

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

May 11, 1978

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE AND YOUTH — VOTE 7

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We are on Culture and Youth tonight. Estimates, page 29 and I will ask the minister to introduce his staff, please.

MR. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Chairman, I will do that. Sitting on my immediate left is Acting Deputy Minister Jim Benning, Ron Wborden sitting over there, Roy Ellis of Recreation, behind me and Glen Tuck, Culture and Recreation Facilities beyond to my right.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ITEM 1

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — I would like to ask the minister. There was a great deal of controversy surrounding George Dyck's self-styled, self-appointment to the Western Development Museum Board in Saskatoon and a lot of ruffled feathers in terms of museums throughout the province. I understand now that George Dyck has, at this point in time, resigned from the Board but he has left them with the bill. Could you tell the members of this House how big the bill was that George Dyck now feels that he is to be paid for operating that museum?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The figure the member is looking for is \$9,000. I should point out for the benefit of the media or other members who may not be familiar with it, I think the member for Saskatoon Sutherland knows this but Mr. Dyck served in the absence of an executive director and did a good deal of the work that an executive director would have done. The agreement that was made between himself and the Board (in which we played no part, I might add — I am just giving this information to the members), was that he would be compensated \$ 9,000 for his efforts during that nine-month period when there wasn't an executive director.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Minister, you know I respect your position that you had no part in it. I take your word for it and I say that sincerely. There were many people, including myself, who had the feeling that George Dyck elbowed his way in there and in a very unwholesome manner. There is a question in my mind at least, whether he should be paid one red cent for going in there and for all the trouble he caused that Board. Now, you say that there has been an agreement to pay him \$9,000. What was the bill that he submitted that he thought he was worth for that period of time?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't know that. I do know that it was discussed at a Board meeting but I don't know what his opening bid was and I wasn't part of the negotiations and I honestly don't know what his opening bid was. I just don't know. As I say, it was discussed at a board meeting at which nobody here was present.

MR. H. W. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Minister, then what you are saying is Mr. Dyck submitted his bill and to the best of your information the board has sawed off at a sum

of \$9,000. That's your information. Now during his brief tenure in his self-styled position at the head of the board, because of the way in which he took over, there was a loss of an aircraft that was to be donated through the museums of Saskatchewan. Could you give the members of the House the details of whom it was to be coming from, the donation of the aircraft and what happened to it and why?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Again, I say to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, the board is an autonomous board. I have asked the officials and none of them has any idea what you are talking about. I don't know what I can do. I am not sure I can undertake to supply it at a later date because again it is an autonomous board. I don't know what I can do; I just don't have the information. Nobody knows what you are talking about.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — I won't push that any further. My information is that there was to be a donation of an aircraft and because of the George Dyck fiasco, that donation was withdrawn and some of the museums are smarting a bit about it across the province. Pardon me — (interjection) Well, I think because of the way he took over the board.

Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you one question. You say that you have no involvement in that particular board and while I accept the fact that your government and you in particular have no involvement in the matter of settling up George Dyck's salary, I suggest to you that right now in recruiting new members for the board, that there has been a directive from the department either verbally or in writing (I don't know which) but there is a directive saying that the political stripe is one of the important criterion for selecting new board members, that is to be kept in mind.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's absolute nonsense. I wish I were in a position to divulge to the member the people whom I have spoken to about sitting on the board. You would see that they are of all political stripes. But what I want for the board is a strong board, I think we need that at this point in time. That's what I'm looking for. I haven't asked anyone what their membership is and in some cases I know that they have not necessarily supported this government, people I have talked to. That's just absolutely false, I say to the member.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Well, Mr. Minister, my information is and I say to you that it's not you but there is somebody down that chain of command, when recruitment takes place for members of the board, who is suggesting to various sources that they are looking for new board members, that political affiliation is an important criterion. And I say sincerely that I don't suspect for a minute that you gave that directive but one of your over-zealous party hacks has taken it upon himself to give that directive. How can I name him? I don't know who it was that gave that directive.

Now coming back for one minute to this George Dyck matter, can you either confirm or deny that he submitted a bill in excess of \$12,000? Now you said that your information is that he reached a saw-off with the board of directors and that they promised to pay him \$9,000. Can you confirm or deny that he submitted a bill in excess of \$12,000?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, I can't.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, under the Youth and Culture, I should have asked a question this afternoon, I sort of slipped up. So you may have to correct me and tell me you covered it under government services; the five people indicated in the executive administration, do these cover your staff or is your staff covered under Government Services?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There are three of them who are my staff and that includes as well, I am informed, the Deputy Minister and his secretary, those are who make up the five.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question. I understand that George Dyck's son was given a fairly substantial grant to look around the Duck Lake area of Saskatchewan to investigate the possibilities for tourism and so on. Could you please tell the House details of that grant to Mr. George Dyck's son?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am informed there was such a contract, completed in 1974 between — it is Dr. Dyck, I gather — between Dr. Dyck, the Department of Culture and Youth, and DREE. The expenses were shared 50-50 between DREE and the province. I think that is the information the member wanted.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister the details of the size of the grant; I understand it was a grant under the Department of Culture and Youth. Could I, first, get the size of the grant that was given to Mr. George Dyck's son?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I think I did tell the member it was Culture and Youth, it wasn't. It was Tourism. At that-point in time Heritage matters and so on were handled in Tourism. The total amount, however, was \$18,000. It wasn't a grant, it was a study and that was the cost of the study.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — It was a study in order to investigate the possibilities in the Duck Lake area, is that correct? And what exactly in the Duck Lake area were they looking for?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It was a project called the Saskatchewan Rivers Heritage Project. I am sure the member sitting behind you is familiar with it. It is an effort to develop the history of the area in a fashion, I think, which will be meaningful to Saskatchewan people and will attract tourists. I am sure that the member behind you is more familiar with it than I am; it is very popular among the people of Duck Lake.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — When was the report started, to your information, Mr. Minister?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It was started in 1973 and completed in 1974?

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — The project was actually completed in 1974?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The report was completed in 1974; you asked about the project. The project, of course, is still alive, especially the Heritage Project.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — What I was asking was specifically when was the report completed?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The report was given to us in 1974.

MR. LANE: — You say the report was given to you. I'm talking about the completion date of the report and when the report was actually delivered to you?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In 1974. I'm not sure what the member thinks I'm avoiding but it was 1974 we got the report from him.

MR. LANE: — What I'm getting at is this. I would like to know the date of the completion

May 11, 1978

of the report to the best of your ability and what time elapsed between the time of completion of the report and the time it was delivered into your hands? In other words did Mr. Dyck's son sit on this report for a while?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, there was no sitting on the report, I'm informed. It was the delivered to the then Department of Tourism in December of 1974 and then they went on to hearings in March of the next year. So there was no sitting on it.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister whether he is aware of any plans by any group or corporation or individual to build a motel/hotel complex or motor inn in the Duck Lake area?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, not to our knowledge but then the member has to keep in mind that that is not exactly our department, the building of motels. It is really Industry and Commerce.

MR. LANE: — No, but what I'm getting at is, has it come to your attention that as a result of this report that anything is developing from the report, that there has been some interest because of the report and, therefore, there is going to be some building of complexes to facilitate whatever the report contained regarding tourist matters?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We don't have that information. We have no information which would suggest that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you said that this thing was ongoing with hearings and so forth. Is your department still involved with the following up of that particular project, the study?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The answer to that question is, yes, we are negotiating with the federal government, hoping to enter into what is known as an ARC Agreement, an area of recreation and conservation agreement which will develop the area and develop the tourist potential of the area. We are hopeful that we will have an agreement with DREE on it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Who are handling the negotiations for you or have you got a special group handling the hearings and so forth?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Baker, who you can see here sitting here advising me, is one of the people who is doing the negotiating: Louis Jule who couldn't be with us this evening — in fact he is in Duck Lake right now as a matter of interest; there is a Joe Josephson who is with Tourism and Renewable Resources; and then there are three or four officials from the federal government from the departments of DREE and Parks Canada involved in the negotiations.

MR. KATZMAN: — When is the last involvement that Dr. Dyck has had with this project then?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — December, 1974, when he handed in his report.

MR. KATZMAN: — The presentations to your department from the towns in the area that are affected, Rosthern, Duck Lake and so forth, could you tell us what presentations . . . what projects they were concerned with? For example, I understand there was some concern re the town that they made for the movie and so forth, could you indicate

what is being relayed to your department?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The people of Duck Lake have made submissions to us. They would like that townsite preserved. I think many of them are aware that the town was intended to last. The movie site was done at the last of the month and it was put up pretty shakily and frankly, some of the buildings are not in the best of repair. But that is right, the town has wanted to preserve the movie site. I think many of them recognize that parts of it just can't be preserved. It is like preserving a paper box.

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):— Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I understand that just in the last month or two the Board of Trade or the people in the Duck Lake area have written you saying, 'Never mind the townsite now.' You are supposed to be moving a couple of buildings or three buildings or helping them move two or three buildings into the museum site, I understand. Could you tell me when this is going to be done and is your department going to do all the financing for this move?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I can't give you a precise date. We are still negotiating with the Duck Lake Board of Trade and the town. Obviously, we hope to get it done this summer and the sooner the better. But I can't tell you precisely when; the agreement hasn't been finalized yet.

MR. WIPF: — Can you tell me what amount of money the government paid for that townsite?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am informed it was in the neighbourhood of \$100,000, that paid for all the facilities there, the power line and so on and so forth.

MR. WIPF: — And how much money was spent on fixing up two or three of those buildings after you bought them?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Under \$20,000.

MR. WIPF: — And are these buildings that were fixed up — I understood it was quite a bit more, Mr. Minister, but I have no reason to refute your argument there — these buildings that were fixed up and wall board put in and flooring put in and electricity put in and everything, are they the ones that are going to be moved into the townsite?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. Can you tell me if within the last month since Mr. Matsalla was out at Duck Lake, have you been approached for any special grant to help the Duck Lake Historical Museum or Historical Society stay solvent and to help the Museum Board.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We are giving them some assistance in the form of . . . the member will be familiar with the SWIG Program. Students Working in Government. We are placing at their disposal two students who will be working with them during the summer. That's the only assistance they've got in addition to what I've already outlined.

MR. WIPF: — Then there is no grant going to them . . . \$4,000, \$ 5,000 or \$6,000 to help get this society started to preserve that museum. I can tell the Saskatchewan River Heritage Project gets on line.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There is an addition of a museum grant which they get regularly.

They get that every year.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr, Chairman, I have a few questions with respect to student employment in Saskatchewan. I understand, of course, that the YES Program is proceeding again this year, that the budget has been increased and that it will probably employ more students as a result of it this year than before, Also that you do have a new program, Students Working in Government, I would like to ask the minister, how many jobs he expects to create between these two programs and the total amount of money you intend to budget for them? I have the YES figures here but I don't have the Students Working in Government,

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In the SWIG Program, there are 360 jobs being created. In the YES Program than will be 1750 jobs created. You ask the budgetary figures. It's \$1 million in each case, in each program.

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Chairman, \$1 million for the Students Working in Government and \$1 million for the YES Program? Well, I'm not really sure I follow the logic of the government here. You're telling me you're willing to spend \$1 million on the YES Program to subsidize communities and non-profit organizations to hire students and that will create 2,750 new jobs or jobs for students. You're also prepared to spend \$1 million on Students Working in Government and that's going to create 360 new jobs. Is that correct?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, that's correct.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, I'd like to ask the minister if he has compared the usefulness of the YES Program, which is a good program. Some of us might argue that there could be more done. And here's the argument. We can only assume that if you take the \$1 million that you're spending on the Students Working in Government Program and spend it in the same manner as you spend that money on the YES Program instead of creating an additional 360 jobs you might be able to create an additional 2,750 jobs as you do with the first million you spend on the YES Program. Why do you find the SWIG Program a priority over extension of the YES Program in terms of dollars?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm sure the member isn't suggesting that we're not getting value for our money for the students who are working in the SWIG. We are. We just heard that two of them will be working out at Duck Lake on that project and that will have a return on its investment, It is true that we get more jobs per dollar in the 'Yes Program' but we have reached a kind of a threshold on that program. We now have the program get up so that it is only available to municipalities and non-profit or recreational projects.

The only real extension that could be made of the program is to make the program available to the private sector, Now, we are considering that, I should add. That is under active consideration. There are some problems with that. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley might remember them if he was around. The problems are that it is very difficult to control abuse of that type of a program. Self-employed people — the usual jig is that self-employed people hire their sons whom they would have hired anyway. The son may not even work; he may be off skiing in Banff or somewhere and still pick up \$350 dollars. There is a great deal of abuse of it. Ontario now has a modification of 'Yes Program' which is the private sector and they report horrendous abuse of it. We like the program because as you point out it creates a lot of jobs per dollar spent but any extension of that will lead us into the private sector which in the past, when the

former administration was in, proved to be a very difficult program to control.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well I would like to pursue that end with you because I'm sure that you are not prepared to hesitate implementing that program in view of its man-hours or man-days of employment return for dollar investment. I'm not sure that you would be prepared to resist that because there were some administrative problems with it. I know there was abuse with it. I was in university when that program got going pretty well. I remember friends of mine who did get summer jobs under that program and I remember of hearing about cases of abuse, but I think it is a poor choice to make, given a million dollars to utilize to spend it in government to create 360 jobs that you people say you are making an attempt to cut back anyway in a general sense, when that money could be spent in the private sector. Maybe you need to be a little more conscientious in your administration. Maybe you have to apply the guidelines in a stricter manner, but you can provide 1,900 additional jobs with that million dollars being spent when you open the private sector up than you can if you put these people in government. I would like to firmly suggest that you do that if it is at all possible. I don't consider administrative problems to be adequate reason for not doing that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I say to the member that we are considering it. The member earnestly suggests that we do and we are. The Minister of Industry and Commerce, I don't see him in the House right now — he and I, in our departments, are actively considering it and I hope we have a program next year in place which will extend to the private sector if the unemployment situation among young people doesn't improve. It requires a lot of thought and a lot of effort and we can't put it together in a hurry.

The advantage of the SWIG is that it is a program that one can put together relatively easy and relatively quickly. Any extension of the 'Yes Program' is going to take a lot of work on the part of the officials, I hope that we have it next year. I hope we are spending our money next year on 'Yes' and it will have to be considered, but I tell you, it is a very difficult program.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you have a wealth of past experience to rely upon. At the worst, you could take the old forms, I think it used to be called the STEP program. You could apply that program like it is and it would be of far more benefit than the million dollars spent than your SWIG program is going to be in terms of employing students and that is your objective.

Your objective isn't to fill a labor vacancy in terms of recreational development in the rural areas. It happens that it works out fairly well when local community organizations employ students but your primary concern is to put students into jobs and by spending your million dollars in the program that you used to have, for all of its inadequacies, in my mind, would be money far better spent than investing it in 360 students working in government. They may develop some hard work habits working with you people over the summer anyway. It might, in the long run, be more a detriment to those students than a benefit. But I'd like to suggest that you are in a position that you can bring that program in on very short notice. You won't have any trouble getting your applications filled, I'll guarantee that. You have tremendous and the former administration had a tremendous response from employers before. I think in by far the majority of cases, sincere response. Private industry in many many instances, went out of its way to create employment that they wouldn't have necessarily had to create, in order to give these young people an opportunity to work. We see many of the large industrials today, in a way, creating employment for students in the summer which is arguable in dollar terms for that company. Imperial Oil and other companies do that sort of thing. I say that if you

May 11, 1978

took the old guidelines and the old forms and the old regulations and simply put them in today, your money would be far better spent than the million you are spending for 360 students working in government.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't know what additional comment I could make. I point out to the member that we do have a wealth of experience, all of it bad. Ontario has a wealth of experience, all of it bad. It nevertheless does create a lot of jobs I grant you this. This is your argument; it does create a lot of jobs per tax dollar. That's the attraction of the program. I am sure, given our excellent staff of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and myself, the government will have a YES program next year which is in the private sector.

MR. McMILLAN: — How many students are going to be coming on the job market or are in the process of doing so? Now you have your college students who are available for work at this time, plus your high school students the end of June. How many, overall, are you looking at in the peak two months of July and August?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — My officials tell me that probably nobody has the figures as to how many high school students will be coming on the job. We can tell you there will be, the estimates are, there will be 14,000 unemployed young people under 25, in July. I can't tell you how many of those will be high school students.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, so you will have to assume then other than what help your programs create (and we are looking at 3,100 jobs and I am sure those will be filled), other than that, you are looking at 11,000, probably 11,000 young people seeking work in July, who will be unable to find any. Is that correct?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, that's a reasonable statement. I don't think that we ever, nobody ever suggested that this province has the responsibility to find jobs for all the young people. Certainly, the federal government has the major responsibility for the Canadian economy, making sure that the Canadian economy is humming at peak capacity so that there would be jobs for young people. We only have a minor share of the responsibility. We think we are meeting it but I agree with you if you are saying that the major share of the responsibility isn't ours, it's the federal government. That's certainly right.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, I don't know. You might be able to sleep at night with your own conscience by suggesting the problem was a federal government problem and while there was something you could do to improve the situation for students, you had no responsibility to, because it's primarily a federal government program. You got 11,000 students who are going to be actively unemployed (if that term is sufficient), and . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you say no. I simply said a minute ago does that mean that there will be 11,000 students in Saskatchewan who will be unemployed and looking for work . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — 11,000 'young' people.

MR. McMILLAN: — All right, young people. I assume that the vast majority of them will be students. You have an opportunity here to employ 1,900 of them, despite the administrative nightmare, if in fact, it exists to employ 1,900 additional. You are not

prepared to do that, for the same money and you are not prepared to do that. Why is that? Because you are scared that someone in private industry is going to take advantage of the program? Is that basically the reason?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's right. We had the program before and it didn't work. We are doing our level best to devise a program that will but, unlike other governments in Canada, we are not going to implement programs that won't work, just for the appearance of trying to do something.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you suggest then, that creating additional 1,900 jobs with \$1 million is a program that doesn't work. I grant you that you may very well have a problem with some of the employers who like to take advantage of it. Be that as it may, it will create an additional 1,900 jobs. And I should think that should be a first priority with you. The priority in your mind is not to help the students; it is to avoid helping the private businessmen. That is your priority. Look at it. That is your priority. If you have the opportunity, without increasing your budget a dime, to create an additional, almost 2,000 jobs, that should be significant to you. But you are not prepared to do that because a small minority of the employers might take advantage of the program.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The member is happily assuming away the public. The problem is that with the old program we did not create 1,900 new jobs. We subsidized a large number of existing jobs and it is not a small minority of the 1,900. The evidence we have indicates that a major portion of those jobs were not new jobs; they were existing jobs. If the member's assumptions were accurate, I think we would have gone ahead with the program. The problem is they are not. A major portion of the jobs which you would have on paper would be, in fact, existing jobs and that is what happened to the old program. It just didn't work. Not only were there abuses, it didn't create the number of new jobs that the member assumes.

MR. McMILLAN: — So you are saying then that over 50 per cent of the private employers who are willing to participate in the program, over 50 per cent of them in Saskatchewan, are unwilling to co-operate with the government and young people in this program in an ethical manner. You say a significant majority and majority is more than half.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I thought I said a significant number, I didn't intend to give the member any percentage because I don't think we have it. But a very significant number of them.

MR. McMILLAN: — Have you any idea what sort of percentage of people will abuse the program?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, then how can you assume it is not 10 per cent? And if it is only 10 percent per cent, I'd say the program is well worth going into because you will create then, probably, 1,500 new jobs. New jobs. And with your program and your \$1 million you are creating 360 new jobs. I'd say the risk is worth it because it will benefit those young people that won't normally have the opportunity to work this summer. And that is assuming that we can't in a short period of time, make any significant improvements to the program based on past experience. I think your administrators are probably very capable people; they do a good job in other sections of the Department of Culture and Youth. They could probably come up a set of regulations in a hurry which would greatly

improve the averages that we experienced under the STEP Program, the average people that take advantage of the program. I cannot, of course, stand here and demand that you do that, but I hope in good conscience that you will look seriously at implementing that program this summer with whatever modifications you feel are necessary in order to provide additional employment to, perhaps 1,000 or 1,500 or, perhaps all 1,900 students in Saskatchewan.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, I am wondering if you could bring us up to date on what involvement your department is going to have in the Saskatchewan River Heritage Project. Are you going to be influential in where they are going to locate the information centre? The Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources asked you in your estimates, are you going to be influential in where that centre is going to be located and have you got an idea now where it is going to be located? Is it going to be in Duck Lake or south of Duck Lake?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We will be negotiating this together with the other departments whom I mentioned with the federal government. Obviously, we'll have an influence on it. The answer is, no, in this point in time we don't know where any of this would be, we don't.

MR. KATZMAN: — The member for Duck Lake, don't forget Duck Lake, what he keeps telling you. We won't get into a dispute over this at this time. Minister, re grants to the Western Development Museum, I am going through your estimates and I find Item 11 has an amount that cannot be the amount that you are granting so there is a lot more money involved in the museum and could you tell me why you are missing it in your estimates, or is it given through another area? You have the Regina, sorry the Saskatoon, Yorkton, North Battleford and the Moose Jaw Museums.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The member is referring to subvote 11, is he on page 31 of the Estimates?

MR. KATZMAN: — Yes, subvote 11 only shows a very small amount of money compared to what they do get, I understand.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, that's what we give them \$351,000.

MR. KATZMAN: — That is the total of all the moneys that goes to the Yorkton, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and North Battleford museums from the government of Saskatchewan or is it funded elsewhere as well, that's why?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, that's it.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, Mr. Chairman, the museums you tell me get that amount of money. Do you finance some of their projects to make work in the YES and so forth? Is that where all the capital is coming from?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — They get traces of YES money, I should put it to the member, we are informed that their budgets would be around \$800,000; the rest they pick up from other sources including gate receipts. They get a surprising amount of money at the ticket office.

MR. KATZMAN: — So you're saying to the four museums that are referred to, Vote 11 is

the only money that you give them except for what they get out of the YES money and that's basically it. Is that correct?

MR. SHILLINGTON: That's correct, the member has probably acquainted himself with supplementary estimates, there is something there, but apart from the supplementary estimate, this is it.

MR. KATZMAN: — O.K. Mr. Minister, the construction for example of the Moose Jaw museum which was the last one built, I understood the government put in a substantial amount of money into that. Is that incorrect?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's all completed, and it's in the Public Accounts, but it does not appear in these years. That was completed some time ago.

MR. KATZMAN: — For an example, in the past years you have put the money in for the capital construction and basically they get the amount under subvote 11 and they get the rest of their money elsewhere, but that's the total of your funding unless they get YES grants.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's right.

MR. KATZMAN: — Now, the grants that they get where they are hiring older people, or elderly people, to restore cars and this type of thing, does that come through you or does that come through the federal government that you are suggesting?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — All the moneys that we give the museum are in that figure. Now they may get something from New Horizons; now that I cannot give you any information on; you wouldn't expect it, but they may get that in addition, but all the money the museum gets is in this figure.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the \$25 million that was announced last year on the facility grants to be given out over x amount of years, could you tell me if the total amount is now committed for or if there is funds still available for people to apply for? That's the first question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We have approved applications to the tune of \$9.6 million. We have paid out I am informed \$4.7 million of that.

MR. KATZMAN: — How much are you committed for for the next few years or is that included in the \$9.6 million?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, 9.7, that's what we are committed to.

MR. KATZMAN: — O.K. Mr. Minister, I have before me the Star Phoenix Tuesday, May 9th, where on page 10 one of the headlines says Corman Park allows Clavet \$7,500 of their facilities. What they are doing is giving so many people to Clavet to use for tallying what they can apply for. Several months ago the city of Saskatoon was given some money by the arm of Corman Park. Each of the towns in the area that they serve has been done the same. Is this the procedure through the whole province with the RMs?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, the member may not be aware that the program is structured to encourage municipalities to work together. There is an extra \$5 a head if they do. I don't have the exact figures of how many combined projects there are, but

May 11, 1978

there is a large number of them. The municipalities have been working together in very large numbers.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is there any conditions that says if a RM gives its portion of a grant to a city, so the city must provide the recreation facilities for the people of that RM or is it up to them to make the arrangements?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, they make their own arrangements.

MR. KATZMAN: — So in other words, if an RM just has no use for the money itself and says that rather than let it go to waste they are going to give it to a city, with no strings attached, that is perfectly proper?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Right.

MR. KATZMAN: — Going back to this particular Corman Park again, when there is a joint project do you have a mileage limit? For example, one very large amount agreed to from Corman Park to the City of Saskatoon was for a fieldhouse for a shooting club. Do you suggest they can take the amount per capita from any portion or does it have to be within ten miles or five miles?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The municipality . . . designate any portion of it.

MR. McMILLAN: — I would like to pursue with the minister this employment thing because my figures weren't exactly accurate when I gave them to you the first time and I expect that your fellows knew that as well. I just want to explain one thing to you. Right now you are prepared to spend \$1 million to employ 360 people in government. That's almost \$3,000 per job created you are prepared to spend. These are additional jobs that are created above and beyond whatever that department uses or hires, or agencies that hires these students, feels is necessary to get by on right now. Those are new jobs being created. If you applied those funds to a YES program and involved private citizens, your average cost for your job created is going to be in the neighborhood of \$300 to \$500, on the rough figures we have here, if we could create close to 3,000 jobs with \$1 million.

Now, let's start talking about the risk. If 50 per cent of the people who participated in that Youth Employment Service on private industry, if 50 per cent of them took advantage of the program and simply used it to subsidize the wages of someone they would have hired already — 50 per cent, and you apparently don't think it is that high and I don't either — if 50 per cent of them did we would still be creating 1,015 new jobs more with that \$1 million than we do by creating 360 in the civil service. Do you see what I am getting at? Your great fear is that you might take half of that money and end up subsidizing private industry with it. But what are you doing anyway? You are taking \$1 million of it almost and just funding your own government with it. I say the money would be far better spent outside the government in private industry because of the number of jobs it would create. I think the figures here have even more impact. I don't think that 50 per cent of the people who use that program would be unethical enough to abuse it. I don't know what the percentage would be either, but I am quite sure it would be far less than that. For every percentage less than that, the number of new jobs you create would be going up. I would like to suggest now that you give this House a commitment to seriously consider implementing that program far this summer, for the first of July. Can you do that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I can tell the member that we are studying the program. We are studying it with a view to hopefully having a program replace it which will work. But I can't give you . . . as to when it is going to come into effect.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — One thing that bothers me is why in the world does the government have to study a program that might work? All you have to do is go back and check the records, when this particular program was in effect by a previous government in which there were no stipulations and certainly there were some abuses in that of the type you are afraid of, but don't you think you have learned enough from those abuses to put in the guidelines that might be necessary this time? Your reasoning for saying that you are studying it is just a hollow excuse to put it off for another year. You have all the information you need as to what kind did occur because the province did experience one full year, if not two full years, of operation under that program where private industry and private individuals throughout this province were able to take advantage of that program. As the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) said, certainly there are going to be some abuses. But I have enough faith and confidence in the private sector of our province that the abuse which may exist is not going to amount to more than between 10 and 15 per cent. Ten and fifteen percent per cent, and when you look at the value of the jobs which you create for our students during the summer months, that far outweighs any abuse that that program may have regardless of what program any government implements. Whether it is an NDP, Liberal, Tory or Social Credit government, there is always a certain percentage of people who stay awake at night to try to get around that program. You are never going to implement a program that is going to have no abuses whatsoever. So why be so concerned about a program that can do so much good in this province, and I say you are only looking at abuses at 10 to 15 per cent. You've had experience in operating and dealing with such a program. I believe it was two years in operation, it was a popular program at that point in time. I think the government should reconsider its position and re-implement that program for 1979.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, I'd like to add one further thing, too. And it is maybe something that the minister doesn't consider. When you spend your \$1 million to create 360 jobs, that is the total amount of money involved, it is \$1 million for job creation. If you spend \$1 under the million under a YES Program, you are giving incentive to other individuals to add their money to yours. This would not even be a matching grant because their contribution for the most part would be quite a bit more than the \$200 you are prepared to put in. You might draw in for your \$1 million involved, if you had complete involvement or no unethical involvement from private industry, you might drag in another \$2 million or \$3 million out of private industry that may not normally be involved in job creation for young people in Saskatchewan. I think that is worthy of consideration. But when we are talking about the \$1 million here we are talking about \$1 million of taxpayers' money and whatever else the Crown corporation, or agency or government department is willing to put in as well. I am talking about additional money that is not in the job creation market now either through public funds or the through private interests. And I think that in itself is well worth the consideration.

MR. KATZMAN: — Talking about the program the two members preceding me were talking about, my understanding is . . . it has been two years since I have actually worked with the program itself. Are the jobs that are created supposed to be new jobs? For example, I'll use the city of Saskatoon. With my employer I had some association with these jobs and you suggest that they must be new jobs created that otherwise would not be there. But the problem with that is that you immediately destroy union contract. What happens in the union contract is that there are so many positions and everybody

takes them. Then you bring in these new positions which are usually newly created jobs which will end up being day work and better hours and better everything else and the same wages and yet the employees that have been there for years don't get a chance to get better working conditions. Will it be as last year or are you considering as long as there is an additional staff member, allowing it to be that way rather than saying they have sit in the brand new job. In other words, if the staff was 50 people, the staff now goes to 51; it is not important which job that they are placed in.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not completely sure I understand the member's suggestion but I gather it was that the we do not require the municipalities to identify the new job created. In other words, if they create a new job, call it a deal. The difficulty with that is that this is a program designed to assist students and you might not necessarily create a new job for students if you did not identify it. The only way to be sure that the program is being administered fairly is to ask the municipality to identify the new job it created for the person it is intended for.

MR. KATZMAN: — That is the point I am making, exactly. In a union contract, it says that those that are there get first crack at the jobs in most cases. Therefore, in the case of the city of Saskatoon when they created new jobs for YES they had to first of all get the union to agree to break the contract because this new job could not be allowed to any of the employees that are presently working. So, therefore, these people would come into the new job. What I'm saying is let the city, or the municipality indicate that we have one new job. This is the position; your man who may come on our staff may take one of our permanent men's job and he takes this one. That's perfectly fair because a brand new position was created for a YES person. In other words the new staff must be a YES person but he could fill any job within the department and there is a new job created which doesn't automatically have to get unions to agree to break their contract. Because of them breaking their contract, some of the unions do not allow additional staff to be employed. They say, either you do it this way or no YES. So I'm saying that you are stopping some people from being employed by your rules. Would you consider looking at the other rule?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, we will take the member's suggestion under consideration.

MR. KATZMAN: — One other item on this one. I'm assuming the reason the minister suggests that he won't allow the private industry into it which may create approximately 2,400 jobs (but he is thinking about it for next year) is because next year is an election year. During an election year you want to say, oh, well, we're creating this and creating this. I assume that's why, when my staff phoned this afternoon to check out this program, they told them, oh, it's all going to be new next year; we can't tell you what we're doing. So I'm assuming by the normal way that your government works and the way they visibly pat their back that next year we will hear it is available for private industry so you can stand up in the boondocks and say, hey, we created more jobs. Why don't you do it now then?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the amount of money spent on this program was doubled this year. I don't think anyone assumed this was going to be an election year. That's not the way this government operates. This government operates by giving people good government year in and year out whether it's an election year or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I would only like to add that we have given the minister ample time to get up and defend his reasons for not participating in a program, at no additional cost, which would have created between 1,000 and 2,000 additional jobs. There is only one reason why the minister sat there dumb and that's because you don't have a good reason for not getting into it other than your hatred for private industry. You get up and give us one good reason, show us where we are mistaken when we say to you that by spending that same money you could create between 1,000 and 2,000 additional jobs. I'll be interested in hearing that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I say to the member that a program, which a sufficient number of people abuse, is a program which will soon become discredited and the public will complain. I say to the members opposite, we are not prepared to bring in programs which will discredit ourselves. We would like to be around after 1979 and if we bring in these kinds of programs such as the members opposite brought in previous to 1971, we are likely to suffer the same fate. That's not what we are trying to do; we are trying to bring in programs which people respect and we will.

MR. McMILLAN: — Tell me how much complaining was done by those 1,000 or 2,000 students who were hired under it previously and by those employers who found themselves in a position to hire an additional student? You are a little worried that some of these people are going to complain? Who is going to do the complaining? The 2,000 additional students who would have worked that didn't previously have it? How thin-skinned can you be? You've got a good program. You know you can bring it in with some improvements. It is not just good for the government: it is good for the young people whom you are supposed to represent in this department. I say in your refusal to bring it in because you are a little sensitive about the public reaction is cowardice.

Item 1 agreed.

Revert to Item 1

MR. McMILLAN: — I would like to ask a question on a different matter, perhaps in a bit of a lighter vein. I would like to ask the minister what his total . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Is this on item 1.

MR. McMILLAN: — Oh, I'm not fussy. It will go on item 1 with your leave.

I would like to ask the minister what the total fiscal involvement of the Department of Culture and Youth was in the movie, *Who Has Seen the Wind*, in the end? I know what you supposedly committed to them to begin with.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The Department of Culture and Youth put no money in it. SEDCO did. It was SEDCO that invested money in *Who Has Seen The Wind*. We believe it to be around \$350,000. I may say that it is a typical investment of SEDCO — money taken with bit of a risk and a good profit return on that money, a very successful venture and typical of the kind of thing SEDCO is doing for this province.

MR. KATZMAN: — The cover for the SEDCO annual report in Culture and Youth was confused. Maybe it is just the copy I received. Why, then do we have such a full display here if the Department of Culture and Youth didn't have anything to do with the production of the movie?

May 11, 1978

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Because the production of the movie was an important cultural event in this province — one which we are pretty proud of.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I don't think your mike is working. I can hardly hear you. Is this one working?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I think if we have a little quietness we could have . . . Order. We will recess for five minutes.

Item 1, 2 agreed.

ITEM 3

MR. KATZMAN: — Could the minister supply a list now or later of those who are receiving assistance under this vote?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, we'll supply you with a list.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Chairman, would this be the item under which the government would be funding French language and French cultural groups, and if it is, how much money in this item is being devoted to French matters?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would point out initially that the Department of Education has a program as well which the member is probably familiar with and they deal with French education and French language training. We have two programs which deal with language training. The Summer Language Immersion Program — the only one I can identify which deals with the French Language specifically is a grant of \$2,320 to the French Training and Cultural Association. We then have another program — one of the Language Opportunities Program with a fairly expensive list of grants, some of which went to French groups. We could call out the grants to the French groups and supply them to the member. It will take a few moments to go through the list and check them now.

MR. MALONE: — What is the total amount of money under your department, Culture and Youth, which is being spent for the development and promotion and encouragement of the French language and French culture in Saskatchewan?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That we would have to put together and send to you at a later date.

MR. MALONE: — I want it on your Estimates. You can come back to it if you want. I want the figure while you are still on your Estimates.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I also have some questions on item (3) which perhaps the minister will supply. Is that the item wherein you give grants under Mosaic '78?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We don't have a specific grant earmarked for the Mosaic '78. We do provide a grant of \$4,300 to the Multicultural Council of Regina and they operated Mosaic '78. That, I suppose is the answer. It was a \$4,300 grant to them for their year's operations. They ran Mosaic '78. We didn't give them a specific grant for that program.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — So there were no grants or anything available to each of the

groups.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, not other than the Multicultural Council, not unless the Regina Multicultural Council makes it available to them. We don't give grants directly to any of the groups. We give one grant to the Multicultural Council of Regina — \$4,300 and that was for their year's operations. Whatever they did with that and whatever help they give the individual groups . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — What areas of the province get that same grant? Saskatoon and Prince Albert, they divide it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There are nine Multicultural councils. Do you want me to read them off? Nine Multicultural councils: the Regina Multicultural Council got \$4,300; the Saskatoon Folk Arts Council got \$3,000; the Moose Jaw Multicultural Council got \$2,000; Prince Albert Multicultural Council got \$400; Swift Current Multicultural Council got \$500; the Yorkton and District Multicultural Council got \$1,250; Melville Dance Association got \$2,000, the Estevan Multicultural group got \$950 and the Battleford Committee got \$4,100, for a total of \$18,500.

MR. KATZMAN: — What's the criterion that is required on these grants? I understand from what you said earlier, these groups decide who gets how much in each of these communities, not the government, is that correct?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — These grants are not given out directly by the department. They are given out by the Saskatchewan Multicultural Council. Their criteria isn't easy to give in a few words. By and large, they receive the applications, judge them, and give a portion of the cost of the year's program. Each case is judged on its individual merits.

MR. KATZMAN: — How do you know how much you're going to give now, for next year? Do you allocate so much money to this provincial association and they divide it up any way they want?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's all we do. We give the Multicultural Council a sum of money which they then divide among the multicultural councils.

MR. KATZMAN: — Would you have any idea how many are turned down? What percentage of the people who apply are turned down Or what percentage would be accepted? Take your choice.

Item 3 stood.

Item 4 agreed.

ITEM 5

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — What are your components of that expenditure?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The major component of the item Other Expenses is grants. We gave out \$99,600 for competitive games in the province. We gave out another \$42,000 for recreation for the handicapped. Provincial coaches program cost us \$145,000 and sport and recreation were given \$285,000.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Did the department give any consideration to a permanent coaching staff of the various sports to improve the capability of the Saskatchewan

May 11, 1978

athlete?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We don't hire them in the department. We do give grants to ten provincial associations to hire permanent coaches to develop their sports. So we do give grants to the provincial associations.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — O.K. Why did you choose the ten that are in the report?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, they were the ten major provincial sport organizations which appeared to be well enough developed and large enough to be able to make use of this kind of a program. Obviously, not any provincial association is well enough organized that has a well enough developed sport to be able to use a coach or program. Now these, in the opinion of the officials who made the decision, were the ten provincial organizations which were well developed and which were able to make use of a coaching program.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Well, you eliminated most of the sports with that criterion. Now, would you not feel that it would be advantageous for the department to hire the coaching in other sports and allow them to develop so that an organization could build around them, rather than insisting on some degree of organization first?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, but that's, whatever the merits of the idea, that is not what the sporting organizations want to do. They are pretty insistent that the department not hire the coaches but give them the money and let them hire the coaches.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — You have any input into the quality of the coaching?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, we insist that a condition of the grant that they have the certificates for their sport.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — No international recognition or anything of that sort?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, no. I think the only condition is, that they be certified coaches.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, the \$285,000 for the fourth item you mentioned, is that matched or is the coaching portion matched by funds that are accrued under the Western Lottery, which is where a lot of funds go, toward recreation?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — Are any of these funds indicated here matched by funds that come from that area. for example, for teams going . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — Not even for provincial competition in provincials? They give grants. Don't you give grants as well?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, we are pretty insistent that the lottery fund not provide for what is called piggybacking of funds. They don't fund the same things that we do. We are pretty insistent on that and the lottery fund has respected that request.

MR. KATZMAN: — Since when has that been a rule?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Since the very beginning.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to disagree with the minister because I was at a banquet table where both presented cheques for identically the same thing. Youth and Culture presented a cheque and so did the Sask Board, which was the lottery fund. So I think the minister should check his statement.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would be interested to know the details of the case. There may be circumstances under which the groups qualify, both for a grant from us and a grant from the lottery fund. Now that may well be, but I would have to know the circumstances before I could respond to it.

MR. KATZMAN: — With a group qualifying for both then they can receive both, which you said they couldn't a minute ago.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh sure, Oh sure, sports organizations can receive both but not for the same purpose.

MR. KATZMAN: — For the same purpose.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would be interested in knowing the details of it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the Minister of Agriculture made one on behalf of the Department of Youth one night at a banquet which I was at and a person from Sask Sport made the other one. So . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — But I would venture to say that they were for different purposes. The same organization may have gotten two cheques, but for different purposes.

MR. McMILLAN: — I would like to ask the minister a simple question. Which member of your department is responsible for sort of maintaining a check on the 10 provincial coaches who are hired to make sure that their credentials are up to snuff and that they are operating within the terms of the principles that you would like to see them operate with?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Bill Clarke.

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — I ask the minister about a team that has applied for a grant. It's the Balfour Technical School girls' volleyball team in Regina. They won the Regina City Championship, the Senior A Provincial, the Junior A Provincial, the Silver Medal at the Saskatchewan Winter Games. They since have been invited to the Can-Am Games to participate in them in Seattle at the end of May. They were flatly refused any assistance from your department. I can't think of a team that has accomplished more for the city of Regina or the province of Saskatchewan. What were your reasons for not giving any assistance?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wasn't quite clear from the member's statement what the request was for. I'll bet it was for travel and our department provides no money for travel. I turn down three or four requests a week for travel: we just have no money at all for travel. It is open to those groups to go to the Lottery Fund and ask for travel. The Lottery Fund does provide travel money. Our department provides no travel money.

May 11, 1978

MISS. CLIFFORD: — What assistance would you provide for a team representing Saskatchewan in such competition?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We provide no travel assistance.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Do you have any assistance whatsoever for a team that has been recognized as a qualified team, an outstanding qualified team in Saskatchewan? Surely you must have some assistance for these people who do all the work.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We don't provide assistance for teams that are travelling to interprovincial or international sports events. There is almost an endless number of such groups these days, and I just don't have it in the Budget.

Item 5 agreed.

ITEM 6

MR. WIPF: — Just one question. What does this Youth Vocational Services include?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It provides counselling services to young people in smaller communities in Saskatchewan. We have two people who are on the road, who work in smaller communities only.

MR. WIPF: — You say counselling services; this is in sports?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Career counselling, sorry.

Item 6 agreed.

ITEM 7

MR. KATZMAN: — We had a very extensive debate, if I remember correctly; on this item last year and since that I noticed a very large write-up in the newspaper where the minister has seen a film and barred the film from being shown in Saskatchewan.

Would the minister indicate in this case — you checked the film and said no, yet in this House before you have indicated that you, under the film classification, couldn't do that. Now it is a contradiction of what you were saying last year in this House.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wasn't saying anything in this last year in the House. I kind of hoped that that state of affairs might prevail this year. Let me just outline briefly what occurred with respect to the film you refer to which is 'Pretty Baby'. I did see the movie because I anticipated that there might be some questions asked of me on it and I wanted to see it. I can tell you, whether or not the member believes it, that the film classification board acted on their own volition. It was their own decision; I did not interfere in it. I can also say for the member that this thing has been appealed by Paramount Pictures. I am in the process now of trying to pull together an appeal board and I'd rather avoid any extensive discussion of the merits of the film until the appeal is disposed of.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, forgetting that particular film. Last year there was a concern shown in this House by all members, including your side of the House regarding the drive-in theatres, with their special accesses and so forth, facing on to highways and

that type of thing, and the concern for somebody's eyes wandering from the driving and causing an accident. Your suggestion was that your department would be considering maybe making some recommendations with regard to what can be shown outdoors. Do you have any comment?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That matter has been attended to. There are now conditions attached to some classifications which say 'Rated Adult' but not to be shown at — that wouldn't be an example — 'Rated Strictly Adult' but not to be shown at the drive-in theatres. You have probably seen those. So in a sense, the film classification board is trying to keep the films which are visually offensive out of the drive-in theatres.

MR. D. M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I am wondering — possibly this question should be directed to the Attorney General's Department — is it your department that polices the age groups with respect to classifications of films?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It is the Attorney General's.

MR. HAM: — In other words, if you were concerned or if I was concerned, for example, about those under 18 attending drive-in movies, it would be his department.

Item 7 agreed.

Item 8 agreed.

ITEM 9

MR. KATZMAN: — Is this the total moneys from all government sources that is given to the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, that is scarcely a fair question on my estimates. I can tell you how much the Department of Culture and Youth spends on the Centre of the Arts but I can't tell you how much the government in total spends. It is hardly a fair question of one department.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Has the Centre of the Arts yet got the clearance from the fire inspector? A year ago they refused to give a safety certificate to the Centre of the Arts because of an inability to have, I think it was smoke detectors, warning lights, etc.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I will have that information shortly. The Director of the Centre of the Arts is unfortunately busy there tonight but I will have it in a few minutes, somebody is going to phone him.

MR. KATZMAN: — The reason, Mr. Minister, for my question regarding the Centre of the Arts is there has always been a dispute between the city of Saskatoon and the Centre of the Arts. Saskatoon citizens get a very small subsidy and didn't receive that much assistance to build it and pay for it themselves, where the city of Regina threw up its hands and the government took it over and finished the project. The question I am really concerned with is, are these the only funds? The reason I ask it is there are no other estimates that I know that I can ask it under. Are there any other funds available? Do you know of anybody else that gives any?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The grants you see before you are the only grants given to the Centre of the Arts and to the Saskatoon Centennial Auditorium. There is something, I

May 11, 1978

think, in the Supplementary Estimates but this is all there is in the Estimates.

Item 9 agreed.

Items 10, 11 and 12 agreed.

ITEM 13

MR. L W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — What are these grants for?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am sorry, I have to confess that my attention was otherwise diverted. What was the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. I am finding it very difficult to be able to follow both sides of the House here.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes. Mr. Chairman, under this item it just simply has ‘Grants’ and I just wanted to know what these grants were for?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The general terms, they are an attempt to assist communities in upgrading their recreational facilities. I can read you the pamphlet which we hand out to anybody to asks if you want. But that a general explanation, they are intended to assist communities in upgrading of recreational facilities.

Item 13 agreed.

Item 14 agreed.

ITEM 15

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, can you tell me what the implementation of the Qu’Appelle Agreement has to do with Culture and Youth?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The Qu’Appelle Agreement includes an historical aspect and this department is involved in historical sites, interpretive displays under the Qu’Appelle Agreement.

Item 15 agreed.

ITEM 16

MR. KATZMAN: — The minister suggested earlier that a \$1 million was going to be paid to Youth, yet it shows \$1,203,670. Could he tell me how he is going to pay three employees that much money?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I’m not sure I understood the member’s question, I think he asked why is there \$1.1 million in other expenses when we talked about using a figure of \$1 million earlier. I was just using a round figure of \$1 million for the sake of simplicity.

Item 16 agreed.

ITEM 17

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I am sure that you have got some projections and how that is to be spent and how it is to be allocated. Will you supply that to me, which cities get — the two major cities for example, what percentage are they going to get, is there going to be a per capita disposition?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Chairman, while this information is being obtained, I can answer the member's question on subvote 3, if he wants, on the money spent on French language. In 1977-78, we gave \$9,720 in direct grants to French language organizations. In addition, we spent another \$4,700 on translation services, which included French and others as well. In addition, there's an item we can't quantify. Our support to multicultural councils includes, of course, support to French groups. And we can't quantify what that is in terms of dollars. We don't specify in our 1978-79 budget anything for French support. French cultural organizations and groups will be eligible for grants in the future the same as they have in the past. And we can't quantify what those grants will be. It will depend on what their programs are and what they submit by way of request. The budget for the translation services will be \$51,368. I should point out, as well, that the French groups, next year as was the case last year, will receive support from the multicultural councils.

MR. MALONE: — The translation services, what are you talking about there? The two-way microphone or the ear-plug type of device, I've used at conventions . . . what do you mean by that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — By and large, document translation. I get a letter from my counterpart in Quebec, Claude Charron, it's usually in French. I send it down to the translators. They translate it and send it back. That's a fairly simple example. We may also translate documents sent to us by the province of Quebec or the government of France. Occasionally, we get letters in Ukrainian, German and we get documents in different languages. We translate any letter in any other language into English, for our own use.

MR. MALONE: — In-house services for the benefit of the government and that's the bulk of the money you spent last year, \$47,000. What you spent last year is peanuts, quite frankly, under your department. Now, you can't tell me precisely, this year, what funds you have available for the promotion of French language. French culture, and so on. Is that correct?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No. This department is basically a granting department. By and large, what we do is give out grants. What grants we give out the next year, will depend on what applications we get from French language groups and French council groups and what their programs are. I can't tell you now what the grants will be next year. It depends on what they apply for, really.

MR. MALONE: — Let me turn it around then. How much money do you have available for grants to people who want to promote French culture, French language. Now is it \$50,000. \$100,000?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm sure the member doesn't want the exact figure. The cultural activities grant is in the neighborhood of \$100,000. That's parcelled out among the various groups.

MR. MALONE: — Which grant?

May 11, 1978

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The Cultural Activities Grant.

MR. MALONE: — Just for French?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You asked, as I recall, how much money is available for these types of grants. The answer is 5100,000. Of course, the French cultural groups are not going to get the entire amount, but only a portion of it. But I can't tell you at this point in time what their share will be. It will very much depend on their applications and what they apply for, and what other people apply for.

MR. MALONE: — Then actually you have for everybody is \$100,000?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, in round figures that is right.

MR. MALONE: — As minister of the Crown would you please tell me what other departments would have moneys available for the promotion of the French language and culture. I am, of course, aware of the Department of Education and your department. Are there any other departments in the government that have money available for French language, French culture promotion, understanding, and so on?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I honestly don't know. I can't honestly answer your question. I don't know what the other departments might have. The two departments that I am aware of are Education and ourselves. Others may well have them, but I don't know.

MR. MALONE: — I am glad the Premier came in tonight. For some months now he has been going up and down this country talking about national unity. Sometimes I have agreed with him, sometimes I have disagreed with him and I will probably pursue this on his own estimates.

But the Premier, and I think all members of this House, have indicated that one of the ways to promote national unity is to promote a better understanding of the problems in Quebec as well as the problems right across this country.

Now, going through your estimates I am trying to find where the government has budgeted funds available for the people of Saskatchewan to gain a better understanding of the French culture, of the French language, of the French fact of life in Quebec. The Department of Education certainly has funds available for instruction in our school system. Fine, I agree with that. What about the people who aren't going to school, the people who are, you know, passed the school age? I am suggesting to you minister, that it is likely your department should be the one responsible for handling this type of spending if the government puts a priority on spending money this way. Now, the Premier can say perhaps say that there are other funds, other departments and if he does, fine. But I say to you when you come into this House and say you've got a \$100,000, you don't know how you are going to spend it, it's the total amount for all people who want to promote their cultures, whether its Ukrainian or German or Irish or whatever. I say to you, that you are not doing a very good job and it is going to take a lot more than \$100,000 to get an appreciation of not only the French culture, but other cultures in this particular province of ours.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes. I should say one thing initially and that is, I gave you a figure of \$100,000. That was extremely round. When the officials found the exact figure, it is \$187,000. That doesn't change what you are saying. By and large, I may say to the hon.

member for Lakeview, that I have met with the French Cultural Association. They aren't complaining vehemently that they need more money for their cultural activities. A good number of their comments and suggestions are directed toward French education. That is what they see as sort of the pillar which will prop up their culture and a pillar which will form the basis of a strong French culture. It is not the kind of a program I think the French people will agree with me, I am not being partisan now but I think the French people would agree with me. This is not the kind of a problem that you can throw money at and expect to achieve dramatic results. We invite applications from them for cultural activities, they submit them and we in the which we divide up the moneys, give the money for the cultural activities. I think that I can honestly say that I haven't heard them complain that the money they get for cultural activities is too small. I haven't heard that comment from them and I have met with them many times. They wanted money for other areas. I don't think I have heard them say that they need more money to encourage and foster cultural activities among French people.

MR. MALONE: — Let me just say a couple of things to that. You know very well that that particular organization is demanding of you to have a separate department of government to deal with their affairs and minority affairs. I see you are being passed a note and some information. To say that they are pleased with the situation is putting too good a light on it, Mr. Minister, I think you will agree. Secondly, that particular organization hardly, to me, is the epitome of the answer to all of the problems we face in this province because of a lack of appreciation, if you will, of other cultural backgrounds of this country. It's just one of many, many things that are going on in Saskatchewan and in Canada. Now, I suggest to you that you have doubled the amount of money almost available to you since I last asked you the question, but it is still a pittance. I suggest to you that if you want a meaningful program to do something that would create a better understanding, there are all sorts of things you could be doing — exchange visits by students from this province to the province of Quebec or New Brunswick or whatever. For you to say, or for the Premier to say (and I see he has slithered out), for him to say that he is doing everything he can to foster better understanding in this province, is absolute nonsense, when that is the budget you have available to you. I agree, it is not a problem that can be solved by just spending a whole bunch of money. I concede that. On the other hand, when people do come to you with meaningful programs that will work if they do have some funding, you won't have the money available to you. If that measly little amount of money you have is not just for French culture, it's for all of them and believe me, the Ukrainian people, the German people have just as legitimate claim toward funding as the French people so obviously that is not enough to go around.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, let me say, in answer to the member for Lakeview, that if the French people come forth to us with a suggestion of an idea for a program we would judge that on its own merits. But that isn't what they have done to date and that isn't where they have got their demands. You may speak disparagingly of the French

May 11, 1978

Cultural Association . . .

MR. MALONE: — I did not.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, you indicated that you didn't think they had a corner on all of the wisdom about the problem. I can say to the member it's the only, that I know of, French Cultural Association. It is the one we got to work with and you know you can't go beyond them and assume that we know better than they do, what French people want. I say in summary, that if they come forth with a program which will cost more, we will consider it on its own merits. But this is the funding for the program which we have agreed upon to date.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Chairman, I just can't let that comment go by. I did not speak in a disparaging way of that particular association. I agree with them sometimes and I sometimes disagree with them and for you to suggest that I did, is very much misleading this House and the people of that association, and you know it.

What I say to you again, is that association speaks for a certain segment of the population of Saskatchewan and I think they speak very well for that particular segment of the population of Saskatchewan. It is not the entire French speaking community, it is part of it. But it is just one of many, many, many organizations and it can't be considered the be-all and end-all of all of the people in this province who have a desire to see a better understanding between French speaking Canadians and English speaking Canadians.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, would the minister supply me with that information at a later date — during this session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Are you asking about the information about the Arts or the information about the Diamond Jubilee?

MR. LANE: — The Diamond Jubilee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, we will have to supply you with that at a later date.

MR. LANE: — At a later date?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes.

Item 17 agreed.

Supplementaries

MR. KATZMAN: — Could the minister say what the \$75,000 to the Western Development Museum was? Earlier, he indicated that the amount here was the only amount, so . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This amount of \$75,000 was given to the Western Development Museum to retire debts which have accumulated over the period when they had troubles which we all know about. This was money given to them to retire the debt.

Supplementaries agreed to.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION — VOTE 33

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Public Service Commission, page 87. I will ask the minister to introduce his support staff.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, Ray Purdie sitting to my left and behind me is Ernie Bereti, the Director of Administration for the Public Service Commission.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, before I get to a series of general questions, I would like to ask you a specific question. In view of the announcement today by the Prime Minister, have Messrs. Gates, Dionne, Schmeichel and Henley reapplied for employment within the government of Saskatchewan and if they do, will their application be met with a favorable response?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, those persons who are on a definite leave of absence are certainly free to come back, those who may have resigned they have no longer any responsibility. In the case of Mr. Schmeichel that you made a particular reference to, he was not an employee coming within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission.

MR. MALONE: — I take it then that Schmeichel, I believe, worked for SMDC. Is that not within your jurisdiction? All right. I take it your answer then for the other three is that, whether they are on leave of absence or whatever way they separated from the government to run as a candidate, you will allow them to return to their place of employment within the government while they are candidates for the New Democratic Party, whenever the federal election is being called. I suggest to you Mr. Minister, that is a very, very dangerous thing for your government to be doing, because it sets a precedent that I think you, even you and your government, will appreciate. These people, if they are on the payroll of the NDP government, are going to be serving two masters, if you will. They are going to be trying to do a job for the government, and the second thing they will be doing is trying to get elected. You, as head of the Public Service Commission, and the more direct employers will never know what they are doing on a given day, whether they are out campaigning for themselves or out working for the government.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that if these people do reapply they should not be taken back on the public payroll unless they resign as candidates, or their leave of absence should be extended to such time as the federal election is over with.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a good idea.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I find this somewhat interesting. From the standpoint of the Liberal Party it depends apparently for whom the public servant might run for office. If it is for the Liberal Party, then they should have all the freedom and all the rights; if it is for another party then the person should be denied all of the rights. I recall back in 1964 a person by the name of Paul Dojack who was a candidate running against me at that time and I recall that he was nominated quite a long time before that, before an election was called. The Liberals supported the idea that he should have all kinds of freedom to run. I support the idea that public servants should have the right to run for public office and that they should be entitled to a fair leave of absence during the election campaign, and if elected, thereafter get leave of absence to attend to the

duties of that office.

I recall that just in the last election, there was a candidate for the Liberal Party who was an employee of the Government Insurance Office and he was granted leave of absence. He ran in Saskatoon and he was granted leave of absence. He ran and as I understand it, after the election was over he returned to the Government Insurance Office.

In the case of — I think the hon. member mentioned three names, a Mr. Yates who was a candidate for Swift Current. He has taken a leave of absence; I don't know whether he wants to return. In the case of Mr. DeJong, he has resigned — I think he was nominated on a Saturday, as I recall it sometime in February. On Monday he handed in his resignation and he severed his employment with the public service. If Mr. DeJong applies for a job and he is qualified I am sure that he is going to get as fair consideration as anybody else.

In the case of Mr. Schmeichel, he is not in the public service. I cannot speak for the Crown corporation that he worked for but I remind the hon. member that under the provisions of The Labour Standards Act, the law of Saskatchewan is very clear and very precise. Any person employed in the public service or in a Crown corporation or working for any private employer, if he seeks nomination and is nominated, has got the right to a leave of absence. The employer, whether it is a Crown corporation, the public service or a private employer, must give that person reasonable leave of absence and then when a person is elected, he is entitled to leave of absence to attend to the duties. I think that that is the way our democracy should work. I don't think we should discriminate against public servants, because they are citizens of this country as well as anybody else.

MR. MALONE: — Well, that is really quite impressive, Mr. Minister. I don't disagree with anything you have said. I haven't suggested that I disagree with anything you have said. When they get nominated and take a leave of absence, that is what the law says, that is a perfectly appropriate and proper law. I congratulate those men for taking a leave of absence immediately when they got nominated. In DeJong's case, I gather he quit but that is not the point.

The point is, for good or for bad, we are not going to have a federal election this summer. I suggest to you that those people are going to be coming back and looking for work and you are going to be putting yourself in a very, very difficult position, because you know full well that I don't believe the public in Saskatchewan will stand for having people working for the government when they are nominated federal candidates of whatever party. So I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, that you should have a policy on this. The policy that you have outlined as to, once a nomination is obtained and people getting a leave of absence, is an excellent policy. It doesn't cover the situation that I have put to you and you know very well that it doesn't.

Let me just ask you a couple of questions in a general way. The jurisdiction of course, of the Public Service Commission is found in the act but what is the difference between their jurisdiction in hiring government employees, and employees hired by order in council? Is there a frame of reference whereby certain employees all have to be hired through the Public Service Commission and can't be hired through the device of order in council?

MR. SMISHEK: — The first part of the hon. member's question in relation to those persons who were candidates — may I tell him that in many respects his question at the

moment is hypothetical because neither Mr. Gates nor Mr. DeJong, either of them — it's only a matter of hours since the Prime Minister has announced that the election is not going to be called. I'm sure it creates more anxiety for the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party and some of his colleagues than any anxiety that might be created for us as a government in the case of public servants.

On the question of orders in council, there are two provisions in the act, section 9 and section 48. In the case of section 9, that section spells out very precisely that permanent heads, as such, like the deputies, are to be appointed by order in council and ministers' staffs. In the case of section 48, other persons may be appointed by order in council but they all must be treated equally as public servants and have the same rights. There is no differentiation in terms of their rights as employees, except one is clearly set out as permanent heads and ministers' staffs, section 9, the other section 48, other staff, but they have equal rights as public servants.

I'm not sure whether I have answered the hon. member's question: I think I have.

MR. MALONE: — Well, surely the desirable practice of the Public Service Commission is basic to hiring everybody. I know there are certain positions any government has to hire through order in council because of the nature of the job; some are political, grant it. Some are just highly qualified people they have to deal with on a special basis, doctors, experts in fields and so on, and I don't dispute the government's right to do that. Indeed, it is the only way it could be done. But, basically, I think the minister would agree with me, would he not, that most public employees should go through the Public Service Commission approach, that is they appeal to the Public Service Commission for a job, they write the exam and when openings become available they are given a first chance to take that opening if they are qualified and so on. Is that the case? Would you agree with that assessment?

MR. SMISHEK: — I might tell the hon. member that certainly the whole principle of The Public Service Commission Act is to appoint persons on the basis of merit through the Public Service Commission. I can tell the hon. member that it is the policy of the government to appoint as few persons as possible by order in council.

MR. MALONE: — It's good to hear that, Mr. Minister, because I have here in front of me a return that the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg applied for some time ago asking for the main position, salary, wage rate, etc., of each person appointed by order in council to all government agencies, boards, commissions between January 1, 1975 and October 30, 1976. The total amount of positions filled were 516 at a salary of approximately \$16 million for that period of time. These positions are as such: 45 in the Department of Finance; 69 in the Department of Government Services; 134 in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and that may be a special case, which I concede; 36 in the Executive Council; 15 in the Provincial Secretary's office. Now these positions are not positions of high stature, if you will, of deputy ministers, agency heads and so on. They are analysts, research officers, clerk typists, all the way through, positions that I believe would be filled very easily in the normal course of events of having the Public Service Commission just advertise them and fill them.

I suggest that when you get that number of appointments by order in council over that fairly short period of time for the total amount of money involved of some \$16 million, that the logical reaction of most people is to wonder what's going on, as to whether these people are being hired for some political reward and why it has been necessary to go through this order in council route to hire the people involved. Can we begin by

saying in the Department of Finance, 45 people were hired by order in council and I can give you some of the positions (I'm not going to give you the names unless you insist on it): administration analyst, career counsellor, clerk typist, administration analyst, clerk steno, executive assistant to the minister well, I suppose, that's understandable — financial consultant, auditor 2, clerk steno 4. I can send the list over to you but these jobs, all hired by order in council — your department. I think some explanation is required from you and I think that you should try to explain, if you will, the 134 in DNS, the 69 in government services and the 74 in the Attorney General's Department.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, let me first of all begin with the Department of Finance where the hon. member makes reference to the 45 persons in the Department of Finance who are appointed by order in council. I can tell the hon. member it has always been thus and can tell him precisely why. For example, in the Budget Bureau we have 34 employees. The Budget Bureau staff is mostly appointments. It has always been the case. It has got nothing to do with politics. The Budget Bureau is a very sensitive area. These are employees that, through order in council, are out of scope. They are of a confidential nature, including stenos. The stenographic people in the Budget Bureau are appointed by order in council. Because of the confidential nature of their work we have not been able to negotiate them as out of scope employees. So I give them the figure of 34 in the Budget Bureau to start out with. Then add my staff, which consists of five persons that I have in the minister's office, and then there are other directors. I think it is very self-explanatory. For that I make no apologies and I would presume that unless we are able to have the Department of Finance Budget Bureau staff excluded through the collective bargaining process, which has not been the case, we will be appointing them by order in council because of the confidential nature of the work and because of the peculiar set of circumstances and the quality and type of employees that need to be hired there.

In case of the Department of Government Services that the hon. member refers to, I agree that the number is large. May I tell him that the system centre employs about 100 employees. Now, in the system centre, and I really do not like what has been happening, but it is because of the particular nature of the work of developing systems for the computer service and management services, that as the whole system grew — It developed quite a number of years ago when the computers were being developed, and I can tell the hon. member that the Public Service Commission, together with the Government Services Department, is trying to bring those employees into the public service proper. I am hopeful that in this fiscal year all of them will be brought in, into the regular stream of merit appointments rather than orders in council. I think you referred to the Attorney General's Department, the Crown solicitors. They have traditionally been orders in council appointments, and getting legal council has been a bit of a problem for the government. They have been, by and large, appointments by order in council.

In the case the hon. member refers to, there we are making every effort to hire Northerners. Their qualifications are quite often somewhat limited but in the interest of trying to create employment for northern people we do have a considerable number of appointments by order in council.

MR. MALONE: — Well, let me just deal with your Department of Finance. You talked about the confidentiality of some positions. I do not accept that you have to hire by order in council to get somebody who is going to maintain the confidentiality that is necessary in the Department of Finance. What difference does it make? If somebody has the ability to work in the Budget Bureau and is the proper person for that position,

what difference does it make whether he has gone through the Public Service Commission route or has been hired by order in council? I say none at all. What you leave is a very grave suspicion in people's minds that they are political appointments. I am sure they are not political appointments, many of them. Many of them probably are. I can see names in here that have a familiar ring to them when you go through them, not many . . . (interjection — inaudible) . . . Well, I am not going to name them. I will tell you later if you wish, or if you insist I will tell you but there is no point in it. But what is the confidentiality of a person who is a clerk-typist 3, a clerk-steno 4, admin. assistant (a whole bunch of admin. assistants), auditor 2, career development office, career counsellor. What is the uniqueness about those jobs? What is so special about them that they could not be hired through the Public Service Commission?

MR. SMISHEK: — Well, Mr. Chairman, among the things, and I agree with the hon. member that there are a number of these categories that I would like to see them, through the process, hired through the merit system. We have, in the case of the Budget Bureau, we believe, and we have a difference with the union, we believe that those positions should be out of scope and I think he knows what I mean. That they should be outside of the collective bargaining agreement. Their hours are very irregular. These people are called upon, very often, to work all kinds of hours in the preparation of the Budget, meeting with Treasury Board. It is the nature of the job that demands certain different kinds of things that the regular employee — and it is not a question of trying to dodge overtime. They are people who are paid, in my judgment, reasonable salaries and we think they should be excluded. We have been unsuccessful over the years of collective bargaining, to reach a mutually acceptable understanding with the union to have those persons out of scope. The only way to get them out of scope, including a clerk steno III and other clerical staff, working in the Budget Bureau, the only way that is open to the government to have them out of scope is through order in council appointment. I invite him to examine that during the period when his seatmate, the hon. member for Indian Head -Wolseley was in the Cabinet and the same thing happened.

I would prefer that we would be able to reach a mutual agreement with the union and to have them processed through the normal system. It may not be, in all cases, because time is a factor in getting people recruited and appointed. While we do run a competition and advertise, at times you have to move fairly rapidly and the process of processing some of the appointments in the Budget Bureau would inhibit us being able to get the best qualified persons.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, I want to just say a few words on this. I have never heard such unmitigated nonsense in my life. You want some confidentiality and some people whom you can trust in the Public Service. It is one heck of a lot better to appoint them through normal channels of interview and introspection than it is for the minister to personally select that person. I want to tell you what you are doing when you appoint \$16 million in salaries in the Public Service in Saskatchewan by order in council. You are deliberately discriminating against young people who have the qualifications for that job and eliminating them from the opportunity of seeking employment with the Saskatchewan Public Service. What you are doing is taking a young person from Milestone or Wilcox who goes to secretarial school or goes to business administration or whatever particular vocation they select, and you are denying them the right to apply and seek a job in the Public Service of Saskatchewan because you say regardless of their qualifications, regardless of their training, we are going to appoint that person by order in council, not the person who was there and has

the best qualifications. I say that the government of Saskatchewan and the NDP, if you are supposed to be union oriented, if you are supposed to be the kind of government that is seeking to help the working man, you should be trying to eliminate all order in council appointments, eliminating to the bare minimum the permanent unclassified positions in the civil service to permanent heads, absolutely. But I want to tell you that's deliberate discrimination against young people who have qualifications and training in Saskatchewan who are denied the opportunity of applying and being selected for a job in the Public Service when you have \$16 million in order in council appointments.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may raise his voice and try to make a speech; he is now trying again to play to the media gallery. We don't believe that we do discriminate because we make it a matter of government policy subject to some of the areas, subject to the qualifications that we do give preference to persons who are residents of the province of Saskatchewan. That is a matter of policy and I can tell the hon. member that what we are looking for in certain categories, that we cannot get ourselves so inhibited that only residents of Saskatchewan will be employed because we know that there are residents from Saskatchewan who are employed by other provinces and by the government of Canada. We do have to have a broader perspective and it is not a question of making, of preventing or discriminating against young people, those young people having the qualifications. Remember, we do advertise and they do apply; there is an interview system. It is a matter of trying to get the best people for the jobs that need to be filled. I can assure the hon. member that we are as sensitive and concerned about this area, without making noisy speeches, as he is and perhaps more so. It is true, we are committed to the right of collective bargaining and the right of people to join unions, organized unions of their choice and to bargain collectively, but there are some constraints and some difficulties. I can tell the hon. member as well that in the area of certain exclusions and order in council appointments, that we are working with the Government Employees Association to try to resolve this problem. At the last collective bargaining agreement it has been agreed that both parties, The Public Service Commission and the Government Employees Association will set up special committees to review the whole question of order in council appointments and people who are out of scope as a result of order in council, with the view to bringing them into scope. I hope that we can reduce the number of order in council appointments. But I can also tell the hon. member, in relation to the total public service, if he examines the period 1964 to 1971, in relation to total public service, I would suggest to him that, as a percentage of the employment force, we do not have any larger percentage of order in council appointments than there was back in the period 1964 to 1971.

MR. MacDONALD: — Well, I am just going to make another comment. I say the minister is full of malarkey. I'll guarantee you have five times as many and if you go back to the period of 1964 to 1971 and take any one year — take your own staff, for example, take any minister's staff during that period of time, take special assistants and the executive assistants and all the rest of them and you go and tell your deputy to go back and check and you will find that you have five times as many. Don't suggest that you don't raise your voice any time that you turn around and \$16 million is a lot of money. I am not talking about Saskatchewan citizens: I am talking about a young person, who has the quality and meritoriously deserves to be hired and you jump over her head with an order in council appointment and that is discrimination. I hope what the minister says is accurate, that you are going to do your best.

Now I want to ask the minister another question. Can you tell me how many special assistants and executive assistants to the ministers are appointed by order in council in

the government today? What have you got, 18 or 19 ministers? Can you tell me, No. 1, how many special assistants or executive assistants are appointed and No. 2, can you tell me the answer to another question. Do you have a policy in the government concerning a person who is an executive assistant or a special assistant for a period of time? How many of them eventually move into the permanent service? In other words, I realize that a special assistant is a political appointment. I notice one tonight in Government Services, who was a special assistant or an executive assistant, who is now all of a sudden moved into the managerial capacity in one of the government departments. Can the minister tell me, how many executive assistants and special assistants (perhaps the Chairman of the Public Service Commission might be able to tell us,) have been moved into the permanent civil service in, say the last two years?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, as a general rule, I can't give him the precise figure, we would have to count them up as to how many assistants or special assistants the ministers have, but I think by and large, it's two executive assistants to a minister; this is the minimum but don't hold me to that figure. You know, we have to count them but that's the general rule. In the case of special assistants or executive assistants that may be put into the regular public service into managerial categories, they would have to compete in the qualifications and the job requirements as anybody else and there have been very, very few that have been appointed. There have been, as I recall, to start out with, in one of the departments a person was appointed (I think it was in Municipal Affairs initially) as a special assistant because of his availability and then moved into the senior managerial position of a deputy. I can recall only one but the person was available at that time; we wanted to get the person into the public service. There are very, very few. You know, where that kind of a situation applied, they would have to compete for the requirements of the job.

MR. MacDONALD: — Of course the minister knows that that is not entirely true. That is one of the great luxuries of an order in council appointment, that you don't have to compete. You don't have to have the same qualifications. That's decision of the minister and it is a decision of the Executive Council. It is not necessarily a decision of the Public Service Commission. In fact, you can make an order in council appointment of an executive assistant and it never does go through the Public Service Commission. You can make an appointment to a permanent position and that may be a Cabinet decision, it may be a ministerial decision, so it is a luxury of an order in council. I wonder if I might ask the minister, would the chairman of the Public Service Commission provide for me — if he cannot do it tonight, would the minister give me the assurance that he will provide for me a list of all the executive assistants of each individual minister and all special assistants appointed by order in council, and also would he mind indicating to me those special assistants or executive assistants in the past two years, who have been moved into the permanent civil service? Could you undertake that for me?

MR. SMISHEK: — Well, Mr. Chairman, that could be done. Remember this, all the orders in council that are passed are public information. There is no secret about orders in council appointments. I am wondering why the hon. member would particularly want to have names because those names are available. We do provide the Leaders of the Opposition Parties with research staff. As he knows, orders in council are available to them. I will take that under advisement because whether the person is appointed by order in council as a special assistant or executive assistant (I do not care what political party it is) I do not want their names to be misused. I will be glad to provide them with the numbers if that will satisfy him but I would prefer not bandying names around so I will take it under advisement.

May 11, 1978

MR. MacDONALD: — Well, first of all, I will ensure the minister that they will not be abused if they do not abuse their position. That is very clear.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh!

MR. MacDONALD: — Oh no. Don't say oh! If you go to Pelly, there are an awful lot of them up there that did abuse the position, an awful lot of them! I could tell you about a clerk at the table here one year who was campaigning in Lakeview against my seatmate. The day before he was sitting in here and the day after he was sitting in here. Now, if a man is going to turn around and abuse his job and his position, then perhaps his name will be brought up but I can give the minister every assurance that no special assistant or executive assistant will ever be abused if he is only working for the government of Saskatchewan and not doing political work in the middle of an election. If I have to put the question on the order paper I will.

I asked the minister a question and I find no reason why he should deny that information. As I understand in Estimates, it is the responsibility of the minister to provide the information as requested by members of the opposition. That is what the Estimates are all about. I can ask you who your deputy minister is, who your branch heads are and you have the responsibility to tell me. All of a sudden you are denying me my fundamental right over here to ask you a question about some of the staff that is being employed in your responsibility as Minister in charge of the Public Service. I find that very strange and I wonder if there is a reason for it. So I am going to ask the minister again, will you undertake to provide for me the names of the special assistants and executive assistants of the ministers? I will give you every assurance that if they do not abuse their responsibilities, there is no way that I will abuse them and I can also tell you that there is no way that my colleagues will abuse them.

MR. SMISHEK: — I will do that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, may I have a copy of the same if he is going to be supplying?

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister — I may have missed this question if it was put earlier but I would like to know what your policy is with respect to employees of the government working on government time in provincial or federal election campaigns, if that is tolerated in the government opposite.

MR. SMISHEK: — The answer is no. If they want to work in a provincial, federal or municipal election campaign after hours, they are free to do so but they are not to work in any election campaign during regular working hours unless they have leave of absence without pay. That is the policy.

MR. McMILLAN: — So you are suggesting that if anyone like that came to your attention you would be prepared to take action on it then, if you found out that any of the civil servants were spending government time working for one political party or the other during their working hours?

MR. SMISHEK: — Yes.

MR. McMILLAN: — Are you aware that any of the employees, who work within this building for the executive council or any of the other operations of this government

inside this building, have been doing exactly that on government time for the past few weeks?

MR. SMISHEK: — No, I am not aware of it.

MR. McMILLAN: — If you became aware of it, would you be prepared to take action against any individual who might be brought to your attention here?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes. I would certainly, first of all, take the matter up with the minister whom the person is working for. That is not the policy of the government. If somebody is misusing his position, that is wrong.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, Mr. Minister, if we can get into your annual report that you placed before the House just this year, I would like to first of all get into the new division which you now call, classification services. It affects requests for reclassifications of employees and, I understand, within the government itself, the job evaluation process is about to start in certain areas and are you not doing twofold by doing both this and job evaluation? Is the reason for going this way because job evaluation is a very slow process and, therefore, you are doing both presently?

MR. SMISHEK: — Could you repeat the precise question?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the precise question is twofold. The classification of services which is a division you have, is working on reclassification of employees. Supposed they are saying that my job should be reclassified that I am doing — O.K. On job evaluation you go through the same principle in saying, this man's position is two steps or three steps or 10 points or whatever system they use, above this job and therefore should be repaid. Now, I understand, within the Government Services, the government employees are doing a study on job evaluation and I am asking, are you doing the two things simultaneously, doing reclassifications until you get finished with the job evaluation?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, for the information of the member, every employee under the provisions of The Public Service Act and under the collective bargaining agreement, has a right at any time to apply for reclassification of his or her job and to have that job assessed and to determine whether the classification criteria that now is applicable is still valid. In the case of job evaluation it is an ongoing process to, so that we are up to date to ensure that we don't fall back as jobs do change and keep the proper relationship. Now those are two separate areas of activities that are going on simultaneously.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, as the minister says, they are two separate areas but my understanding is that the government is about to take a job evaluation study on the majority of its employees to make sure that the concept or difference between each level of service they are providing, responsibility and so forth, is properly paid for. Where, under reclassifications, quite often those who complain will get the reclassification and those who don't, don't. Therefore, you get an improper adjustment between departments. For example, one person in one department may be doing the same work as a person in another department but because the minister or the department head thinks that they should get a reclassification and the other one they don't. you will have the difference developing over the period of years. Therefore, job evaluation gets rid of that problem and I am suggesting if you are doing the two simultaneously you may have a department head who is pushing for his employees.

Therefore, down the road you are going to have a real mess on your hands of red circling.

MR. SMISHEK: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the hon. member gets his information. That is precisely what we are not doing because that would create chaos. Now it is true that very often the branch head or department might want a particular person or a job reclassified, generally to be upgraded. He can't do it on his own that is why we have the Public Service Commission. They evaluate that job in relation to other similar jobs to make sure the whole system is not thrown out of kilter. There is no special program that is to be on the way. We have the job classification system working and the evaluation system but there is no superimposed evaluation that is to be undertaken.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, it is interesting to note Mr. Minister, that at the schools on job evaluation, several of them that I have attended, half of the people there are employees of the government of Saskatchewan, who are there because they are trying to learn the system because they claim that the government is going into a job evaluation program. Now I haven't been on any of these programs for about two years now. I have talked to several members in the cafeteria that were on them with me and they still inform me that the government is considering these and that they are anxious to get ahead once the Saskatoon problem is finished with so they know how that comes out.

MR. SMISHEK: — Maybe there are employees who misunderstand things. When you have in certain categories sizeable turnovers there may be some confusion among particular employees. But the job evaluation in the government is an ongoing process. It is there; we work with the union as well but there may be some people that misunderstand it. There is no new program that is being undertaken. We think that the program is effective; we are trying to keep up to date with the program, using the most current methods, criteria and systems to be on top of job evaluation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I will pinpoint one particular area. There was a small job evaluation study done within the hospital area where the end result was that the female staff was not being paid adequately and the Minister of Labour and the women's section of the Department of Labour were involved stating that something would happen by it. That is the first example I know of, of a job evaluation that's being done within the government. I'm suggesting what happened and what job evaluation is really proving, is that the females within government services, in a lot of cases, have been underpaid. Job evaluation has been proving that, as far as I can see, very well. Now what I am suggesting to the minister is in a job evaluation study, that I understand the government employees are looking for, that this will come out. And when you are also doing reclassifications. when you are about to get into job evaluations as well, you end up with a really bad problem down the road as the city of Saskatoon has with red circling. I'm suggesting, if you are going to move into that program that you have a target date when you may start doing a total job evaluation system and prior to that date, do you not feel that you have to back away from reclassification to get away from some problems developing?

MR. SMISHEK: — You know, with respect to the hon. member, what the Minister of Labour was talking about is not within the public service; what he talked about is a study to be undertaken on the question of equal pay for similar work but not within the government service per se but the broad study inside of the total employment picture. We believe that within the public service we are certainly much more in tune of paying equal pay for similar work than is the case outside the government employment. There are some anomalies but I can assure the hon. member that there is an ongoing process

of evaluating jobs and that every employee employed within the public service has the right at any time to apply for reclassification of his or her job.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the reclassifications (I am just looking at the chart on page 11 of your report) the percentage of reclassifications that you receive and the ones you approve, can you give me an idea what percentage this works out to be on page 11 of your annual report?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I think that that is asking a little bit much. We do provide the figures on the page. Surely the member can sit down and do his own percentage calculations.

MR. KATZMAN: — The reason I am asking is very simple. The reason for withdrawals or cancellations, do you have any reason why that 73 people withdrew?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, you know quite often you find an employee who assumes that his job has changed. Now, after a review and analysis, he comes to realize that over a period of 12 months, his job has not changed and based on that fact, he would withdraw his request, based on the information that is provided.

MR. KATZMAN: — What is the reference to within over a period of 12 months? Do you take that long to do a reclassification?

MR. SMISHEK: — No, because look, in employment we have a lot of jobs that during one month . . . I can give you an example. In the case of the Department of Finance, the work is not the same month by month, because we have to be preparing budgets. There are a series of analysis of the current budget that take place. Then we are in a budgetary system; then there are presentations to the Treasury Board. What the work of the Budget Bureau analyst is in the month of May, is not going to be the work that he is going to be doing in the month of December, because you know, the processes is such. The work in a lot of government jobs is not the same week by week or month by month. You have to take the whole job in the 12 month period of what is the total content of that job. Even in the case of secretarial, the volume very often increases in the month of January compared to what it might have been in the month of July and different typing might have to be done.

MR. KATZMAN: — Two other questions on a different area. The member for Lakeview earlier, was referring to the massive appointments by order in council and the concern I have, re orders in council is, not who gets them or who doesn't, but it is the problem where basically, long service employees don't get a chance at some of the higher jobs that are appointed through order in councils. I realize that deputy ministers and so forth maybe should be done the way that you are doing them but within the Department of Labour the other day we got on to this exact point where some long-service employees had been overlooked for promotion; yet there were new people brought in from outside. In fact, if I remember correctly, four people together had 12 years of service with the government at the present time.

The question I am really asking the minister is, do you feel that you are not destroying the incentive for the people who come through the rank and file to move up, by doing so many orders in council? Secondly, could you tell this House what problem is within the union and yourselves in negotiations re the problem of having people who do confidential work not being taken out of the scope of the union? In negotiations I was involved in, if

the management was able to prove that this was the case, the union never argued about it. I am rather surprised to hear your defence on that particular point.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, we do not discriminate between employees in scope or out of scope. In the case of promotions, whether it be in the government service or whether it be in the private sector, because a person has long years of service does not necessarily mean that he or she is going to get the promotion. What they do have is the job security. In terms of promotions taking place we do consider seniority as one factor, but also their ability and their skills and experience, in as far as the promotion is concerned. Surely you would not suggest that persons with the longest years of service, even though they may not have the qualifications or the skills, should somehow be moved into senior management positions. That does not work within the public sector, nor does it work in the private sector. I can tell the hon. member that I know from where I speak because I have worked for the private sector as well and that kind of system would collapse. You would not get the best skilled people into the right jobs.

MR. KATZMAN: — If the minister is telling me — I will try to paraphrase what you said. What you are saying to me is that all civil servants there are looked at, and if they qualify and have the ability you will always give them first shot at it prior to bringing somebody in from outside on an order in council. Is that what you are saying? Other than in certain specific areas?

MR. SMISHEK: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we first of all advertise within the service if there is a chance to get people within the service. Only when we cannot get people within the service to fill the requirements of the job then we advertise outside. Certainly people within the service are given first priority, subject to having the qualifications to fill the requirements for the job.

MR. KATZMAN: — So basically, in all of the orders in council referred to earlier, you look in-house first and if there is nobody in-house, then maybe you will pick somebody from outside through an order in council, but you are giving me assurance that you try to look in-house first.

MR. SMISHEK: — That's right. For example, I make reference to the Budget Bureau. Those are advertised internally and subject to the necessary qualifications, the people in-service are given the first priority.

MR. WIPF: — One or two questions, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, within the last two or three or four weeks you have hired a director of operations for the aviation department or whatever you want to call it, in DNS, or a manager of operations, I don't know the classification that he was hired under. I understand this is correct. Am I — or would you know that?

MR. SMISHEK: — There are hundreds of positions. I think it is a proper question to be asked when the DNS comes up.

MR. WIPF: — O.K., Mr. Minister, there was a gentleman in Prince Albert by the name of (and maybe you can check this out for me) Rex Holscher, who applied for the job. Rex Holscher had worked for the department; he was working for the jail during the uprising and your people may remember him because he worked there as an alcoholism co-ordinator or counsellor. He gave testimony at the Moore Inquiry; he was demoted three or four days later and finally quit his job. I have written some letters on that to you.

This fellow applied for the job as director of operations and he was informing me that someone, another fellow had been hired over . . . his qualifications, Holscher's qualifications, were much higher and he was just wondering why this had to happen. Now, I realize that you haven't got the information here, Mr. Minister, but I wonder if you could supply me, in the future as to this reason, and why the hiring.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, first of all I deny that the hon. member has written to me. He has not written to me about it. Well look, Mr. Chairman, I think that that's dirty pool. Just a few minutes ago he said he has written to me and now he pointing to somebody else. That leaves me with the impression that somehow I have not responded. I know nothing about the particular case. We have 10,000 or 11,000 employees roughly, and surely he doesn't expect me to have the answer in this one particular case.

If he is willing to address a letter to me, I am prepared to provide the information, based on the investigation that I can make. Mr. Chairman, we did not have any uprising to my knowledge, in the city of Prince Albert.

MR. WIPF: — Well, Mr. Minister, I am sorry that you are a little touchy. It is a little late for you probably, but, the minister I did refer to, I should have been referring to the hon. Minister of Social Services about a letter. I got a reply back. I wasn't nailing you for that. I realize you don't have all that information in front of you because you hire, as you say, many people in a year. Could you check that record, I would like, if possible, to get the information on why one fellow was hired over him when he had these qualifications.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I invite the hon. member to submit his question to me in writing so that I know what he is asking for. I can assure the hon. member that I will respond.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2, 3 and 4 agreed.

ITEM 5

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, under this particular vote, could the minister indicate how many of his staff take training courses, for example, outside of the province of Saskatchewan? You can send it to me later if you would like. How many are in-house training courses?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, there are very, very few people who are sent outside. We do provide courses internally and in addition to what is provided through the Public Service Commission, the departments run their own training and upgrading courses. Internally through the Public Service Commission, we've got the records management budgeting processes dealing with problem employees, orientation courses for managers, personnel interviewing and selection for line managers, public relations for senior managers and human rights. Their courses that are contracted are done through the commission, effective writing workshops, position description, writing and orientation through classification, public relations for supervisors, planning, controlling, employee relations, introductory accounting, intermediate accounting, planning systems in government, meaningful performance evaluation, time management, conducting effective meetings, organizing the small work unit, motivating employees, organizing the work unit. And then in addition to that we run some evening

May 11, 1978

courses. For the information of the hon. member before he asks the question of what I referred to as courses contracted, we contract with the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan to assist in those courses.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could the minister at a later date supply me with the number of the people who take each of those courses?

MR. SMISHEK: — Does he want them now, I'll read them off.

Item 5 agreed.

ITEM 6

MR. KATZMAN: — One last question for the minister. The flex system, how many of the government employees are on the flex working hour system?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Chairman, I am not able to give him the precise number except to tell the hon. member that at least three-quarters of the public service — it will take a large amount of work to calculate the precise number but we'll guess at least 75 per cent.

Item 6 agreed.

Item 7 agreed

Public Service Commission — Vote 33 agreed.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.