure that Wald Ambulance is going through this process because they are one of those services which does have, as you say, a wide area with some long distances involved in terms of their catchment area and the Assiniboia Hospital, etc. So I'm sure if they haven't applied now, they will have for, you know, the more specific process that they need to go through; so then I'm sure that's under way.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Minister, I will want to review our exchange tonight very carefully when we get the written record of it, and there may be some specifics of that that I would like to pursue with you on another occasion in writing because this is a vital service in a rural community, and we're all anxious to see it preserved and enhanced.

Mr. Minister, just one another ambulance-related question, and that has to do with air ambulance services in the province of Saskatchewan. As we know, sadly, from time to time, even the best road ambulance with the very best of equipment and the very best of trained personnel is not able to cope with some of the most serious of circumstances, and I am wondering what plans your department would have in the foreseeable future to enhance the air ambulance capacity in the province of Saskatchewan, and most particularly enhance it with the addition of the new and fastest technologies like jet helicopters and so forth. Are those things at all within the planning horizon of the department?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — In the air ambulance area we have a medical director who's about to make some recommendations to us in terms of that system, because as it relates to . . . well just the fact that we are the far-flung province that we are, with the more intensive services in the two larger centres, there may be a need for some of this. And as the member has said, there's a whole range of potentials here in terms of what can be done. What we have to do is come to an agreement on what's most appropriate and cost effective and so on.

So I don't rule out a move to some of those higher technology-type of ambulance services, but they're not on the planning horizon for the very immediate future, but I can tell you that we will continue to look at those kinds of things.

(2045)

Mr. Goodale: — Well I appreciate the minister's encouraging answer to that question. I'd just urge him to accelerate the time frame because those things I think in a province like Saskatchewan are critically important.

Mr. Minister, there's a long list of other issues I would like to raise with you. In the interest of time this evening, I will just go to one other subject area and that has to do with the construction plans of your department for hospitals and nursing homes and the integrated facilities that combine some aspects of both hospitals and nursing homes in one new building. I know you've answered some questions on that already this evening, so I think I can be brief on this subject.

The last five-year plan for this construction schedule that you talked about earlier this evening, could you confirm for me when that plan began. My records seem to indicate it was about 1983. I just wonder if you could tell me in this five-year plan, when was the first of the five years, and when was that five-year period expected to conclude.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Okay. The last year of that five-year plan where approvals in principle were given was for the year '89-90, so — what would it be? — the '84-85 would have been the first year of that. And there was one year last year — when was last year, '86-87 . . . oh, '87-88 — '87-88 where we had deferrals of the projects. And I sent it out to all those that were due in '87-88, plus the projects which had received approval in principle for this current year and for next year, a deferral there as well, but with the assurance — and this is key — with the assurance that they would not lose their place on the priority list, so to speak, that there would be no new projects coming in ahead of them. And that is still the case and they have that commitment from the government.

And this year, the projects and the integrated facilities that are going ahead this year are those projects which were scheduled to go ahead last year. Now I haven't been able to and will not be able to now, at this stage, to give an absolute assurance that we're right back on track but with a one year delay, but it is our intention to carry on and to do these projects as quickly as we can. And as I said to one of the members earlier, it is our intention to add to that list so that we maintain a longer planning horizon both from the point of view of good government planning, but also from the point of view of good planning and legitimate kind of planning by the local organizations out there who are raising the local money and dealing with the local R.M.s and so on. And I know the member has a couple in his riding that he's about to ask me about, and I'm sure that that answer, as I've given to them, you can reiterate to them as well.

Mr. Goodale: — Well I appreciate the minister's reassurance. Could I, Mr. Minister, have from you in writing within the next few days just some detail about the five-year plan in terms of actually when it began, what projects have been constructed so far under that plan, where are they, and how much they have cost. And with respect to the ones that have been deferred, could you indicate to me which ones have been deferred and where

they were on the original schedule, the reasons for the deferral, and where are they now, just so we could see the whole pattern of what's happened.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I'll undertake to answer the question just as you put it. We'll take it from *Hansard* and we'll answer the question in writing just as you put it here.

Mr. Goodale: — I appreciate that very much, Mr. Minister. Could you then just clarify for me the assurance that you referred to in your earlier answer. I believe you said to me that any of the projects that were included in the five-year schedule, that for one reason or another in the government's judgement had to be deferred, would not lose their priority. They would not be replaced by other projects coming in ahead of them, and in all likelihood, although this wasn't a guarantee, the deferral would just be of one year's duration. Those that were ready to go in '88 would likely be '89, those that were '89 would be '90.

I wonder if the minister could simply clarify that because as he anticipated in his previous answer, I have a couple of those that are important, two, specifically, that I can refer to, of course, Gravelbourg and Lafleche. They had been, as I understand it, approved in principle for 1989, I believe was the original commitment, and I wonder if the minister could give me some specifics as to where those now appear in the government's game plan.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Both of the ones that the member refers to were approved in principle for '89-90, okay? They were '89-90 projects. You have my assurance that they will not . . . but the projects which were approved for '88-89, for example, will be in front of those. I'm not in a position now to say that it will be definitively those in a particular year and that there will only be a one-year delay. But I'm hoping that there will be that and in some cases perhaps we can even do a catch up on it. It's not our intention to delay them any longer than we have to, secondly.

So I can't put a definitive date on when but I . . . and as I have said to those communities as well, and I'll reiterate to the member just as you've outlined it, just as I outlined it earlier. And when you do, as you said before, when you go through the written record of our exchange here, you will see that the assurance is there, and if we need to write back and forth, we can do that as time goes on.

Mr. Goodale: — Just one final question then, Mr. Minister. I wonder if you can tell me if you have formal applications for hospital improvements and/or the construction of integrated facilities in the communities of Rockglen and Coronach. I wonder if there is anything presently before your department in terms of an active file on those two communities.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — They're just trying to recall the particulars of . . . There has been a meeting or there's one scheduled for Rockglen. Let me just reply to the member in a more definitive sense once I, you know, once I determine where there's, you know, what stage any meetings, or what proposals they will have had before us.

But certainly, in the case of Rockglen, they can recall that

and I think . . . Well I don't want to risk getting into this with Coronach because I'm not sure about the meeting, but I'll provide in writing the status of any meetings or any sort of file that we have on either of those locations.

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I will look forward to having that information.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to point out that at the beginning of these estimates, we had talked about the fact that this government was attacking the principles of medicare, being universality, comprehensiveness, public administration, and accessibility. And we illustrated that through this government's policies in the prescription drug plan whereby people are having difficulty getting access to prescription drugs and needed medication. We illustrated that by talking about the destruction of the school-based children's dental program which has made it very difficult for young children to get access to dental services, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, and which, in effect, has reduced the number of people who are eligible under that plan, Mr. Chairman.

We talked about the long hospital waiting lists and we talked about that today in this House with respect to the fact that back in, I think it was March — my figures are February or March, the most recent figures I had — which indicated the hospital waiting lists were at approximately 12,000 to 13,000 people, Mr. Chairman, long hospital waiting lists for people to get needed services.

At the beginning of the estimates, we showed, on a case by case basis, circumstances where people were being denied access to medicare. They were being denied access to comprehensive services. They were being . . . and the fact that government was moving away from publicly funding services such as the school-based children's dental plan. And on a point by point basis, we were illustrating that this government is attacking the corner-stones of medicare, Mr. Chairman. It's attacking the corner-stones of medicare, and it's doing it under the false assumption that costs are escalating under control because that's the PC rhetoric, Mr. Chairman, that costs are escalating out of control.

And yet we were able to illustrate today in the estimates that this government has taken no serious measures with respect to controlling costs, for example, on the prescription drug plan other than, Mr. Chairman, to make people pay 100 per cent up-front drug costs, and in that way they're attempting to control costs. By denying people the service, by denying people access to services because their pocket-book can't afford it, they are attempting to control costs.

But otherwise they haven't provided doctors with a comparative formulary to compare prices of various drugs when they are prescribing, Mr. Chairman. They haven't done that, Mr. Chairman, but the minister let slip the fact that the market would solve these things — a phrase to that effect — with respect to prescription drugs, Mr. Chairman. And that's where that government is coming from, Mr. Chairman. They're moving towards the privatization of medical services and attempting to do that on the false assumption and the false argument that

costs are escalating out of control.

But when we take a close look at the budget, we see that some \$260 million of this year's budget are reallocated expenditures from former years, Mr. Chairman — 260 million reallocated in this year's budget. We take a look at these interest payments that are being made to the property management corporation, another government Crown corporation taking interest payments from hospitals and nursing homes, Mr. Chairman. And, of course, this adds to the health care budget, and it gives them a little more padding so that they can say that they're spending this enormous amount of money on health care. But when you compare apples to apples and not apples to oranges, Mr. Chairman, it becomes readily apparent that costs have not escalated in the manner that they've indicated.

We've also talked about specialists leaving the province, Mr. Chairman, at unprecedented rates, specialists leaving the province, Mr. Chairperson, and it's largely due to this government's policies; it's largely due to the policies of this government inasmuch as they are underfunding hospital care and they're underfunding many programs we see — the lack of equipment, for example, in the cardiac unit in the University Hospital in Saskatoon. There is equipment there that is old and out of date; and there is equipment there that other cardiac units across Saskatchewan have that this cardiac unit does not have, Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And you can shout from your seat at me if you wish, but that's the true facts of the matter, Mr. Minister.

And so we see an underfunding by this government and a lack of commitment to the health care policy, that has created a health care crisis in Saskatchewan, and has created an environment whereby health care specialists find it very difficult to practise their profession, Mr. Minister; and as a result of that, we see specialists leaving the province. And the minister was unable to come forward with any real plan to maintain and retain the specialists we have and to attract further specialists to this province.

(2100)

As I indicated earlier, there were a number of individual cases brought up in this legislature with respect to hardships being suffered as a result of PC cut-backs in health care and the lack of PC commitment with respect to health care, Mr. Chairman. We talked about these individual cases because these people had asked us to bring them forward, and they were hoping that by bringing to the floor of the legislature, it would make the public aware of some of the hardships they are suffering and would also bring the matter more closely to the government's attention so that perhaps they would give their case further consideration. But we see virtually a very uncaring government, a very uncaring government, and it's extremely difficult to get any real measures out of this government and any real help from this government. Mr. Chairman, because they don't care. These people are only statistics to them and they're not real individuals.

And let's just take something that we didn't go into in detail with these estimates, but the CNAs (certified

nursing assistants) of the Cut Knife hospital who were all fired because there is lack of funding to the Cut Knife hospital, and who are now taking jobs as aides . . . I am advised by these CNAs, they are being encouraged to take jobs as aides rather than certified nursing assistants, Mr. Chairman, because there is lack of funding and the hospital board is being encouraged to hire aides instead of nursing CNAs, Mr. Chairman — a very unhealthy situation. And that's a stark example of how hospital funding and the lack of it in this province has created problems for people.

I also want to comment on the fact that when questions were asked in this House, it took such an inordinate length of time to get some of the answers from the minister, and it makes me wonder just how he is on his department, Mr. Chairman. But I can . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I beg your pardon?

An Hon. Member: — He's more interested in privatization.

Ms. Simard: — Yes, my colleague from P.A. says he's more interested in the privatization of health care as opposed to solving many of the problems that we've brought to his attention and that the people of this province have brought to his attention, Mr. Chairman. And that's a sad state, I tell you, for the province of Saskatchewan.

But I've been travelling across rural Saskatchewan over the weeks, and I know, Mr. Chairman, that the men and women and the children in this province want quality health care. They want universal, accessible, comprehensive, publicly funded health care, and they aren't going to stand for the closure of rural hospitals. They're not going to stand for the privatization of health care. They want their prescription drug plan reinstated. They want their school-based children's plan reinstated. They want a commitment by their government with respect to providing quality, accessible health care in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — And I tell you what, Mr. Chairman, they're going to get it in 1990 or 1991 after the election is called.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, just prior to going on the estimates, I'm not . . . Just for anyone who's worried about it, I'm not planning to give a long response to what the hon. member has said except to say that . . . except to say that what she has said, has once again . . . The way she has portrayed the health care system is not the way the health care system is out there across the province.

And the other thing I wanted to say is, and I have given the undertaking to the member from Saskatoon South, a former minister of Health, who last year I remember that the estimates . . . And it's, I think, to the credit of the critic here this year . . . The estimates last year, as I recall, about the month of October last year deteriorated one day during the debate between myself and the former minister of Health and now a member from Saskatoon South, to a

point where I think in looking back on that after some sober second thought, I will withdraw some comments that I made on that occasion. And I made some comments as it relates to the relationship between that member, as minister, and the former deputy minister of Health who now resides in Victoria, Mr. Ken Fyke.

So I will withdraw those comments that I attributed at that time to, I believe it was to the . . . Well I'll just withdraw what was said in the *Hansard* of October last year related to the relationship between the member and Mr. Fyke. And I gave that undertaking to the member from Saskatoon South and it's so done.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 34 inclusive agreed to.

Item 35 — Statutory.

Vote 32 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates (No. 2)
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Health
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32**

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 32 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — I would like to thank the minister and his officials.

Ms. Simard: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank the officials for having assisted in these estimates. We appreciate the help that they've given us.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, I just — very quickly — but I want to thank these people, not only for the period of time we spent here in the House with estimates, but certainly these people, plus all of the people out across the province, who work in the Department of Health. They give excellent service to the public of this province and they should be thanked by all members in this House for the work they've done throughout the last year.

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 53**

Mr. Chairman: — I'd like the minister, please, to identify his officials.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It gives me pleasure to introduce some of the officials that will be assisting me tonight. Seated to my left is the president of the property management corporation, Otto Cutts; directly behind me is Shirley Raab, vice-president, finance; and over across the aisle from Otto here is Les Handford, director of financial planning. There'll be other officials that will move in from the back as we proceed through the estimates.

Item 1

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when you boil down the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation from the blue book, you find there are really only essentially two lines dealing with the property management corporation which total up to 140, just over \$148.4 million.

And really, what's important, Mr. Chairman, is what's not in the blue book, what's not in the blue book about the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation; that in itself, Mr. Chairman, speak volumes about practices of this Crown corporation to which we are now asked to provide even more taxpayers' dollars.

The old and honoured parliamentary practice of grievance before supply is represented by the estimates and the examination thereof that we have before the House at this time. Put briefly, we, as the people's representatives, have the right and indeed a responsibility to hold this government accountable for its expenditure of taxpayers' dollars from the preceding supply of funds made available last year.

Very few of us, and I include myself, Mr. Chairman, have the time or the sophisticated ability to examine the previous year's operation to determine whether more funds should be supplied. In large part, we depend on the timely presentation of annual reports; we also depend on an analysis by others well qualified to do that job. We, as the people's representatives, proceed through the estimates based on the foregoing.

And I want at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, to deal about the timely production of reports by this department and now a Crown corporation. And the first report I want to refer to is 1985-86 annual report of the department of supply and services, which this minister was in fact in charge of because his picture is in it, and I assume he was in charge. The letter of transmittal on this report, coming out of the report, is November 1, 1986, Mr. Chairman. It was finally tabled in this Assembly on July 9, 1987, or seven months later from the letter of transmittal which was in the report.

The annual report of the department of supply and services, 1986-87 — more than one year after the close of the year, this report was tabled in the House on April 6, 1988. The first report of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation was tabled more than one year after the close of the year. So this information is brought forward more than one year after the close of the year.

I think by relating these facts to the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, it's quite clear that the timely presentation of reports and information is something that has not been followed by this minister in charge of this department and this Crown corporation to which we are referring to this evening.

(2115)

I want to leave that aside, Mr. Minister, and go to the last auditor's report for the year ending March 31, 1987. In going to that report, it's quite clear upon examination that there are only two other sections of government that took more space in the auditor's report than the department of

supply and services and the property management corporation which evolved from it.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the auditor comments in the auditor's report dated the year ending March 31, 1987:

All employees of the Department of Supply and Services resigned on February 28, 1987 (that was the end of February, 1987) and accepted employment with the ... property management corporation.

And the auditor goes on to state:

My representatives made the following observations regarding changes to departmental appropriations that did not appear to have appropriate authority.

Dealing with Parks and Renewable Resources, the auditor had this to say:

"... Rent of ground, buildings and other space." Prior to August 31, 1987, my representatives enquired whether there was a written agreement supporting the payment ... Subsequent to August, 1987, my representatives attempted to follow up (on) this matter numerous times and each time they were informed that the matter was being investigated. On February 17, 1988, (a considerable time later, Mr. Chairman, the auditor's) ... representatives were able to meet with management, at which time they were informed that no written agreement existed and that the rent was calculated in accordance with the SPMC's (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation's) accommodation manual.

And the accommodation manual will be mentioned later in the auditor's report, Mr. Chairman. It's well to make note of that at this time.

Upon further investigation of this payment, Departmental officials informed my representatives that the payment was not for rent, but was a grant payment to SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) respecting the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources for 1986/87 ...

It goes on to state:

However, the voucher was incorrectly coded and no approval was obtained from the Lieutenant Governor ...

And the auditor goes on to state:

In my opinion, the Department had neither support nor authority to make such a payment and accordingly, this payment was not properly vouchered or certified.

The amount of money we're talking about here is not small change, Mr. Chairman; it's \$2,414,000, in excess of

that figure. And I want to find out from the minister what his response is to the auditor's observations with regard to the payment to Parks and Renewable Resources for \$2,414,660.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — My officials indicate to me that in the initial stage that all the capital moneys from Parks was put into the property management budget, and then the property management corporation paid that back to Parks in their budget. And this is what the auditor was somewhat concerned about.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, you suggest that the auditor was somewhat concerned about ... You haven't really given any answer, any response to it as far as I'm concerned. We're talking about over \$2.4 million which the auditor has drawn attention to, and there's a number of other examples here. I don't understand your answer. It doesn't seem to wish away the auditor's comments.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — As a corporation develops and grows, I think one would realize that there are certainly ... Sometimes there can be things that can be attributed as errors. What my department are telling me is that actually it was capital money that was, as I say, taken into property management corporation and paid back to the Parks department, but in the coding was indicated as rent. And that seems to be the bone of contention that the auditor is concerned about, that it was shown as rent when actually it was a capital transaction. I hope that adds further enlightenment to you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, I want to bring another case to your attention, which was mentioned by the auditor. It is related to repayment of loans by certain hospitals and universities.

Effective March 31, 1986, SPMC (the property management corporation), the Department of Health, (and) Department of Advanced Education and Manpower ... entered into agreements to convert grants made by the two Departments in the 1985/86 fiscal year to these institutions into loans owing to the SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) by the institutions. One condition of the loan agreement was that the obligation of the institution was limited to an amount equal to the funds received ... and also provided for the repayment of these funds directly from these Departments to SPMC (the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation).

In March, 1987, the Department of Supply and Services repaid \$2,511,210 in respect of these loans agreements owing to SPMC (the property management corporation) by making a grant payment to SPMC (property management corporation) under authority of Section 4 of The Public Works Act. The payment was classified (coded) as a grant payment.

Based on the terms of the loan agreement, such funds should have been provided in the Department of Health and the Department of ... Education and Manpower appropriations ...

identified in estimates of these Departments rather than the Department of Supply and Services because the Minister of Supply and Services was not a party to the agreements.

And I want to know, Mr. Minister, do you have a response to that condition raised by the auditor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think what the auditor is concerned about, there maybe was a little break with tradition. But actually I think the member would agree that the government could put the money in whatever department they wished. It would not necessarily have to be within, say, health or with Education, it would be within supply and services. But I think what he was indicating that perhaps that was somewhat different than what tradition had been.

But I want to reinforce to the member that we were going through a very transitional phase there moving from a department of supply and service to a property management Crown. And also where the funding, the funding to third parties was being conducted in a manner different than it had been done previously when it came out of the line departments.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I would have to agree with you, Mr. Minister, that the auditor doesn't agree with you and your department, and also that we're not talking about small sums of money here. We're talking about \$2,511,210 that the auditor is alluding to in this particular instance. Agreed, you went around the procedures that normally would have been applied, and the auditor was not satisfied.

I want to go on to another one, Mr. Chairman, grants made to property management corporation re capital projects of various school boards. And in March '87:

... under the authority of Section 4 of The Public Works Act, in order that SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) could make grant payments to various school boards in Saskatchewan with respect to capital projects.

There was an authorizing:

... Order-in-Council (which) did not specify the school boards to whom SPMC (the property management corporation) in turn was supposed to make grants.

The responsibility for all matters, the auditor goes on:

Responsibility for all matters relating to elementary and secondary education in the Province are assigned to the Minister of Education ... Accordingly, capital grants to school boards have traditionally paid under the authority of The Education Act ... Supply and Services made the grant payment to SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) without an agreement with the Minister of Education relative to carrying out duties imposed on him and, accordingly, without knowing how the grants would be calculated for each school board ...

In addition, by utilizing authority under The Public Works Act to pay SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) and having regard to the broad scope of grant making powers which SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) was accorded under the authorizing Order-in-Council, it is not clear whether any criteria were effectively in force to govern the payments to be made by SPMC (the property management corporation), but in any case, no evidence was available to indicate that the criteria under The Election Act would be applied by SPMC (the property management corporation) ...

The auditor concludes:

In summary, I am concerned that these actions have reduced the information available to the Members of the Legislative Assembly and thereby reduced the ability of the Members of the Legislative Assembly to exact a comparable degree of accountability on an ongoing basis.

The following information is no longer disclosed.

The auditor states:

The Public Accounts no longer disclose the School Divisions who received capital grants during the fiscal year and the amounts each Board received.

The Estimates no longer disclose the capital grants for School Divisions and accordingly the Members do not have the opportunity to specifically appropriate the sum necessary for new capital grants.

And I might add parenthetically because they are now done by a Crown corporation.

I want to know if the minister has any response to this observation by the Provincial Auditor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I think one has to realize that there was a transition phase there, and I make no denial that there is a change from what traditionally had taken place, and I think that's what the Provincial Auditor is indicating. He's not saying there was anything inappropriately done. He's just saying that there was a change in the way it had taken place. And, as the member will realize from our discussions in Crown corporation under the property management corporation, that there was transition year from when it went from supply and services to the property management corporation. A lot of things changed in that period of time, but certainly new well-established ways in which the financing to third parties takes place. And in the case of Education, as I believe the members knows, there was a period where it was done by property management corporation, but in actual fact, now it is back to the way it was done formerly in the case of Education.

(2130)

So there should be no reason why anyone would have any difficulty in ascertaining what grants were given to what school boards across the province.

Mr. Brockelbank: — What the Provincial Auditor is saying, Mr. Minister, here is that \$20,950,000 — this is even in a larger sum than before:

... is no longer disclosed:

The Public Accounts no longer disclose the School Divisions who received capital grants and the amount each Board received, and

The Estimates no longer disclose the capital grants for School Divisions and accordingly the Members do not have the opportunity to specifically appropriate the sums necessary for new capital grants.

What the minister is saying is he's saying that this is being corrected, and in the future, all the things that the auditor says that we shall not see, we will be able to see, and if so, why did it take the auditor to have to tell you that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think one has to realize that the property management Crown is a treasury board Crown and therefore under the direction of treasury board. And as I said previously, treasury board can allocate the moneys in whatever department they would wish for whatever type of purpose.

However, I think you should realize, and I stated that before, that there was a transition phase, but in the case of Education, as it is today, it's back to the similar way that it was previously. For one year there was a look at working it through the property management Crown. It has gone back under the Minister of Education.

So there should be no reason why anyone couldn't trace what moneys goes to whatever school board for whatever capital projects through the Department of Education capital expenditures.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, we will be watching this with interest to see if you have in fact complied with the auditor's observations in the auditor's report.

I want to go on to another section. It has to do with rental payments, and it goes on to state: "... The Public Works Act reads as follows ..."

Essentially I'll boil it down. It says the minister may enter into contracts or agreements. It goes on and says:

Pursuant to Section 27, the Minister of Supply and Services authorized a delegation of authority on July 29, 1985, according to which any lease or lease/purchase of building space or property (including agreements for amortization of leasehold improvements costs and furniture leases related to building space or property) must be in writing and approved by officials authorized by the Minister. (Since he's given a delegation of

authority.)

The auditor goes on to state:

In March, 1987, the Department of Supply and Services paid a total of \$7,638,403 to SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) for "rental charges resulting from construction work in progress financed from 1985-1987". Prior to August 12, 1987, my representatives asked to examine a copy of the contract between the Department ... and SPMC to ensure that it was approved in accordance with the Minister's authorization or delegated authority. At that time my representatives were not provided with copies of such contracts and management would not confirm whether a written contract existed for this payment. After several attempts to obtain a copy of the contract, at a meeting on February 17, 1988, my representatives were informed that no such contract existed. They were also informed that these payments were made in accordance with the accommodations manual issued by SPMC (the property management corporation) ...

There you have the mention of the accommodation manual, and I want you to make note of that again, Mr. Minister.

... representatives were further informed that the rental charges were in respect of construction and renovation projects in progress at March 31, 1986, which were transferred over to SPMC (property management corporation) ...

Subsequent to the meeting of February 17, 1988, my representatives reviewed the documents and information provided by management ...

And the auditor's representative reported as follows:

a) The accommodation manual which the Department relied on as support for payments was not in effect at that time when the rental payments were made.

So the accommodation manual, which was cited by me in example number one and again in this example number three, was not even in effect, and the department was citing that accommodation manual as the authority for making the payments.

This goes on further:

The agreements for sale did not make provision for any rental payments in the period prior to the accommodation manual taking effect on March 31, 1987.

So the agreements made no provision for the period not covered by the accommodation manual.

How are they made?

SPMC's request for one particular payment

included in a payment voucher stating rental charges resulting from (get this, Mr. Chairman) construction work in progress Prince Albert \$2,079,430.

That was the voucher.

Another request for rental charges resulted from construction work in progress stated 2340-50 Albert Street \$2,082,802. My representatives requested a further explanation of these payments but were unable to obtain such information. Management indicated that they had other priorities to deal with and that the requested information would be made available as soon as possible. At April 30, 1988 (April 30, 1988), this information has not yet been provided. Accordingly, I am unable to complete my examination and thus am unable to completely fulfil my reporting responsibilities pursuant to The Provincial Auditor Act.

Do you have a response to that, Mr. Minister — a rather serious charge?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I think, again, if the Provincial Auditor realizes now that the accommodation and account manual is in place and that that is the guide-line upon which our agreements for third parties are made . . . And certainly there is no attempt to not disclose those things. We were in a transition phase, building a new corporation, a new way of doing business, and I think anyone would realize that during that period of time that it takes some time to get things up and running. But I can say at this point in time, they certainly are and any transactions would be conducted in view of the accommodation manual.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is the same minister, basically the same officials, and the minister says we're in transition. Well that may be the portent of the times. This government may be in transition with this kind of bookkeeping, one of the most observed conditions, contrary to the auditor's rules and practices, by this department and this Crown corporation. And I go on, Mr. Chairman. This is the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, second report, filed May 10, 1988 in this Assembly, and it says about the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, on page 10:

The Provincial Auditor raised the issue of how the formation of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation may reduce the accountability of the executive government of the Legislative Assembly. In accordance with the usual crown corporation policy, the new corporation would not disclose payee information which would have been available had the activities remained the responsibility of a government department.

This is something that I have said a long time ago and other people have observed as well.

Your Committee explored this matter with

corporation officials. It was indicated that the payee information respecting items purchased for government departments through the corporation's purchasing agency would still be included in the Public Accounts; however, expenditures relating to the operation of the new corporation would be reported in the format normal for a treasury board crown corporation.

One of the observations that has to be made with regard to the creation of the property management corporation is this, Mr. Chairman: in 1986-87 the property management corporation received \$181.9 million in loans which should have been called expenditure. If this had been set out as an expenditure, it would have increased the total expenditures for the year by \$181.9 million in the Consolidated Fund — that, and would have increased the 1986-87 deficit from 1.2 million to \$1.4 million.

So what the effect of this was by the property management corporation was to reduce the deficit in the Consolidated Fund, which we've observed before; it's not news. We've known all along that the decision to fund capital projects with borrowed money, outside the combined funds was reducing thereby the total reported expenditures and thus reducing the deficit.

Another observation which I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is this. An auditor's qualification had to do with this particular matter. He says that there was \$135 million write-down of loans to Crown entities which should have occurred in 1985-86 instead of 1986-87.

In a sense it doesn't really matter which year the write-down was attributed to, but there is a good political reason for having the write-down later. The significant political fact is that these write-downs were known to be necessary early in 1985-86, well before the election. They are cited in the '85-86 auditor's report to the public accounts of that year. The government chose not to execute these write-downs in the pre-election year which is a subtle manipulation of the debt of this province, and I don't think the minister in charge needs to be complimented for that. I think he should reassess his position with regard to the observations that have been made by the Provincial Auditor, which I tend to side with. But I wonder where the minister may take the view that's been taken by the member from Kindersley, who makes observations about auditors. It's clear that the member for Kindersley, if he's making observations about auditors, he's making observations about this auditor here in Saskatchewan. he's not making observations about auditors in British Columbia or Newfoundland, he's making observations about the auditor in this province.

And when the Minister of Justice says, as reported in *The Kindersley Clarion*, June 15, 1988:

Auditors are people who bump against reality once a year. (They) live in a jungle-zoo and call themselves bureaucrats. They wear thick glasses because they're looking at the fine print to see if every "i" is dotted.

Well I'll tell you that we could have a provincial auditor in Saskatchewan who only could read Braille and could go into this minister's department and Crown corporation and come up with a report like this, indicates he's not there just dotting the i's and crossing the t's. He's got much more serious business to do than that. And I suspect what the minister from Kindersley had the temerity to suggest in this Assembly, goes for the minister in charge of the property management corporation as well. And I'm distressed to see that.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, what were the auditor's fees in 1986-87, in 1987-88, and estimated for '88-89.

(2145)

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Was the question of what we pay the Provincial Auditor?

Mr. Brockelbank: — The question is: what was paid to the auditor for auditor's fees in actual 1986-87, '87-88, and estimated '88-89?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The figures are the following — and we don't pay the Provincial Auditor, but to external audit: in '86-87, 30,000; in '87-88, an estimate of 80,000; and in '88-89, approximately the same 80,000 estimate.

Mr. Brockelbank: — So the auditor's fees from 1986-87 have gone to an estimated \$80,000 from \$30,000. That's a fairly substantial increase, Mr. Minister. Can the minister supply me with the letter of engagement that went to the auditor? How about in each of those years, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We can't provide it tonight. It's not with us, but we can provide it to you at some time in the future.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I go to your report, your annual report, Mr. Minister. It says, more than once, the corporation will be run like a business. "This will give the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation the flexibility it needs to operate efficiently . . ."

I notice you didn't mention costs here, Mr. Minister. How do you explain going from \$30,000 for the auditor's fees to \$80,000? I want to know why it went up so much.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — If you'll recall from Crown corporations discussions, the year of '86-87 was, as I pointed out, the transitional year where, if you'll recall our discussions of about two weeks ago, there were 25 properties that were under the Crown — the property management Crown — for that period of time, so that would indicate the difference in the fees. There was far less work to be audited in that year because there was very little in the property management Crown and most of it was still supply and services until the end of that year where then it moved into the property management Crown.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, the cost of auditing, if it was allotted to the area where it occurred, would have been much in excess of \$30,000 in '86-87 because that

was for a partial year or for a partial Crown corporation. There would have been other audit fees which you wouldn't have been charged for. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No. In that year the other portions would have still been in supply and services and that would have been done by the Provincial Auditor, and there's no charge for that.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I look forward to seeing the letter of engagement in each of those three years, Mr. Minister, in due course.

I want to ask you some other questions, and the first one has to do with staff in the department. I want to know who the ministerial assistants are for the minister: names and salaries as at December 31, '87 and the same for March 31, '88, at the conclusion of the fiscal year.

I might say, Mr. Minister, it's not necessary to have that information at this time, if the minister will provide it for those, covering all ministerial assistants, executive assistants of a political nature in the minister's office or in the Crown.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I'll get that across to you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I would like to, in due course, Mr. Minister, get a listing of the amount of money which the property management corporation presently owes in mortgages and loans. And I suppose you would arrive at a logical cut-off date. It may be March 31, '88. Perhaps the minister can state what the cut-off date would be.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I indicate to you that the owings would be about \$450 million as of March 31, '88.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Could you provide me, Mr. Minister, with a breakdown as to mortgages, loans, or any other identifying significant amounts, and also provide who they are with, the interest rate, and the term of the loan.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, we would be more than pleased to provide that to you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I would also like the property management corporation, Mr. Minister, for the period '86-87 — during that time, they received loans in the range of 181.9 million — to provide a accounting of these loans, especially how much the payments are, and over what length of time they were taken. Can the minister provide that in due course.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — For the member's information, in the annual report of '86-87, the information you're requesting is on page 11 under items 3 and 4. But let me add, if that isn't sufficient, if the member finds that he wants more detail than is provided in section 3 and 4 on page 11, we would be willing to provide that to you. But if you find that sufficient, that's where my officials indicate the information you're requesting is recorded.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Okay, Mr. Minister, I will get back to that matter if I feel that it's necessary at a later time. And you've agreed to provide more detail on that in the event

it's required.

I wanted to, Mr. Minister, deal with a specific request. It's about Saskatchewan Crop Insurance, Melville quarters. I imagine that is handled by the property management corporation. Can the minister tell me the arrangements there: was it lease; were the quarters built for the client? What's the case with regard to that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It's a leased facility.

Mr. Brockelbank: — It's a leased facility. Was the arrangement made prior to the construction of the facility?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, it was constructed new for the tenant.

Mr. Brockelbank: — What were the terms and conditions of the arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — If it's okay with the member, my officials are digging that information out. We can continue on with subsequent questioning if that's acceptable to you. We will provide you with the information that you're requesting just as soon as it's available, but they're having to take a little time to dig it out.

Mr. Brockelbank: — All right, Mr. Minister. I would want to know the financial terms that are involved, the owner, the length of the lease and so forth.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could provide me some information with regard to the executive aircraft hangaring arrangements in Saskatoon. Can you tell me what the arrangement is there.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That again is a leased space and perhaps if the member . . . We're digging out this information for you. And I would imagine you're wanting to know whom it's leased from and what the financial term is and the length of the lease. I'd be more than pleased to provide these things for you and maybe to expedite it. If there are other areas or buildings that you would want that information, you could request it and we would provide the necessary information.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, my understanding is that an agreement was reached in 1985-86 in hangar number five, Saskatoon airport; and that the, among other things, the department of government services leases for executive aircraft an aircraft stall which runs in the neighbourhood of 1,000 to \$1,200 a month where there is an option to . . . where the option is, that if the government wanted to lease space, it could lease it at the rate of \$100 a day. My understanding being that the executive aircraft, in the period of time which I'm talking about, '85-86, was in the executive aircraft stall in the hangar about two, maybe three days, for the entire year, which, had you been leasing on the daily basis, would have cost 2, \$300, but if you're leasing on the monthly basis would cost 1,000 to \$1,200 a month. I want to know any other kind of renovations which were undertaken by the department of supply and services or the property management corporation with regard to ancillary

facilities at the Saskatoon airport for the executive aircraft terminal there.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The reason for having an adequate space that we can put the planes in, of course — and I think you realize this, that if the planes were up there in a day when there was a bad wind or anything of that nature, we wouldn't want to see any damage. So we have this good space reserved in which the planes can be put while they're in Saskatoon.

You asked about were there any renovations, and there were some to the . . . what we might call the office space attached to the hangar, and we would be pleased to provide those renovations to you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Can you provide me, Mr. Minister, also how often the aircraft has been hangared in those facilities in, say, each of the last three years — how many days.

(2200)

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I don't know if we would have a record of where it was in for a total day or that. I know sometimes when I use the plane and go up there and have business in Saskatoon, it goes into that hangar and then when one comes back from your business, whether it be two hours or three hours — whatever it may be — the plane comes out of there now. So I don't think we really have a record of how many full days there could be that the planes were hangared in that facility.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to trust the minister's memory on this. I'd like an accurate report of it later on; I'd be satisfied with that. But my understanding is that it is seldom used, and as a consequence we're paying for space that we're not using. So I'd like to have information on that with more detail later on.

I suppose the centre-piece of this property management corporation's identification in Saskatchewan would have to be empty office space running into tens of thousand of dollars a day, Mr. Chairman, and I want to deal with that very briefly. I'm referring to an article which appeared in February of this year, in the *Leader-Post*. It says that:

The government owns or leases . . . totalling 10.5 million square feet of space across the province of which 4 per cent is currently vacant . . .

And we did some calculations on the amount of space that was vacant and came up with a figure. We are not alone in these observations about government space that's unoccupied — sitting vacant on which we're paying for it. For example, here's an article from the chamber of commerce, March 14, '88:

The movement of government departments and cut-backs in staff has resulted in a surplus of space in some government buildings. One of these is the T.C. Douglas Building in Regina — the marble palace at the south end of Wascana Centre which housed the Health department. About half the building is empty so someone came up with the

idea that it could be used to house the soon-to-be-homeless Mackenzie Art Gallery in Regina. The gallery will move to the west wing of the building some time this year after renovations have been completed. It puts the gallery away from the downtown area and perhaps out of the way, but it does house it in an artistic building and a very pleasant, but expensive, location.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, could you give us some details with regard to the use of the T.C. Douglas Building and arrangements that have been arrived at with regard to the Mackenzie Art Gallery and renovations.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I want to back up again to the planes for a moment because I don't want to leave you with the intention, or the understanding, that I could supply that information. It's solely at the discretion of the pilot and we don't log whether it goes in or not. In other words, the pilot may go up and it's windy when they arrive there, they decided to put it in there for an hour or two that day, or another day they decide, no, they won't put it in. So there is really no record kept of how often the planes go into that hangar. So I don't want to leave you with the understanding I'd be able to supply you with that because we don't have that statistic.

In regard to the vacant space, yes, there is some vacant space held by this government. I think one has to realize what some of that space is, and I'm sure the member does. Certainly Whitespruce at Yorkton comprises a good percentage of it. What was known as the Weyburn mental hospital at Weyburn, now not in very much usage, comprises another large portion. Some of it is at the former mental hospital at North Battleford, or Saskatchewan Hospital North Battleford where there is some more of this vacant space.

So when one looks at vacant space of the government, certainly, there is some vacant space. Some of this has been vacant for some time, and it is rather difficult to find alternate uses for some of that space.

Pertaining to the Mackenzie Art Gallery and the health building or the T.C. Douglas Building, it is the intention to move into the west wing of the T.C. Douglas Building.

You ask about the financial commitments, and that would be that there is going to about \$3 million coming from the federal government, and the portion from the provincial government, 3 million, and then I think about the same amount from a group called, Friends of the Mackenzie Gallery.

So, yes, it is the intention to move the art gallery into what is known as the west wing of the T.C. Douglas Building.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, will you . . . First, I want to give you some examples where I don't mention any of the buildings you have mentioned as being unoccupied space.

There's the 1986-87, the Regina TD Bank building, a certain amount of space was vacant there, 353 square metres which would have cost the government approximately \$76,000 for that unoccupied space.

There's another 800 square metres in that building which would have cost another 86,000 for the six-month period it was vacant. There is a Regina Canadian building with 148 square metres at a cost of \$32,000 to the Government of Saskatchewan. So these are some of the figures.

In Saskatoon, we had the Sturdy Stone Building, at one point had about 3,000 square feet of office space, and some of this at this time that this occurred, the space had a value of over \$60,000 — vacant space. And at exactly the same time, the Premier was moving his cabinet office to the new premier's office which was one and a half times the size of the space he had in the Sturdy Stone Building, the reason being there wasn't enough space in the Sturdy Stone Building.

The facts belie that statement that there's not enough space in the Sturdy Stone Building. There was plenty of space in the Sturdy Stone Building. But it was left vacant and the Premier moved out into the new premier's office which, I say, is one and a half times as large as the space he had in the Sturdy Stone Building. I wonder if that, to you, is efficient. Is that efficient way to run this government?

With regard to the executive aircraft, if you say one of your criteria is efficiency, as you've said in your reports, then I think you better start examining whether the executive aircraft is in that space two or three days of the year, or whether it's in . . . There's 365 days in the year, and if it's only occupying that space for two or three days of the year, we'd be much better off, from an efficiency and economic point of view, to lease the space at \$100 a day to put the executive aircraft in, even if it had 20, 30, 40 days. So I think the minister should look into that.

And I want the minister's comment about this unused vacant space which I've cited, which none of the ones the examples the minister's given.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think you're always going to have vacant space in government buildings, especially in the city of Regina here where the majority of government offices are held, and as you move departments around and as functions change and the size of departments change, it's normal to have some periods of time when there will be some vacant building space. And I don't think this is peculiar to this government, I think it has taken place across the history of the province of Saskatchewan. And also in various other jurisdictions in Canada, I think if you examine you'd find similar types of situations.

In regard to the premier's office, I think the one thing that one should keep in mind in that instance was the accessibility to it, with a store-front office at street level in Saskatoon. I have visited the office and I find it very accessible, and I think that is in the best keepings for the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, that they can walk right in and meet people in the Premier's staff, raise concerns. There's no reason that it isn't very . . . anyone in Saskatoon can't find that office. It's very identifiable, and it is a nice facility, and I believe the office of the Premier of a province should be a nice facility. We have pride in our province, and certainly to have the Premier housed in a nice office, very accessible to the public of

Saskatchewan, is something that I think should take place.

Mr. Brockelbank: I recall going to the cabinet office in Saskatoon. I just walked in, had a nice 10-storey ride to the top floor, and there I was in the cabinet office. Didn't seem like it was an inaccessible place to me, Mr. Minister. It seemed quite accessible.

I think what this Premier of Saskatchewan wants is more street identification in Saskatoon, and I would reassess that if I was the Premier because it hasn't done him much good in Saskatoon. Perhaps he should, rather than looking at street identification in Saskatoon, he should look at some of the policies he's carrying out in a number of areas — health, property management corporation, prescription drug plan, dental program — to find out what's wrong in Saskatoon, because all you've got from Saskatoon now is one token Tory representing that city.

The people of Saskatoon have spoken to you, and they were speaking about the cabinet office and they were speaking about health care in that by-election. And, Mr. Minister, they were speaking about the ward system, but I don't want to get on to that subject; I want to save that for tomorrow. But the problem is that you have a Premier here that's not listening. He's got his mind made up and he's going ahead, and he wants a little grander palace in Saskatoon and a little more street appeal. I suggest the Premier's looking in the wrong area.

I want an assurance from you, Mr. Minister, that in the event that the T.C. Douglas Building is occupied in part by the Mackenzie Art Gallery, that the name on the T.C. Douglas Building will not be changed.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Certainly there's no plan to change the name at this time. I can't give you a commitment as to 20 or 30 years from now. Probably both you and I will not be present in this House and there will be other people making decisions and so on. I can't commit that it will never be changed, but I can tell you, at the present time there's no design to change the name.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I would prefer the minister to say, over my dead body, it'll be changed. But what we have here is a building named after an outstanding pioneer of this province, a person who served longer than any other person as premier of this province, who was one of the most innovative premiers this province has ever seen. And the minister stands up and says, not at this time, we're not going to change the name of that building. I would like a little more unqualified support of the idea that the minister is not going to change the name of that building, period. And don't give us that qualification.

I want to get into the idea of the free enterprisers in our system that want to take part in the free enterprise system. And I'm looking at an article from a rather well-known newspaper journalist where he talks about the Ramada Renaissance hotel and convention centre in Regina.

It's a private sector project that very clearly wouldn't have happened if it were not for significant government involvement, (he says). At the municipal level, the city has permanently

waived the property tax on the convention centre, a subsidy estimated to be worth \$120,000 per year.

It's interesting to note, and I have an article here about Mr. Remai, who is talking, "labour of love builds an empire." And he's like that free-enterpriser that I hear from from Alberta, Peter Pocklington, and it says in the article: "Always a true believer in the "private enterprise system." The complex was built without public funds."

Well that sounds like Peter Pocklington when he says he's a great believer in the private enterprise system.

(2215)

And I want to know, what is the arrangements with regard to this building? How is the people's money being involved?

You must have known, Mr. Minister, you must have known what the concessions were made by the city of Saskatoon because you had something to do with putting together the lease for the building before the building was even built. So you must have known all the quid pro quos, the trade-offs, and I want to know whether you can confirm that the property tax concession on the convention centre is \$120,000 per year.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We don't know what the tax concessions from the city of Regina to the Ramada are. We have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Would it not be fair to say, Mr. Minister, that the tax concessions that were given by . . . or concessions, let's call it concessions, given by other parties involved in this arrangement would have been within the knowledge of the minister, because the minister was obviously making some concessions by signing an agreement, a lease, in advance for space which he held vacant for some time before he could occupy it. And I don't know the extent to which it is occupied at this time, but the minister is telling me — is this correct? — that you knew not of any other concessions that were made in the promotion of this trade centre in Regina, or does any other minister? Can you specify any other minister that would have know of concessions?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, I wasn't the minister at the time and I have no knowledge of that. The first I've heard of it is when you raised it tonight, and certainly my officials indicate that they were not knowledgeable towards it either.

Mr. Brockelbank: — This journalist goes on to state:

In fact, one cabinet minister (from your government) in his first term said he was shocked to hear later that the government had become a major tenant in the hotel. "I remember the proposal that government-leased office space being brought to cabinet when the hotel convention centre was in the early planning stages. It was turned down by cabinet and never to my knowledge was the idea brought back to

cabinet again," says the one-time minister.

So it seems to me that there are ways and means of doing these things that don't involve even the cabinet, Mr. Minister. I wonder if you can shed any light on this charge that has been made by a previous cabinet minister in your government?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I don't know what cabinet minister you're talking about, and I don't know what he's talking about. He may not have been at cabinet, I don't know. I don't know who you're referring to.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I think I'd stick to that line if I was you, Mr. Minister. Just throw up your hands and don't know.

So what we have here with the creation of the Ramada Renaissance convention centre is an over-production of commercial office space in Regina, and consequently in the province, and using the taxpayers' money to legitimize private development. That's exactly what the minister has done. He's done it to someone who says that he's a private enterpriser, but is standing there prepared with his hand to take the concessions that government is offering such as Mr. Pocklington, that private enterpriser from Alberta who has such a way with the Government of Saskatchewan.

I want to deal with some of the estimates directly, Mr. Minister. I see Economic Development and Tourism has a 34.7 per cent increase in this year's estimate, and I wonder if the minister can give some explanation of that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — While my officials are looking that up for you, I would just indicate to the member opposite that it is nothing new for governments to commit space for the development of buildings. And just to jog his memory, I would just list two or three of them that had happened previously — same type of thing — private individuals wanting government contracts for their space if their building was built. There's a Dairy Queen building on south Albert, London Life building, and the H.A. Roberts South Broad Plaza, Chateau Towers, and those are built prior to our term in office. So it's nothing new. It happens across the country, it happened with the previous government with some of the ones I've cited, and it has happened with this government and other governments across Canada. It's quite a common occurrence for that type of commitment to take place to facilitate and encourage private development of various types of office towers or convention facilities.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Minister, the one distinguishing observation a person would have to make with regard to the information you've put forward is that construction of office space under the previous administration never resulted in such a glut of office space in the city of Regina or in the province generally. And the consequences of your policy is that you have a glut of high-quality office space for which the government won't tell us what they're paying.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — On your question about Economic Development and Tourism, the increase that you had indicated, one of the reasons for the increase, the main

part, is the inclusion of the North Portal visitor reception centre. And I know when I was minister of that portfolio we had looked at a very good reception centre for people coming in from the United States. I think there's a capability to change the money and so on at that reception centre, which I think is something that we like to have, a good welcoming place for our American visitors. Another \$60,000 has been provided for repayments on some capital projects, and the remainder of the increase is attributable to normal escalation factors based upon operating costs and lease escalations. So, I guess, in short, the answer, the main thing, would be the North Portal visitor reception centre.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, I wanted to investigate for a moment or two what departments of government that you lease space to, or agencies or commissions, where the space has remained static between last year and this year. And let me give you an example: in the Department of Telephones, the minister stated that the amount of space under the previous budget and this present estimates was essentially the same. Are there a number of areas where it's been essentially the same?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes. There are many areas where it has remained virtually the same. If there's specific ones you want an indication about, I'd be more than pleased to provide those for you, but there are a number of them that have remained, shall we say, static.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I wonder, in order to save time, if the minister can agree to go through the blue book, identify the departments or agencies where the space was essentially static over the two-year period so that I can, at a later time, determine what the increase has been due to, if in fact the rents were static. I wonder if the minister can provide that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — If you can be fairly specific. You want it exactly the same, or where there isn't a great deal of change. They'll get working on it and have that ready for you as soon as possible. I don't know if we'll have it ready tonight, but certainly by tomorrow. We can have it ready tomorrow.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, if it's not available right now, you know, in a week is fine. I don't want to rush the department.

An Hon. Member: — How exact do you want it?

Mr. Brockelbank: — No, it doesn't have to be exact. If the variation in space was minor in relation to the size of that agency or department, then it would be essentially the same. So I want to identify those ones that are the same.

The amount of money that's going into the supply and services and now into the property management corporation has increased substantially over the years, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in 1984 the ordinary expenditures of the department were \$71.9 million; in '89 they're \$122 million. In other words, since 1984, provincial expenditures on supply and services have increased by \$50 million or 70 per cent. That is 11.6 per cent increase per year.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, with the phrases that you've used, like smaller government getting out of these kind of operations and being efficient, why is the department of supply and service and now property management corporation increasing its budget by \$50 million from 1984 to the present? And, in fact, Mr. Minister, the period from 1987 when the property management corporation was created was the largest jump — 1987, '88, and '89 were the large jumps in the amount of money supplied to the property management corporation. Why did it occur then, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I guess the big difference was when we had the department of supply and services, the capital aspects were not included in that budget, as you well know. The capital in Health was in Health, and the capital in education was in Education. So that would indicate a considerable increase in budget because under SPMC the capital budget is held within the department. Actually . . . I think that's the explanation that — unless there is something further that you wanted to know, please respond, but for the largest increase it would be the rolling in to capital into the Crowns' budget.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, I suspect, Mr. Minister, that if you were to take — and I have some figures here that take the entire cost of the property management corporation out of the budget — this consideration this year and you will find that Agriculture, instead of a 2 per cent increase in its budget this year; when you take out the property management corporation, it's minus 7.4 per cent. Take Environment, it shows a 1.7 per cent increase; when you take the property management payments out, it's actually minus 8.5 per cent.

You take the Department of Education, which shows a 6.57 per cent increase; if you take out the property management corporation segment, it is just 0.8 per cent. If you take the Department of Finance, which shows a 34.7 per cent increase in its budget this year, if you take out the property management charges, it's down to 1 per cent increase.

So what you see, in effect, is a artificial inflation. And I want the minister to respond in due course with examples to show that this is not true, but I believe it to be that the government is using the property management corporation to artificially inflate the budgets of a number of departments. For example, take the Department of Health. In '87 it was 10.7 million; in '88-89, it's 12.1 million — an increase of 12.6 per cent. If you add in capital, if you add in the capital, in '87-88 it was 4.9 million; in '88-89 it was 16.7 million, for an increase of 235 per cent. So this means a total increase of 83.2 per cent as a result of increases to the property management corporation of 13.1 million, of the increase the government claims to have given to the Department of Health, will go directly out of the Health budget — \$13.1 million.

(2230)

Over 20 per cent of the increase in Health has gone to the property management corporation. If you take the Department of Education, over 42 per cent of the increase has gone to the Saskatchewan Property Management

Corporation. If you take Parks and Recreation, Mr. Chairman, of the increase, 72 per cent went to Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. So instead of getting the 6.8 per cent increase as promised, the government has given the department only 1.8 per cent.

If you take into consideration the inflation rate, which is about 5.9 per cent, the increase of 1 per cent, 1.8 per cent, is actually a cut of 4.1 per cent. So what the minister is doing, and I suspect that he cannot defend this position, is that the property management corporation budget is being artificially inflated so that at a time more convenient to the minister in the future, the department of . . . or the property management corporation can loosen the purse strings and appear to have done miracles under its mandate.

And I want the minister to be able to defend against the increases, when you take the property management factor out of the figures. I want the minister to give me numerous examples which will make the case that he wants to make, because I don't think he can make that case.

While using the relative profit and loss of a corporation is in most instances a good indicator of the efficiency of that operation, in the case of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation this does not hold true. In this case, the clients of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation do not have the right to seek the cheapest alternative, a supplier of services in the market, or, for that matter, to even negotiate the amount which will be paid to the property management corporation for services provided.

When the Minister of Telephones was here, he said, I have to pay the property management corporation a 14 per cent increase. And he says, my department's static; no change in the department. Now why does the Minister of Telephones have to pay you over 14 per cent increase?

If the government wants to make more money available during an election period, it need only increase each department's payment to the property management corporation in the preceding years, then in an election year they can draw on the accumulated profit, Mr. Minister.

A further consequence of this system is that the government can use perceived increases to each department's budget to publicly build a perception that government is giving generous increases to various departments while, in fact, they are not.

It is precisely these processes which appear to be taking place at present. In its '88-89 budget, the property management enjoyed an increase in revenues of 11.5 per cent from the ordinary expenditures of government departments. As well, the property management corporation received an increase of 193.4 per cent on capital expenditures. In total, the property management corporation received additional revenues of 32.7, or an increase of 27.3 per cent over its 1987-88 revenues.

And these are the concerns that we have about your

property management corporation, Mr. Minister. I'm not satisfied with your answers; I want to see your examples. What the minister has done is he's been tardy on tabling his reports in the House. He has not conformed to the rules and procedures which the auditor has set down for all departments and agencies of government. The minister has not substantiated with examples, and I look forward to receiving those examples if he has them, to show that the Saskatchewan Property Management accounts or billing is not being artificially inflated. I want to see that from the minister, and until such time as that occurs, Mr. Minister, I'm going to have to withhold my approval of your estimates in this department.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think the member opposite has to realize that it's just a different way of accountability. I believe that it is good to have the departments accountable for the expenditures they make, and this way, with the property management corporation, they are. There may be others, and you maybe want to argue that no, it is better for the departments just to request through supply and services all their demands and supply and services picks up the tab. I think there is something to be said in having that in the budgetary process so that the departments have to defend their requests for expenditures for space and furniture and whatever they may want to spend their money on.

Now there may be a difference of opinion here, and your right to yours if you feel different, but I think, and from discussions with people, there seems to be a fair degree of support for that degree of accountability.

Now you talk about the inflating budgets. Certainly the way that one could inflate budgets is by capital expenditure, which previously was shown within the departmental expenditure. Take, for example, in Parks — if you wanted to go ahead with some type of a capital type of construction, it would put that year's expenditure in Parks up a considerable amount.

Now what we have felt, and we're following the lead of the Auditor General of Canada — and many of the other provinces such as British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta, are all looking at the same type of management of third-party, large constructions, of amortizing them over a longer period of time rather than a one-year expenditure in the capital side of the budget of the line departments. Now you may disagree with that, and if you do, that's your right.

But certainly we believe that those two aspects, and through the main premises upon which property management Crowns are founded, not only in Saskatchewan but only in many other jurisdictions across Canada, is that you hold your line departments far more accountable for their expenditures by having them as a budgetary process in their budget rather than just a request to the big central area of supply and services, and I won't repeat myself again, but with the third departments amortizing those loans, payable back to the departments on a yearly basis with interest over a longer period of time of the cost of the building of the project, I should point out that in discussions with contractors and with third parties that seems to have been quite well received by the general public of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Minister, it's incumbent upon you not to wander too far afield when you're talking about what the auditor wants. We can't be concerned about what the auditor in British Columbia, or Ontario, or somewhere else, or the Auditor General of Canada wants, we have to conform to what the auditor here in Saskatchewan wants, and that's something that you didn't do, Mr. Minister.

I want you, Mr. Minister, to give me a commitment that you will take each of the departments — this is in addition to information already requested — and break the payment to the property management corporation down into major components such as mail, service, central vehicle agency, photographic services, accommodation, whatever the main headings may be, for each department that's listed in the book; and a comparison for the previous year for the . . . what amount was under each component in the previous year. Okay? I want the minister to undertake to supply that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think you're asking me to do it in — let's take a figure of six or eight major topics — and, yes, I'd be more than pleased to provide you with that information. I might go a step further to even have some of my staff meet with you to explain the various aspects of it if that would facilitate it for you.

But we would provide that, and I think you're being reasonable. You're not wanting every little expenditure, but along the main six that any department would incur. If that's fine with you, we'll provide that for you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I think I can say, Mr. Minister, that I'd appreciate receiving that broken down into major components and all of the minor ones put in a heading called "Other," so that when I get the figures totalled up, I've got the total figure that appears in the blue book, so I know the amount of increase. And I must indicate to the minister that I would be satisfied to receive that as soon as possible.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, we will do that.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 53 agreed to.

Consolidated Fund Loans, Advances and Investments Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Vote 168

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 168 agreed to.

Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Capital Projects 1988-89 Capital Expenditure by Sector

Mr. Chairman: — Any questions? Agreed. I'd like to thank the minister's officials.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take the opportunity tonight to thank the officials that assisted me

in these estimates. I'd like to thank the critic for his questions.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I'd like to join the minister in thanking his officials for being here this evening to answer questions.

(2245)

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Public Participation
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 47**

Item 1

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, I'm pleased to see the members opposite, the members of the Conservative party, applauding these estimates. Mr. Chairperson, this is indeed a historic evening. It's a historic evening because for the first time in the history of our province we are going to be debating estimates for the department of privatization.

We have here a disturbing trend on the part of the provincial government. We have here, clearly, a government that is committed to the privatization ideology, which is a right-wing, narrow ideology. And it's no secret, Mr. Chairperson, that they have now turned to Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain for their ideological inspiration in this latest economic fad of the PC Party of Saskatchewan.

They've even sent the Premier's principal secretary, his chief political adviser, off to England before the last election to study the ideology in action, and that's the privatization of British Telecom. They've even invited the right-wing professor of privatization, Dr. Madsen Pirie, to explain his ideology to the provincial government, and they've even hired a consultant, Oliver Letwin, from the British merchant bank, Rothschild and Sons, to bring that right-wing ideology to the Tory government here in Saskatchewan.

But while the Tory members opposite are eager and enthusiastic about this latest Conservative fad of privatization, they refuse to acknowledge or admit that it's the same old Tory philosophy that has been tried and tried, and failed and failed, in every western, democratic, industrialized nation in the world.

For once in his life, the minister of privatization is correct when a few weeks ago he told the press that privatization is the wave of the 1890s. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairperson, the minister is about 100 years out of touch. What Saskatchewan people need is a vision and a solution for the 1990s and the year 2000. We don't need the minister's frank admission that his privatization policy is geared toward the 1890s. His PC privatization ideology is old and outdated, and it's old and outdated, and it's been discredited from one end of the world to the other.

Now this minister of privatization clearly doesn't understand the history of our province. He clearly doesn't understand the history, because that history has not been characterized by private greed or private self-interest and private profit as a supreme motivator of human activity.

Nothing could be further from the truth here in Saskatchewan. Their version of history is simply wrong, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. In his desperate attempt to rewrite Saskatchewan history, the PC privatization version of history, this minister has grossly misunderstood Saskatchewan people. He's grossly misunderstood our history and experience of Saskatchewan people working together. He has deliberately tried to misrepresent the common experience of Saskatchewan people, and that is one of sharing.

The facts are these, and if the Tory members opposite decide to dispute it — our version of the facts, the real history of Saskatchewan — I invite them to check with their constituents, particularly those constituents in rural Saskatchewan. It was our pioneers, here in Saskatchewan, which found themselves in the vulnerable position within the world economy, separated by huge distances from their markets and from sources of manufactured goods. Even when farms and homesteads were much smaller, a quarter section, they were isolated and often separated from one another by significant distances.

They found themselves with rich and open land, but in return they had to endure the hardships of a severe and unyielding climate. The centres of economic powers were far away. They were unresponsive to Saskatchewan needs and the needs of Saskatchewan pioneers and their families.

They had to endure the insensitive railroads. They had to endure the Winnipeg grain exchange, which was dominated by private grain companies determined to maximize their private profits. They were dominated by the big eastern banks who were successful in pursuing the private self-interest of their shareholders, but were unresponsive to the needs of Saskatchewan families.

And from that adversity, Mr. Chairperson, they developed courage, strength, resilience, and vision. They knew, and rightly so, that the blind forces of greed in the world market would not meet their needs and would not allow them to develop their vision. And so they developed it for themselves together with their neighbours, and they did so co-operatively.

They put the common good above private greed; they put the community interest, the public interest, above self-interest, and in their determination to pursue that Saskatchewan vision for themselves and their children, they sought to use all of the tools at their disposal, all of the tools at the disposal of the community — private business, to be sure, but also co-ops and the public sector.

And their determination and their courage and their hard work, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, forged the Saskatchewan mixed economy, the unique, made in Saskatchewan solution to the circumstances that they faced. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was a Saskatchewan response to the private grain companies on the grain exchange. Saskatchewan credit unions were developed and owned and controlled here in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan people as an alternative to the eastern banks. The Consumers' Co-op Refineries here in Regina was the first

co-op refinery in the world, and when private greed and private self-interest and big, out-of-province investors failed to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people, our pioneers decided to meet those needs for themselves, using the public sector.

Rural telephone services, rural electrification, rural bus service, provided by the public sector; basic car insurance at affordable rates, provided by the public sector; and most important of all, Mr. Chairperson, comprehensive hospitalization insurance and medicare, developed by Saskatchewan people by using the public sector.

Now when Saskatchewan people realized the potential and the opportunities for economic growth and security that were afforded by our bountiful and valuable resources, they realized that in order for those resources to be developed in Saskatchewan's interests — and I stress, Saskatchewan's interests — they had to be developed by Saskatchewan people.

And was there a foreign investor willing to develop our sodium sulphate resources? No, it took the public sector through Saskatchewan Minerals. Was there any major oil company built in Saskatchewan by private greed? No, Mr. Speaker, it took the public sector to develop Saskatchewan Oil. And was there any foreign corporation or non-Saskatchewan group of investors who were willing to establish a major potash corporation or hard rock mining company based here, with its ownership and control here in Saskatchewan? No, there wasn't one. It took the determination and the courage and the vision of Saskatchewan people acting together through their public sector to develop the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

And finally I want to turn to one other example, and that's the example of Ipsco here in Regina. And I think that everyone would agree that the middle of the Regina plain, hundreds of miles away from iron or coal, is a pretty unlikely place for a steel mill. It was first developed and established by private investors as a pipe mill. It soon obtained public sector equity investment from the provincial government and became a sound and successful steel and pipe operation. It's another example of the Saskatchewan partnership, the Saskatchewan pragmatic approach, the Saskatchewan mixed economy.

And in this government's haste to rewrite Saskatchewan history, this minister of privatization grossly and unfairly misrepresents our shared and common experience as a province and a people. He's unwilling to admit, or afraid to admit, that the Saskatchewan tradition is one of practicality. It's one of a mixed economy, men and women working together in their communities for the common good not merely private gain, and for the future of their family and their children; for the public interest, not merely for their private interest; the reality of the Saskatchewan economy, not the myth of PC privatization.

And so I submit to you, Mr. Minister of privatization, that your ideology of privatization is simply one of myth. It's based on myth. You know that it runs counter to the

actual daily experience of this province and its people. You know that your PC privatization agenda is a betrayal of Saskatchewan and her people. You know that this privatization policy is being opposed by Saskatchewan people, and that is why you have such difficulty explaining it.

Now, Mr. Minister, you have travelled this province for and wide. You've had your meetings on privatization in a number of communities throughout Saskatchewan, and so it's obvious that you must have some sort of plan for privatization. Tonight I would like you to explain to the people of this province what exactly your plan for privatization and how does the privatization of the school-based children's dental plan fit into that plan for privatization?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the opening remarks of the member opposite and, before I would respond to them, I'd like to introduce my officials who will be with me tonight. Seated beside me is the deputy minister of the Department of Public Participation, and that is Mr. Graham Parsons; and behind him is assistant deputy minister, Mr. Ken Brehm.

An Hon. Member: — Who's beside you?

An Hon. Member: — I'm sorry I missed that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Ken Brehm and Graham Parsons.

An Hon. Member: — Brehm?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Brehm. Seated right behind me, right behind Mr. Parsons.

I listened with interest to the member's comments who indicated . . . I think she started off talking about ideology, and I think it would be interesting if the member opposite would acknowledge that there are many countries around the world, of various ideological stripe, that are embarking upon a large number of public participation initiatives, and just for the knowledge of the people here I would just list a few of these: Poland, Portugal, France, Spain, Finland, Denmark. And the list goes on: Belgium, Sweden, Turkey, the U.S.S.R., West Germany, Australia, New Zealand, Guam, Iraq, Israel.

(2300)

In fact, if I went through all of these pages, Mr. Chairman, that I have here, I could take up considerable time in the House tonight indicating various countries around the world, various countries around the world — approximately 50 — of all different political stripes, right from the U.S.S.R. to Great Britain, for example, where we see various initiatives of public participation.

So yes, it is the wave of the world that we live in; it is the wave of the 1990s; and, yes, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan are going to be taking part in it.

An Hon. Member: — The Saskatchewan way.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That's correct. As my colleague says, we will be doing it the Saskatchewan way. I see the

member opposite, and I hear the member from Regina starting to . . . Lakeview . . . laugh and cackle about the Saskatchewan way. Now that's fine if she wants to laugh at things that are done the Saskatchewan way. Personally, as a person who has lived all my life in Saskatchewan, I'm very proud of the things that we do the Saskatchewan way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Because we do have a unique blend, we do have a unique way of putting things together in this province — albeit we are a small population of 1,000 people; albeit that there are people that have suffered from time to time with the droughts, with the problems of nature; where it is not easy to making a living in this country; where our ancestors came here, settled in a prairie land and built a society through various types of movements, be they co-op movements, be they private individual movements, partnerships, various blends of entrepreneurship that we as Saskatchewan people are all proud of.

And the member opposite mentioned a number of co-ops. And certainly there is a great similarity between the co-op movement that is a strong part of what is the Saskatchewan fabric. Many of us, I would imagine every member in this place today has, at some time belonged to some type of a co-op, or his family has.

But I can tell you that what we're wanting to do with the assets of the province of Saskatchewan is very closely related to the growth of the co-op movement, and that is to take these assets that we have as a government and to share them with the people of this province with true ownership, true ownership, and the ability for them to be true partners in building and developing this fine province — in providing jobs, and in diversifying our economy — so that the ordinary person of Saskatchewan, as can be attested today, can share in a Power Plus Bond, can share in real shares of the development of this province in this year and in subsequent years that they can use for themselves for their collateral or pass on to succeeding generations. That's what public participation is the Saskatchewan way, and that's the kind of development that's taking place across this country.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the member opposite mentions that, yes, there's the co-op movement was big in building Saskatchewan, I don't deny it played a significant part. I don't deny, either, that to build some of the things that we've built in this province that we're all proud of, like our medical systems and so on, that we did get the advice of outside expertise. I remember when the medicare system started in this province, and I remember that some of the people who came over here to guide it and to help build it came from Great Britain, the same as there are people who are coming today to help and advise us in the development of public participation, as they are around the world to many other countries.

And I'm not embarrassed to say that this idea started in Great Britain, started under a Thatcher government, started under a Conservative government, because, by golly, I think when we heard Prime Minister Thatcher speak the other day in the Parliament of Canada, that

people around the world said, yes, there is a great leader; yes, there is one of the greatest leaders of the 20th century, and I support her . . . and I support her.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — As do many other people across this nation and around the world. So I want to say to you at the beginning: yes, we are in vogue with the times; yes, we are doing what other people are doing around the world; and yes, we will get the advice of people where we can get it, the best advice available to us, because I think that's only prudent and wise; and yes, we will have public participation the Saskatchewan way, hatched here, made here, delivered here — not for just the present — for succeeding generations.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, you've just received a very feeble response, but I just want to talk about the Saskatchewan way that you've just gone on at some lengths about. You talk about the Saskatchewan way and how your privatization strategy is the Saskatchewan way. And then you talk about Margaret Thatcher and how she was in Canada and gave a wonderful speech and how . . . You know what you're showing me, Mr. Minister? You're showing me that you can do nothing other than cling to the skirt of Margaret Thatcher. That's what you're showing me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — And you tell me . . . you tell me, Mr. Minister of privatization, that this is the Saskatchewan way, and then you acknowledge that you've imported this privatization ideology, this economic fad of your government from Britain, from the premier of Britain, of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher.

Now I want to talk about the Saskatchewan way, and you talk about participating and being involved and being stakeholders in this privatization strategy of yours, and I want to talk about how people have been stakeholders. Let's talk about the Poplar River mine, Manalta Coal, Fred Mannix of Calgary. How were Saskatchewan people stakeholders in this sell-out of a Saskatchewan coal mine?

I want to talk about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation drag-line, another deal to Manalta Coal, Fred Mannix of Calgary, where we lent them, or we guaranteed the note on the Toronto Stock Exchange so they could purchase this \$45 million asset. And then what do we do? We rent it back. Some deal, Mr. Minister.

And let's talk about how Saskatchewan people participated in PAPCO's (Prince Albert Pulp Company) sell-off to Weyerhaeuser. Here we have Weyerhaeuser from Tacoma, Washington. How is that Saskatchewan people participating — participating in the sell-off of a Saskatchewan asset?

And then we had Saskoil; then we have Saskoil. This is a company, a good, solid, Saskatchewan oil company that fired 25 per cent of the workers within one year. How is that participation for Saskatchewan workers, Mr. Minister? And then you bought a \$65 million Alberta oil

company. How is that participation for Saskatchewan people? And within one year, 75 per cent of the shares were held by people outside of Saskatchewan. How is that really Saskatchewan people having a stake in this Saskatchewan oil company?

And then we had the Highways department. You laid off, you fired 157 Highways workers, and you sold \$40 million worth of Saskatchewan equipment for \$6 million. How is that Saskatchewan people participating in privatization? They lose their jobs. That's how they participate.

And then you have the sell-off of SaskCOMP and SaskTel, and it becomes WESTBRIDGE. You haven't released any details of the agreements. No details have been released, no documents, no agreements, nothing.

And then we have Saskatchewan Minerals. Let's talk about how that particular company encouraged Saskatchewan ownership. Sold to two companies outside of Saskatchewan — one in Ontario, and one in Quebec. And what happens? You go to Chaplin and you guarantee those workers' jobs, and people are laid off — some guarantee by this minister of privatization who says Saskatchewan people will have a stake in this company — lay-offs and sell-offs to an out-of-province company. And then we have the privatization of parks. How have those park workers participated? How have the workers at the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, how have they participated, Mr. Minister? Answer that question.

And then we have the privatization of the dental plan. We saw how Saskatchewan people participated in that particular privatization — 411 dental workers fired by your government, dismissed, herded into hotel rooms and told: you're gone; we're privatizing the school-based children's dental program. The services are poorer in rural Saskatchewan; there are very few dental clinics that people in rural Saskatchewan have access to. They used to have access to 338 clinics, now they have access to 70 dentists that are practising in rural Saskatchewan. Some participation, and you call that the Saskatchewan way. That's not the Saskatchewan way. And then you sell off SED Systems to Fleet Aerospace of Ontario, and then you buy back the bricks and mortar — no guarantees that Saskatchewan people will have jobs, no guarantees that that technology won't be moved out of Saskatchewan. And you call that the Saskatchewan way? Some Saskatchewan way.

You didn't answer the question, Mr. Minister. I asked you what your plans were for privatization. Either you have one or you don't. And if you have one, you should table it, and if you don't have one, you're nothing but a floundering minister.

Some Hon. Members: —Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly the member just goes on and on and misquotes facts — her figure on Saskoil shares is simply wrong, simply wrong, and she continues to say that. But I mean, I guess that's her prerogative to give the wrong figure. But I will certainly indicate to you . . . she mentions Weyerhaeuser, and I know that the opposition are against Weyerhaeuser. They preferred to

keep PAPCO and losing . . .

An Hon. Member: — \$91,000.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, \$91,000 a day, that's correct — \$91,000 a day in the 20 months prior to the sale; I think it was \$26,000 was lost by PAPCO in the 20 months after the sale to Weyerhaeuser — \$63.5 million has turned to the government.

I said many times, and I see members from Prince Albert in attendance tonight and they must know that it's correct, that there are approximately 700 people working there, building a paper mill. And that's a considerable number of people in my mind, 700 people building a paper mill, a paper mill that is state of the art, one of the best in the world, right in Prince Albert, that will have 150 permanent employees, bringing in about half a million dollars a month into Prince Alberta, Saskatchewan. And the member opposite criticizes that — you criticize that. I don't know from whence you come, other than you believe that the government should own everything.

You are against the Weyerhaeuser deal. We have done a poll. Decima Research, they're a very credible research group, have polled in Saskatchewan's a large number of people. And you know what the people say? Seventy-five per cent of the people polled are in favour of the deal with Weyerhaeuser, but still the NDP opposition in this House stand up and say it was a bad deal.

Now I noticed with interest, and I see the member from Lakeview, who was, I believe, earlier from Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan. I happened to be in her home town just last week with 3,000 of the people from the Meadow Lake area. Well I see the member, who wasn't there, says there was 2,000, but that is difficult or misleading. She didn't attend, but she says there was 2,000. However, I don't know how she knows when she wasn't there, but well be it, it's probably like her statistics on Saskoil.

However, they were there, and I saw an opportunity and I visited there three or four weeks before and talked to the employees from Green Lake and from Meadow Lake. And I said, you know, what about public participation, or what about buying into this saw mill? And you know what? Ninety-five per cent of them said, right on the money; let us have an opportunity.

And I met with the local tribal council, 10 Indian bands and their chiefs, sat around the table with them, had a good chat with them, a very good talk. Are you interested in this? And they said, we certainly are. Ten Indian bands as the shareholders along with the employees.

And new products. Can you believe chopsticks in Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan? You know how many they're going to produce? Over a billion year. And I don't know, probably the member from Rosemont has an idea of what a billion chopsticks are like, but I don't know what a billion chopsticks represents. So I said, could you boil it down to me into something that the average person understands of what a billion chopsticks looks like? And in the terms that I think everyone over there could understand, it means about two train carloads of chopsticks a day being produced in Meadow Lake,

Saskatchewan, and that translates into jobs, and that translates into new products, and that is what public participation Saskatchewan is.

And you know when we raised this in the House, you know what the Leader of the Opposition said? I'll reserve judgement. I'll reserve judgement. Look, can you not stand up once and say something is right, that something is good for Indian bands, that something is good for employees? Do you have to say, because there is building and diversification and development, I'll reserve judgement, because that's exactly what the NDP said. And I cannot understand how a person who grew up in the town of Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan, got their education there, had their roots there, wouldn't stand up in this House and say: right on; right on, for my home town! Build jobs, diversify, and give our people an opportunity to take part in the development of Saskatchewan.

(2315)

Ms. Atkinson: I'm afraid, Mr. Chairperson, that the minister of privatization obviously didn't hear the question, so I will restate it again. Mr. Minister of privatization, I ask you whether or not you have a privatization plan. And either you do and you should table it; either you do and you should outline it to the people of Saskatchewan tonight, because you have said that this process is going to be open . . . So I ask you tonight to articulate your privatization plan for Saskatchewan in order that all Saskatchewan people can know what you're up to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Most certainly, I'd be more than pleased to do that. The public participation . . . Let's get one thing straight right at the beginning. The member opposite insists on saying the privatization plan. I must say, and there are some from their seats . . . The member from Saskatoon who usually speaks from his seat, very seldom stands in this House, says privatization. Well you can put whatever label you want on it, but I want to explain to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are four dimensions in public participation, and that's what we're undertaking, is public participation the Saskatchewan way.

And let me illustrate to you what step one of public participation is and what our plan is. Public participation in Saskatchewan is the offering of bonds and shares to the people of Saskatchewan. And certainly I think that you see today, before the people of Saskatchewan, are the Power Plus bonds, in which the ordinary people of Saskatchewan can access a bond for as little as \$100. And it will be those people who are served first, that there is a guarantee of a bond for every Saskatchewan person who would want to buy one — \$100. They can buy them through their power bill; they can buy them through the local credit union; they can buy them through their bank, or they can buy them through a broker — whatever way they would want, in dimensions of as low as \$100. And you don't have to come up with the full \$100 at the beginning — you pay a quarter down and then three other equal instalments.

So that's one aspect. Now that bond, that power bond, has a convertible factor. If the person wants to exercise his authority to convert that bond into a Saskoil share, he has three years in which to do that.

So that's one part of public participation, is the offering of bonds and shares to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, with . . . employees can get them, government employees can get them by payroll deductions. They're accessible to all people, and the small denominations will be served first.

Now let us go to a second aspect of that. She mentioned the WESTBRIDGE Computer company, and correct — in the not too distant future there's going to be shares in the WESTBRIDGE Computer company offered to the people of Saskatchewan. Again, easily accessible; again, in dimensions that the ordinary person can afford. And I believe that these are the things that people are saying to me as I travel the province and saying, yes, we want an opportunity to participate in the building of this province, and yes, we want to have a share in one of the largest computer-based companies in western Canada.

So I cite that as one example of our plan of public participation. And there will be more; there will likely be shares in SaskTel. There may be bonds in SaskTel. There may be government bonds. There may be other share offerings as further things are put out for public participation. Certainly we are looking at the possibility of putting out shares in the general side of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). So those are some examples of one plank of public participation, see after the plan — that's part of it.

Secondly, employee buy-ins, we would like to see . . . (inaudible interjection). . . I'm on to the second one; you're going to get all four; just bide your time. The second one is employee buy-ins, and that is where employees who are providing a service for the government at this time may say to the government, look it, we would like to buy into that service, form a company or corporation or whatever it may be, and take over the delivery of that service. And I think one can think of many ways in which that could be exercised. So employee buy-ins is a second aspect of public participation.

A third aspect of public participation, and some that is going on at this time, is the contracting out of services, where services that are being provided now by in-house staff may be provided by people in the private sector. And I guess the one that I would cite in that as a good example is the auditing of the Crown corporations. Previously it was all done by publicly employed auditors, and now we have a lot of that being done by the auditing expertise that's out there in the various parts of Saskatchewan. I think it's being well received and being done very well.

Ditch mowing in the highways, last year we had contracts for that — I think about 10 contracts if I remember correctly — and they came in at a considerable saving over the in-house cost. And I believe we have about 25 contracts that are going out this year in various parts of Saskatchewan to contract out the ditch mowing to farmers or whoever may want apply for this. That's the

third aspect. So there's bonds and shares, there's employee buy-ins, and then there is the contracting out of services.

The fourth one, the fourth one is what the member alludes to, and that is what I would call privatization. And I call privatization the sale of a publicly owned asset to a private firm, and I cite Weyerhaeuser as the example — and we've just been through that discussion, and to expedite the estimate I won't go over that again, but we can look at Weyerhaeuser where we all know there's been a lot of value added. We can look at Sask Minerals, the peat moss division, and the sodium sulphate plant where we have about \$16 million coming into our province which can be used to build and diversify.

So if the member wants the plan, certainly that is the plan. It is a four-dimensional plan. Many of them are taking place. They will go forward simultaneously. You will see bond interest . . . bond purchases and share purchases going on simultaneously. You'll see employee buy-ins. You'll see contracting out. You'll see some sale of assets and asset development taking place over the next few years, all as part of Public Participation. So I hope that gives you some indication of the plan that we have in store.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I could have articulated that plan that you just articulated to the legislature by simply reading Michael Walker's comments in the Fraser Institute *Forum* booklet. I mean that's nothing new, Mr. Minister — that's nothing new.

I mean, we know that privatization . . . your agenda is not restricted to Crown corporations. We know that you're going to contract out work that's presently done by the public sector to the private sector.

An Hon. Member: — Like the dental nurses.

Ms. Atkinson: — Like the dental nurses, as my colleague says. You've contracted that work out to dentists. We know that you've introduced user fees, whereby only those who require services like prescription drugs pay for it as opposed to paying for it through a system of compulsory taxation. And we know that you've been involved in deregulation of certain operations of government which leads to a reduction of the number of public employees doing work in Saskatchewan. That's not new.

Now, Mr. Minister, you say that privatization is only such when you privatize assets that are publicly owned and you sell them off to places like Weyerhaeuser. How do you explain, Mr. Minister, the word "privatization" in the Crown investment corporation annual report . . . or the Crown Management Board annual report where they say that the audit services of the Crown corporations have been privatized. You say that's contracting out, but your own Crown Management Board of Saskatchewan says that that's privatization. How do you explain that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I'll just explain it that . . . I've explain what I call "contracting out". You asked me for the plan. I believe that the . . . if you want to quibble over a word, that's fine, if that's important to you, but I believe

when you have something that is done in-house and you contract to a professional group outside, in my mind that's contracting out.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, your own Crown Management Board calls that privatization. That's not really having the public participate in the delivery of services in this province. They don't participate in ownership; that work is done by private enterprise, private individuals, and people who used to do that as public sector employees are laid off. That's privatization, and hardly public participation.

Now, Mr. Minister, I'd be interested in knowing what your overall philosophy, as the minister of privatization, is. I'd like to know what your philosophy is and what are your goals and objectives for the next year. How will you know whether or not you've been a success?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I guess one of the ways that you'll always measure if you're a success, and I think all governments do that, is by polling, and the recent poll was not discouraging, let me put it that way. There was a lot of people who were very, very supportive of various aspects of public participation.

What are the goals and the objectives? The goals and the objectives of public participation the Saskatchewan way is simply to diversify this economy, to give people, Saskatchewan people, a greater stakeholdership in the building of this economy, where possible to have value added, new products developed, and to have job creation from these initiatives, as well, as I might say, to improve the level of delivery of the services that would be put up for public participation.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I have a paper here that obviously is a paper delivered by yourself, dated March 1988. And this is how you say you're going to evaluate public participation. You say that:

The department will evaluate all public participation opportunities with the objective of ensuring that the people of Saskatchewan receive:

- (1) full benefit from the use of public assets to increase employment and increase employment and create economic and investment opportunity;
- (2) increased opportunities for personal and employee ownership; and
- (3) more effective and efficient public services at good value for money.

Now those are your objectives, Mr. Minister, and I just want to review those objectives because you're the minister of privatization, you're the person that has set these objectives down for yourself, and I want to just do a little work tonight here, Mr. Minister, determining whether or not you're met your objectives.

Now you say that you intend to ensure that Saskatchewan people get full benefit from the use of public assets to increase employment and create economic and

investment opportunities. Let's just evaluate this.

Did the highways workers who were fired in the sell-off of the highways equipment, did that increase employment and create economic and investment opportunities? No, it didn't. The dental plan, when you fired those 411 dental workers, did that increase employment and create economic and investment opportunity? It certainly did not. The drag-line to Manalta Coal, did that increase employment opportunities and create economic and investment opportunities here in Saskatchewan? No. The Poplar River mine, the answer is no; Sask Minerals, no; SED Systems, no.

Clearly, Mr. Minister, based on those examples, you have failed, and failed miserably on your first objective of privatization. Now then you say you want to ensure that Saskatchewan people receive increased opportunity for personal and employee ownership.

Let's just evaluate some other privatizations — the PAPCO sale to Weyerhaeuser. Did that increase opportunity for personal and employee ownership here in Saskatchewan? No. SED Systems sale to Fleet — increased opportunities for people here in Saskatchewan? Personal ownership, employee ownership? The drag-line and mine to Manalta? No. Sask Minerals? No. The dental plan? No.

You've once again failed, Mr. Minister, in meeting the second objective of privatization. In every one of these examples, Mr. Minister, not one share is publicly available to Saskatchewan people — not one share.

Now, Mr. Minister, you go on and you say that your right-wing PC ideology is trying, you're trying to meet these objectives. And at least you're consistent on that score. You seem to have both feet planted in the past and you're facing backwards. That's what you're doing, Mr. Minister.

And then you go on and you say that you want to meet the third objective of a more effective and efficient public services at good value for money. And the one I think about, Mr. Minister, is your little privatization of the children's school-based dental plan. You certainly did not meet that objective, Mr. Minister, when you decided to fire those 411 people. You haven't created an effective and efficient public service. Farm families have to drive mile and miles. They no longer have the opportunity to have that service provided for them at their school. The opportunity is no longer there. And once again, Mr. Minister, you're not providing a service for good value for money. You're not doing it, Mr. Minister. So I think if you look at how you've succeeded in terms of meeting your objectives, Mr. Minister, clearly you've failed on all counts.

(2330)

Now, Mr. Minister, I would be interested in knowing if you can tell me the cost of some of these high flying people that you've brought in from England and elsewhere to advise you on how to privatize and sell off Saskatchewan assets. And I'd like you to explain to the people of this province how bringing in people like

Madsen Pirie and Oliver Letwin is really the Saskatchewan way.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I see the member opposite mentions many things that have taken place prior to the formation of the Department of Public Participation. But be that as it may, if that's what she wishes to do, I will give you some indications here of just the impact upon the various aspects of public participation upon Saskatchewan people. Just roughly adding up here, I see about 50 million . . . excuse me, 50,000 different owners of bonds in the SaskPower series that have come forward over time. And also in the revenues that have come in, about \$160 million in Saskoil shares and bonds, about 20,000 owners. And in Weyerhaeuser about \$236 million in revenue, as I said previously, 700 jobs, 150 more to come; also a dividend by Weyerhaeuser of \$63.6 million in the first 20 months. WESTBRIDGE computer company, about 50 new jobs to date and 6 million in new contracts outside of the province of Saskatchewan. Sask Minerals at \$12.5 million of revenue coming in, an employee profit sharing plan that was not there before. Premier Peat, at \$3.4 million of new money coming in, some new technology in the peat moss, plus a grant to the university.

Meadow Lake Sawmill, \$6 million, about 400 jobs coming into Meadow Lake — modernization, diversification, new users of both hardwoods and softwoods. I was impressed the night I was up there when I heard the man who was heading up the new pulp mill at Meadow Lake indicate that they would using a technology — and I don't understand this technology, but it was called a steam explosion technology, and it would be the first of its type used in the world. And I think that's significant for a town like Meadow Lake of 4,000 people to have a world-leading technology to locate in their town. That has significant benefits for the town of Meadow Lake.

The Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, about \$15,000 coming in there, some 13 jobs — \$800,000 new amusement park through the investment. So you know, I mean, maybe you want to criticize that kind of activity, I don't know. So those are some of the benefits to the people of Saskatchewan, where they do share, they are having an opportunity to be in the building and the diversification of our province.

You mentioned that you didn't think the contracting out of the auditing services was public participation. Well I ask you who the auditors who got the contracts were if they were not the public of Saskatchewan? They have an opportunity to take part and to make money and to earn money by doing work for the government. And I believe that is public participation.

You ask about Madsen Pirie, the amount of money or something paid to him. I can indicate to the member opposite that in the case in the Madsen Pirie there was no action and no activity between Madsen Pirie and the Government of Saskatchewan. I believe it was a group of private individuals around the province of Saskatchewan that contracted to bring Madsen Pirie into our province.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, how about Oliver Letwin?

How much are you paying Oliver Letwin to advise the Government of Saskatchewan how to sell off the assets that have been built up by the people of this province over many, many years? How much is Oliver Letwin, the British person who now works with Rothschild & Sons, how much is he being paid by Saskatchewan people and how is that the Saskatchewan way?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — In regard to Mr. Oliver Letwin, who I should point out has been and is a consultant to many governments around the world, the Department of Public Participation engaged the firm. He works for a firm. We engaged the international consulting firm of N.M. Rothschild & Sons Limited from February 1, 1988 to March 31, '88. And Dr. Oliver Letwin is a member of that firm and has thus consulted in this province as well as in many areas around the world.

The objectives of the contract was to advise the minister and his department on public participation policies and practices. As well, the contract called for a review of the possible public participation program in Saskatchewan and provide a report outlining the public participation opportunities available in the Crown sector. The contract was completed as drafted, and the firm was paid £20,000 for the report and the advice. The specific words from the contract are as follows, and I quote:

To undertake a review of assets and activities of the Government of Saskatchewan and its Crown corporations that could be candidates for public participation initiatives and to provide a final written report on the findings and recommendations on financial and strategic options.

Ms. Atkinson: — So the people of Saskatchewan paid out over \$44,000 for one month's work to Oliver Letwin of Rothschild & Sons, which is a British corporation, to come in here and advise our minister, advise our government how to sell off Saskatchewan. How is that the Saskatchewan way? You didn't answer that, Mr. Minister. How is it the Saskatchewan way to bring in some person from out of Canada, out of Saskatchewan, in Great Britain, to advise your government how to sell off Saskatchewan? And how is that the Saskatchewan way? You didn't answer that, Mr. Minister. How is it the Saskatchewan way to bring in some person from out of Canada, out of Saskatchewan, in Great Britain, to advise your government to sell off Saskatchewan? And how is that the Saskatchewan way which you see to be trotting all over Saskatchewan, talking about the Saskatchewan way? We see it on television. We hear it on the radio. We see it in newspaper ads, Mr. Minister, and how is bringing in Oliver Letwin the Saskatchewan way?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well first of all, let me reiterate to the member that the contract with Rothschild's, and it isn't just Oliver Letwin, it's with their firm, so there's a number of individuals. She said one month; it was two months. There were about three individuals that were here.

And she said, how is it the Saskatchewan way. And I guess she failed to listen to my opening remarks, or chose not to, where I said that what is happening, and you can check Oliver Letwin, and you can check Rothschild's credentials, and I think they will measure up with any in the world. I would challenge you to do that. I would ask

you to contact various countries in which Rothschild's have gone in as advisers to all political stripes right around the world. They are, I suppose, the best in the business, so to say.

You say, how is this the Saskatchewan way. I tell you it's the same type of Saskatchewan way that your predecessors of your ideological stripe, Woodrow Lloyd and Tommy Douglas, when they were working on medicare, if you check back in the records, you'll find that some of the main architects of the Saskatchewan medical care system were people who had come over from Britain. Exactly the same sort of thing. And I think you would say that that was the Saskatchewan way in those days when Woodrow Lloyd and Tommy Douglas were trying to put together a medical care system. And they brought people in from England, and I don't think anyone complained.

We are in Public Participation. There is a firm in England, Rothschild's, who are leaders in the world in this. We have contracted some of those people for their advice, and I believe that is the Saskatchewan way, to find the best advice you can to advise you on how they see it could be done. You take that advice. You go out and talk to the people of Saskatchewan, as I do almost daily, to talk to people in various parts of this country to get their ideas and their concerns. And together that blend . . . (inaudible interjection). . . and if you want to keep mumbling, please go ahead. Some time I'd like to see you stand in this House and say something, but if you like to mumble and grumble as the night goes on, you go right ahead with that, please. But I just want to indicate to you that I believe that is the mix and that is the Saskatchewan way.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I have some questions as well, Mr. Chairperson, to the minister who hides behind the skirts of Margaret Thatcher and the coat-tails of Oliver Letwin; who imports foreigners into Saskatchewan to tell Saskatchewan people what the Saskatchewan way is and to tell the government how to sell off Saskatchewan assets, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairperson. I have some questions for the minister who listens to right-wing extremists like the Fraser Institute while the rest of the Tory seals back there sit back on their flippers and clap their hands in mindless unison, Mr. Chairperson.

And I want to direct the government's attention specifically to the school-based children's dental program, which was the first, the very first thing that this government privatized after the election in 1986, Mr. Chairperson, which is a prime example of how privatization by the PC government does not work, Mr. Minister. They took an extremely effective program, a program that was effective from the point of view of reaching out to many, many children in Saskatchewan, and effective from the point of view of it being a first-class preventative health care program. They took that program and they reduced the services, they reduced the number of children to whom it was available, and as well they reduced the number of services that were available under the plan. And in doing so, in privatizing this plan, they reduced the utilization of the plan, even, as a percentage of those people who are eligible under the new privatized plan.

They reorganized it, they privatized it, they put it in the hands of the private sector while cutting back on services. And, Mr. Chairperson, I would like to just bring to the minister's attention, if he hasn't already seen it — and I'm sure he has — a quality evaluation of specific dental services provided by the Saskatchewan dental plan, which was a final report dated February, 1976, by a number of people who were looking independently at the Saskatchewan dental plan and giving some assessment as to how it is working, and I wish to quote from this report, Mr. Chairperson. They talk here about the results, the results that were obtained under the Saskatchewan dental plan:

... indicating that just over 20 per cent of amalgam restorations placed by dentists tended towards a rating of unsatisfactory, whereas from 3 to 6 per cent of restorations placed by dental nurses were so rated. Conversely, approximately 15 per cent of deciduous tooth amalgams placed by dentists tended towards a rating of superior, while amalgams placed by dental nurses were rated as approaching a superior standard in 45 to 50 per cent of the restorations.

It goes on to talk about other tables with respect to permanent tooth amalgams and goes on to illustrate, according to the tables, that the quality of health services under the public Saskatchewan dental plan was first-rate, Mr. Chairperson, if not superior . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — . . . if not superior to the private sector. And the evidence seems to indicate it was superior to the private sector, and there's probably a good reason for that, and the reason is that children take time, they take patience, they take a control, and it takes time for a person working on the teeth of a child to develop a rapport. And let's face it, people in the private sector don't have the time that a dental therapist may have had.

And so the evidence is clear, the evidence is clear that the public plan was a high-quality plan, and probably a superior plan to any privatized plan in Canada. But this government blindly went ahead with an ideology gone wild, a right-wing ideology to privatize as much of the public sector as they possibly can, regardless of the cost, regardless of the cost financially, and regardless of the human cost, Mr. Chairperson. They're blindly bent on the destruction of valuable, important public services, Mr. Chairperson.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — And this, as I said, the dental plan is just a prime example of their ill-conceived, ill-advised, short-sighted privatization policies which, Mr. Chairperson, will end up costing the taxpayers of this province more in the end, because when these children who are not utilizing the plan at this time get cavities and decide that they are going to utilize the plan, it's going to cost a lot more to maintain their dental health care than it would have had we maintained the public plan which, in effect, was reducing the very need for its own services

because it was operating so effectively as a preventive health care measure.

(2345)

Mr. Minister, I would like you to tell me, with respect to the privatization of the school-based children's dental plan, who wins under this, Mr. Minister? Do the dental workers, some 411 dental workers who were let go, fired, as a result of the privatization of this plan — do they win? Do the children over 14 years old who no longer have accessibility to this plan, Mr. Minister — do they win? Do the children under five years old, the pre-schoolers who don't have accessibility to this plan, Mr. Minister — do they win? I ask you, Mr. Minister, with respect to the privatization of this dental plan, who are the winners?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the member opposite started off her speech, her ripping speech I guess, it rips things up in here, with a kind of, again, saying it's ideologically driven, you see. And I have here a number of examples that I think would be very interesting to share with members of the Assembly and with the viewing public. But, seeing that I think that most of the viewing public have gone to bed, I would hold this for tomorrow, because I think it would be very interesting; I just wouldn't want to take the time of reading it twice.

But I think many of the viewing public would be most interested in hearing about the long list. And you can see there is considerable number of initiatives of public participation in such conservative countries as Cuba, China, Hungary, the U.S.S.R., Sweden, Portugal, and Spain. But I think we'll leave those till tomorrow so that we can share that with a bigger viewing audience than right now, because I'm sure that most people are doing something else rather than watching this debate.

The member again indicates she wants to talk about the dental plan. I think my colleague, the member from Meadow Lake, has described in great detail in the Health estimates the whole plan on extended dental services to where many areas of the population that didn't have access before to dental services now are getting them, and I mean that, the adult population.

The members opposite like to always say that there was a clinic in every community, but they always failed to mention — I was a schoolteacher for 15 years, so I know from which I'm speaking — that those clinics were in those schools for sometimes as short as a month or two months. And they like to say that that was a ongoing clinic servicing all the society, which is simply not right.

The member from Meadow Lake, the present Minister of Health, taught in the schools for many years. We both know what the school dental plan was like, and I know that the Minister of Health is using all his energies and all his abilities to build a true rural dental program in which people, both children and adults, will have access to dental services.

But we could talk about this more and more in here, but I

believe under the Health estimates, which just ended earlier this evening and had been going on for about three weeks, this has been gone over time and time again.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you attempt to justify your privatization on the grounds of public participation. I ask you, where is the public participation in the new school-based dental program when 14- to 17-year-olds are no longer covered; when under five is no longer covered, Mr. Minister; when 411 dental workers are now out of work? Mr. Minister, where's your public participation?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind debating people who get their facts right, but those who do not are somewhat questionable, I mean, there are not 411 people. I heard the Premier a few days ago indicate the number of dental therapists that were not employed, but we can debate that again if it is the wish of the member.

Certainly she excludes, as I said, the senior citizens, the adult population that do now have access to dental services that didn't before. She says the 14- to 17-year-olds don't have access. That's simply not correct, they do; perhaps not insured, but they have access. But the member opposite stands up and again attempts to mislead and misled. Now let's be fair in these estimates. And I don't mind debating a point at all, that's what estimates are for, but for goodness sake, let's try and get the facts straight before we stand on our feet and give misleading statements, as the other member did about the number of Saskoil shares that were outside the province.

I mean, there is a certain degree of dignity that has to accompany this place, and that is to . . . If you don't agree with what is happening, that's fine, that's fine, and if you have a different political ideology, that's fine, but do not try and exaggerate and expand facts to make your point. People want to see you be precise and to the point, and if there is disagreement, that's okay, they will listen to both sides of the debate and the argument, and they will make their decision, and that's what this forum is for. but don't stand up and deliberately say things that are wrong.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairperson, I can't believe it. The minister who stands here and says there were not 411 dental workers put out of work and then attempts to chastise someone because of their facts. I suggest to the minister that once and for all he should get his facts straight.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — There were 411 dental workers put out of work, Mr. Minister. Get your facts straight if you want to maintain your dignity, Mr. Minister.

And with respect to access, who are you trying to fool by saying 14- to 17-year-olds living out in rural Saskatchewan who may have to drive 50 to 100 miles to get to a dentist have access. That's not access as they knew before, Mr. Minister, and the truth is, the facts are they are no longer in the plan. The truth is, the facts are

there were 300 school-based community dental clinics out in rural Saskatchewan, and there's only something like 71 now. And I understand — and I've asked the minister tonight how many of those dentists have backed off with respect to these clinics.

Mr. Minister, I suggest before you accuse someone of not having the facts straight that you better get your facts straight, Mr. Minister. And I want to know from the minister, does this government, does this minister of privatization have any idea at all as to what is happening with respect to this dental plan and where it is heading?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well once again, Mr. Chairman, I have to draw your attention to it. The member stands up and says that there are 17-year-old students in this province that have to drive — and I'll ask you to check the record — she says, a hundred miles for dental service. I've heard the Minister of Health say in this House that it is 50 kilometres. Now 50 kilometres is a heck of a lot different than a hundred miles, but the member opposite stands and says a hundred miles.

Now she tries to insinuate that there is not expanded service. I'm going to take the time of the House — I'll take the time of the House to run down the list. And I'm sure the Minister of Health has done this before, but it seems to be a real point with the member from Lakeview, so if she will sit quiet and listen we will give her all of the satellite clinics: satellite locations in Big River, in Blaine Lake, in Cupar, in Cut Knife, in Debden, in Delisle, in Dysart, in Earl Grey, in Edam, in Ituna, in Kelliher, in Lestock, in Lipton, in Maidstone, in North Battleford, Paradise Hill, Radville, Raymore, Saskatoon, Southey, St. Walburg, Strasbourg.

An Hon. Member: — Take it as read.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, she wanted to know where they were — Turtleford, Waldheim, Wawota, and Wolseley. Those are satellites.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — New principal locations: Assiniboia . . .

An Hon. Member: — You forgot Shaunavon.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well they say I forgot Shaunavon. Yes, I think that's one that just came on in the last few weeks.

Principal locations: Assiniboia, Lloydminster, Meadow Lake, Nipawin, Outlook, Prince Albert, and then Regina, Saskatoon, Swift Current, Warman, and Weyburn. And there's a number in the cities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that illustrates that what the Minister of Health has been doing, in consultation with the dentals . . . dentist society and the dentists, that there has been a growth of satellite clinics. There have been new dental clinics established. And once again let me indicate that these service the entire population; that the school children who are included in the dental plan are still in insured service, but the rest of the population have

access to these dental services in a much broader perspective and much more than they did previously. So I think it is grossly unfair — grossly unfair — for the member opposite to try and stand up and take the population as a whole and say that dental services has been deteriorated, because as I read this and I see this, I see it as an expansion.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, we've just seen another fine performance of the minister of privatization where he accuses my colleague of not having her facts right, and he is wrong; where he accuses my colleague of misrepresenting the truth, and he's wrong. And this minister of privatization says to the people of this province, trust me, I have a plan. I have a plan for privatization, when he doesn't even have his facts straight.

And this minister earlier tonight talked about Saskoil and how more than 25 per cent of the shares of Saskoil were owned by people in Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Minister, I want to talk about the 1986 annual report of Saskoil. And here is a fact, Mr. Minister, and if you choose to go and get the annual report, you can confirm the facts for yourself. Now of the 19,636,238 common shares, only 3,793,328 are privately owned, and less than one quarter of those shares — 948,689 — are owned in Saskatchewan. That's a fact. Of the 7,585,984 preferred shares, less than one quarter — 1,869,197 — are owned in Saskatchewan. That's a fact, Mr. Minister.

Earlier tonight, Mr. Minister, you said to the people of this province that Weyerhaeuser lost \$91,000 a day, that PAPCO lost \$91,000 a day. And tonight, Mr. Minister, I'm going to share with the people of Saskatchewan the truth, the truth that is the Saskatchewan way, because Saskatchewan people, if you know anything about us, tell the truth.

Now here's what PAPCO did. In 1980 under an NDP government, PAPCO made \$23.5 million in profit — that's a fact. In 1981 under an NDP government PAPCO made \$24.1 million — that's a fact. You combine the two years, 1980 and 1981, the profit for PAPCO was \$47.6 million, and that's a fact, members of the Tory Party.

Now let's just examine what happened under a Conservative government — you know, that government that likes to call itself the keeper of business. They know how to run the province; they know how to make a buck. They say that they're the private entrepreneurs, the private enterprisers of Saskatchewan. And they know efficiency, and they know how to keep the government on its toes, and run a mean and lean operation. Well let's talk about ... let's talk about what happened to PAPCO under a Conservative government.

In 1982 — that was the year that the Tory government was elected, April, 1982, we all remember that, PAPCO lost \$9.4 million — that's a fact. In 1983 PAPCO lost, in the red, \$29.1 million — that's a fact. In 1984 they made \$5.2 million — that's a fact. And in 1985 under a Conservative government PAPCO lost \$33.6 million. So let's compare the record.

Under an NDP government PAPCO had a profit of \$47.6

million. Under a PC government, under a PC government — you know, the business people, the people that know how to run business in this province, the best brains of the Conservative party, lost \$66.9 million — and that's a fact. Auditor Peat Marwick Mitchell & Co checked the record.

So when this government trots around the province and at their public participation meetings that they have in Moosomin and Rosetown and Estevan and Gull Lake, and they have information in their little package that they give to the public, they say PAPCO lost \$91,000 a day, but they don't tell the truth. PAPCO lost money under a Tory government, and PAPCO made money under an NDP government. And we know how to run business in this province.

(2400)

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — And this government is incompetent. This government's privatization strategy has meant one of three things: you lose your job; you lose revenues to pay for health and education — that's what happens; and you lose control over our own Saskatchewan economy. These guys want to give it away to big business and people in Ontario and Quebec and Tacoma, Washington, and who knows where else.

And the Deputy Premier of Saskatchewan, he sits there and laughs. Well, Mr. Deputy Premier, you can laugh your way out of a job, because the people of Saskatchewan are going to know what you people are doing, and they will defeat you in 1990 or 1991 because you don't know what you're doing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — And, Mr. Deputy Minister, you can be sure of that because that will be a fact.

Now I want the names and salaries and qualifications of all department staff of the ministry of privatization.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well just to get the terminology right, I'm sure you must mean the Department of Public Participation, because there is no other department. If that's what you're wishing, then, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask her to ask that.

But before then, I'd like to just indicate a few facts that would be of interest to you, Mr. Chairman, and others. I heard the member opposite talk about the shares, the Saskoil shares. I'd like to give you the facts on that: that on the first offering there were 8,165 common shares, 8,294 preferred shares; and of those, of the common shares, 7,287, or 89 per cent, were held in Saskatchewan; and of the preferred shares, 7,254 — 87 per cent — were Saskatchewan holdings.

Now the member opposite may see fit, in her ideology, to dictate to people what to do with the shares that they own. I believe that individuals, if they have shares, have the right to make the conscious decision of what they wish to do with those shares. And some people, as the share value goes up, may decide to sell that share. And

that is quite common in the stock market. That's how it works.

The committee reported progress.

So just to have it straight, that when they were sold, 89 per cent of the common ones were held in Saskatchewan and 87 per cent of the preferred. And it's very interesting to note, and I look at the report of the Crown Management Board, annual report '87, and the last line on page 13 says:

The Assembly adjourned at 12:07 a.m.

As a result of the share offering, CICs voting interest in Saskoil has been reduced to 47 per cent.

So there still was, at that time, a 47 per cent ownership of Saskoil shares by the Crown investment corporation.

The members on the other side, both of them who have spoke tonight — and it's very, very strange to see, especially the one member who originally came from the North, being so critical of an issue that was to build and develop in reforestation in jobs in the North. But they're very critical of the Weyerhaeuser transaction.

I just want to add a couple more facts to the case that I think people would be interested in knowing about the Weyerhaeuser situation. I have indicated to you the 700 jobs; I've indicated to you the 150 new permanent jobs in Prince Albert; I've indicated to you the half a million dollars a month in wages from those permanent jobs that'll be coming into Prince Albert.

But here's some other facts that might be very interesting to know. Of the subcontracts for the purchase from Saskatchewan suppliers and contractors, the subcontracts for the Weyerhaeuser project to Saskatchewan subcontractors and suppliers, \$33 million. And that all relates into jobs and economic spin-off from that type of investment. The materials to the end of May, the materials, Saskatchewan purchased materials, another \$31 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think when you see facts like that, it is a strong indication that the objectives that I had laid out to you earlier for public participation, of diversification of jobs and of building and Saskatchewan people having a large share in this . . . Gosh, we were up there. My colleague, the member from Souris-Cannington who is seated beside me, and I, toured that, oh, two or three months ago. And I saw those 700 people working. I talked to them, and a large percentage of those workers were from Saskatchewan, and a very large percentage of them from right around the Prince Albert area, and most of them were right around the Prince Albert area.

An Hon. Member: — Most of them are my guys.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The member from Shellbrook-Torch River says he knows many of them that are working on that plant, and they tell him that they're very proud of that expansion. They think it's the right thing to do, and no wonder 75 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan say, right on the money, to that project.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Chairperson, it being 12:05, I think we should adjourn tonight's proceedings until tomorrow morning. So I would call it 10:00, I guess.