

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

May 18, 1978.

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE - DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN-VOTE 26

ITEM 1 (continued)

MR. G. N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, we were discussing a bit about the RRAP (Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program) and you said it was under investigation by the Attorney General's Department, Mr. Minister and it is well over a year that this has been under investigation. I am wondering if you have any indication at all when this investigation will be over or when the people in the North, those who are affected by this, can expect a report? Have you contacted the Attorney General to see if it is in the near future?

Mr. Minister, we will have to ask the Attorney General. Would the Attorney General take a question at this point from me? It is concerning the investigation into the RRAP by your department, Mr. Attorney General. I am wondering when we can expect a report to come out of that? It has been a year.

MR. ROMANOW: — As soon as possible.

MR. WIPF: — That is the same reason we received six months ago . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — What do you want?

MR. WIPF — Just want a little action, that is all. Just like the people up North, they want a little action on it. They have been waiting for the report. If it is going to be a long time then, Mr. Minister, it is about time that the DNS took a look about going in and cleaning up part of the mess, which they created themselves by paying out this money and then having to have an investigation into the RRAP.

Mr. Minister, before supper, we had been talking about — I just want to go back to this for a second, the project numbers. Over supper that have you discussed these numbers are the project code? The project code that we just talked about and these other object codes, are they related to the project which is under the numbers that I gave you? Like the Ile-a-la-Crosse fourplex. the SSV number is a project code number and all the object code numbers, are they the jobs that were done for that project? Or. as you said before, there were some of them, the bridges were charged to that code and were maybe built up in Uranium City?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The numbers which you have there and the references are on a non-verified sheet and, therefore, we could not tell you at this point in time whether they are accurate or otherwise.

MR. WIPF: — The other area that I want to go into a bit. Mr. Minister, is the fishing industry in the North. Because of the lack of representation, probably, on your part the fishermen of Saskatchewan have now had to go under the umbrella of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, which in 1975 you endorsed heartedly as a marketing agency. There are some negotiations going on. I believe that now the Co-op Fisheries

May 18, 1978

Limited in Prince Albert is under the RRAP for two or three years and it is going to be reviewed by your department or by your government on a yearly basis.

You said earlier that you would try to get a marketing board in Saskatchewan, a fish marketing board in Saskatchewan, of some type. Can you bring us up-to-date on what is happening in the fisheries industry in Saskatchewan at this time?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and Co-operative Fisheries Limited and Waite Fisheries Limited are three organizations that predominately handle and process and produce the commercial fish from Saskatchewan. FFMC is the exclusive marketing agent for the export of fish out of Saskatchewan, out of Canada, and it is their responsibility and their duty to market the product coming from Saskatchewan. They do that by the appointment of agents; CFL(Co-operative Fisheries Limited) has been an agent and Waite Fisheries has been an agent.

We believe that because of the relationship which FFMC has had with Saskatchewan agents, it has caused the agents financial disparity. They have required that the agents process and pack and handle fish in Saskatchewan at prices which would not cover the cost of operation. The agents have undertaken to do that, to carry on that process and as a result have run themselves into financial bankruptcy. To solve the situation, we had brought the representatives of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the agents together in order for them to work out an agreement which would retain the interests of Saskatchewan in the commercial industry, in that commercial fishing industry here in this province, to retain the industry for the province, that the fresh fish would not move out of here and go to Transcona, Winnipeg, and there the jobs would be created in terms of processing, handling and packaging. The agreement which was, I think, tentatively made between the two parties CFL and FFMC, I am not sure whether it has been ratified; it has been referred to the respective boards for ratification and I am not sure what the final agreement will be with Waite Fisheries and Company. We are hoping that the FFMC will acknowledge the responsibility that they have and will provide for sufficient kinds of money in terms of tariffs for processing, packing and handling of fish in Saskatchewan so that the agents will have some financial security. We can't really do anything more than that.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. Mr. Minister, I want to go to the area of responsibility now of the CLCAs and the collection of taxes in the northern administration district. The first question is, what is your estimated revenue from taxes in the northern administration area?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Roughly \$78,000.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, over the last two years has it been the responsibility of the DNS to collect this money?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, not really. The process of transferring of the tax collection authority is being proceeded with. The transfer of the responsibility of collecting taxes — in some LCAs they collect all the taxes. In some other LCAs, not sure. In the NMC is collected — I don't think, anything. So the department is still collecting the taxes in those areas the DNMC is operating in. In some of the LACs I guess we still collect the taxes. In the LCAs most of them collect their own taxes. Local community authorities, I am advised, collect all their local taxes; I am meaning that they collect all the taxes that are collected; they don't collect all the taxes but they collect all the taxes that are

collected.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, what percentage of this, I think you said \$ 78,000 is the tax base. when the DNS was collecting these taxes what percentage of the taxes did they collect and what was the cost to the department to collect this money?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The estimate is about 80 per cent, in terms of those taxes that are collected outside of the LCAs. I am talking about an isolated commercial fish camp or an outfitter's camp, or something of that kind. I don't think we call them taxes, I think we call them lease fees. There is both; we collect the lease fees but we also collect the taxes, about 80 per cent.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, under the new revenue sharing plan or proposal that you have in the North, I understand that the LCAs, the grants will be deducted to the LCAs by the amount of anticipated revenue that the LCAs should be able to collect; am I correct there?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, that is not correct.

MR. WIPF: — That is not correct?

MR. BOWERMAN: — That is not correct.

MR. WIPF: — I had asked one of your officials on this, Mr. Minister, and that is my understanding. O.K., so if there is a tax base of \$3000, and let's use Stoney Rapids for an example, and you are going to give a grant to — and the grant is figured out, the amount of tax that you should be able to collect out of that LCA or that area is figured into the grant, is it not, as part of the revenue or part of the parcel of money?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No.

MR. WIPF: — The tax, the revenue that could be collected has nothing to do — has no effect on the . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — It is over and above what we give them . . . (inaudible few words).

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, on the new office building that is being built in La Ronge, what percentage of the office space is going to be used by DNS at the present time or, say, over the next two or three years?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I think that there will be arrangements by the AG's department to have somebody in there and SMDC may have somebody in there. Other than that it will be the Department of Northern Saskatchewan personnel.

MR. WIPF: — SMDC at the present time, do they have their own building in La Ronge or are they renting from the Credit Union?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, they do.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, in the new office building, I'd like a little explanation on the reason of blasting - I don't know how much rock they had to blast out of that bedrock mound there - what amount of rock did have to be blasted out of there and what is the reason for drilling into the rock on the top? That would be a vast amount of money I imagine to blast that rock and I think the gist of it was to get a picture wall of rock in the

background.

MR. BOWERMAN: — We're still on top of the rock, we are still building on top of it. It's just that we blew the hump off. That's the only reason. The only reason was rather than build up on top of the mountain we sort of lowered the mountain to build a building.

Mr. A.N. McMILLAN(Kindersley): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister about the creek running through the lobby. Could he elaborate a little bit on the actual décor on the ground floor?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, you will notice that the creek has been diverted. That was a facetious question and it is the same kind of an answer.

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Minister. I have heard and they may be unsubstantiated rumors, that part of the architecture of the operation was to sort of design a system of running water in the lobby. I imagine the babble of brooks in the background would fit in quite nicely with the kind of work your civil servants are doing up there and that certainly isn't a facetious comment. I would like to ask the minister if that babbling water still applies for the lobby of your building?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, the only running water that will be in the building is the same kind of running water we have around here.

MR. McMILLAN: — No, you are going to have flushed toilets in the washroom. I would like to ask the minister about the parkade on the roof? Are you still going ahead with that or have you moved the parkade somewhere else, beside the creek maybe?

MR. BOWERMAN: — There is no parkade on the roof.

MR. McMILLAN: — Was that ever intended to be put on the roof?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Oh, there was one of the architectural designs that had, rather than blast more rock to create a parking area, they thought it would be best to design a building with a structure so that the parking could be done on the roof.

Mr. McMILLAN: — So now you are going to blast more rock instead, are you or are you not going to have any parking?

MR. BOWERMAN:—Part of the blasting which is being done now and the design which is being done provides for a parking area.

MR. McMILLAN: — I'm going to another area. Just lately we've started a bus run from Prince Albert up to Creighton and I think your department put in \$24,000 or something to that effect. You were talking about feeder lines coming in from Deschambault Lake and Pelican Narrows and Sandy Bay into that route. Is that working this summer, are we on that and these feeder lines will that be contracted out to somebody or will the DNS be supplying the transportation to the main highway on this?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, STC is the one that is running the bus line, all that the department is involved in is the grant. The grant subsidized the operation to see that we have a transportation system going up the east side. Our grant could be up to \$50,000.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, in roads, one of the settlements in the North that I understand, one of the few settlements that does not have a winter road into it at this

time, is Stoney Rapids. Has your department got any plans to provide for a winter road at this time? And if so, will they be building it in the summer? What are the long range plans to get a winter road into Stoney Rapids, from say. Uranium City?

MR. BOWERMAN: — There are really no plans well enough developed to give a satisfactory answer to the member.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, in another area. I wonder if you could explain the present policy on lease holders for land along lakes and a policy of yours (if you have a policy yet) for leasing land lots along some of the highways that are going to be put in the North? Is it possible for an individual to go up. get lots along side of the highway for commercial use as filling stations or cottages? What are the plans for that?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, it is not well identified. We do have a policy which I think incorporates about a dozen pages or something like that. It is not easily defined. We are trying to put together a policy which will provide some security for those persons who have either lived there, had a bit of resource, harvesting kinds of people that is, be they fishermen, trappers, whatever. Northern people who may want the first opportunity to put in a business. Those are taken into account. Each application is almost carried forward on its own merits. It is getting more so, even with respect to recreational leases on isolated lakes and rivers. We found that what happened is that leases that have not been well appraised or assessed at the time the application was made, a person who is in and out of a trapping cabin or a fishing cabin, has been around there for four or five generations; we move in. give a lease and we are sitting right in the middle of the fellow's area, or whatever, a fur producing area. a fish producing area, whatever it might be.

We have now come to the conclusion that it is inappropriate for us to do that. We were doing it as a matter of tradition, it was the way things were done and we were just carrying out the usual policy. But the facts of life are that as more people become interested in the northern areas for those kinds of services and facilities, we are encroaching more and more into the life and habits and rights and privileges of people who have lived there for many years. We are trying to develop a policy. We are trying to put one together as we go along. It is not well defined nor well articulated. We do however, have a policy which we follow and rather than try to explain that policy to you. it is an in-House policy position which you are perfectly . . . I will hand it to you or send it over if you want.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. Mr. Minister, is there at the present time a stop being put to people who have leased or had holdings for several years or many years? Is there a stop put to them for selling their holdings off to someone else, or the lease to someone else at this time?

MR. BOWERMAN: - No.

MR. WIPF: —Just recently, (and I could be absolutely wrong on this and it would be the first time, mind you.) but has the whole lake of Lac La Ronge, the whole water body, been incorporated into a park?

MR. BOWERMAN: — It hasn't been yet. Our objective is to do it.

MR. WIPF: — Will there be commercial fishing allowed? You know, there are some commercial fishermen there and how much consultation has there been with them?

And is this going to cause any hardship on your commercial fishermen in that area?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, commercial fishing is carried on there now. The objective is to continue to give the traditional resource users the same privileges in the future that they have now. In other words, trapping will continue, hunting will continue, fishing will continue. That's not the normal procedure in a provincial park but we are in a different kind of a situation. We are setting up a Park Advisory Board which has on it representatives from most all the interest kinds of agencies, cottage owners, trapper associations, commercial fishermen, communities, Stanley Mission, La Ronge, Lac La Ronge Indian Reserve, things like that.

MR. WIPF: — O.K., Mr. Minister, then there is—that is one of the concerns of one of the commercial fishermen who I spoke to in La Ronge, that they wouldn't be squeezed out of the road and the tourist fishing would come in over top of them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . One other question, Mr. Minister, in the area of our furniture supply — over-supply, can you tell me out of the inventory that was taken, the amount of damaged furniture or used furniture that has been destroyed in the Buffalo Narrows area or the Ile-a-la-Crosse area and the other areas in the North at this time. Can you put a dollar value on that? There was an inventory, I understand, taken last fall or winter.

MR. BOWERMAN: — We don't have a list of equipment here that was declared to be condemned and the fact that it was condemned we consider it to be valueless. I can get the list, I had the department supply me with the list and it is in my department but we don't have it here.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, we talked a little earlier about the Delta Holdings Property and the lease arrangement in Delta Holdings and they had, as I have stated, probably the government at that time picked up one of the best contracts they could for the taxpayer in Saskatchewan on a long-term basis. This contract has three or four or five years to go yet; I just forget what it is. What would be the purpose at this time if you have a good contract and there are no problems, what would be the purpose of hiring an outside lawyer to be looking at this contract and — I forget his name, we mentioned it earlier — how long has he been employed or on contract with DNS to check over this contract if there is no problem, or to check over this lease if there is no problem. What would be the purpose of hiring an outside consultant instead of going to the Attorney General's Department if there are no problems?

MR. BOWERMAN:—Well, I have tried to say over and over again in the House in answer to this question that when the plan was first established in 1971, that we were going to set up a single agency and we were going to decentralize. We were going to move the offices to the North. We moved into a situation in La Ronge where there was no housing available. If we were expecting staff to go to La Ronge there was no way that you could go there, nobody would build houses. The staff certainly wouldn't go there and build themselves houses in La Ronge; you couldn't expect them to. What we attempted to do then was to go to the people in La Ronge. We hoped that the people in La Ronge might see this as an opportunity to invest in some of the activity that was going to take place in the North. We tried to convince some of the entrepreneurs, business people and so on, in La Ronge, that there was an opportunity here presenting itself for them. We as the government, did not want to go into staff housing. We preferred not going into building houses for our own staff and renting it to them. Goodness only knows there are enough problems in staff relations and so on, without having to provide for the houses and then have problems with whether the paint is right, the drapes are right, and all of the other things that go with leasing and renting housing accommodation. So it was our

objective to rent to get persons in La Ronge or businesses in La Ronge to build private accommodation for which we could rent the facilities. We had six or eight tenders or offers to build. Delta Holdings Limited was the best offer that we got to build, I forget—22 houses and 48 apartments, something like that. That got us underway. We got into a — the history of this you know about. Delta ran into some financial difficulties; it ran into some labor difficulties; it didn't get the housing accommodation finished as they had indicated that they would on time. We were under an obligation to get the department decentralized, therefore we moved into those accommodations. We couldn't get anybody else to build. We couldn't get private people to build so then the government had to make a decision as to how it was going to house the staff in the North.

We then came to the conclusion that it was necessary to change the original policy and to build staff housing, to build our own houses and so then we moved into the area of providing our own staff housing facilities. We have subsequently built houses in La Ronge and we have bought trailers for La Ronge and we had apartment blocks constructed for La Ronge. Now we find that the housing situation in La Ronge is still in a difficult situation, not only for the department but for the public. The public doesn't have housing accommodation. They are continuing to move into La Ronge, the SMDC, exploration companies, other kinds of business people going in to service the growing population in La Ronge, so the housing situation continues to be tight. We think that we should look at the possibility because we have now been building staff houses. We should look at the possibility of whether or not there would be some advantage and some use for us and for the community of La Ronge for us to get out of rentals because the only rental houses that we now have are with Delta.

We should maybe get out of that agreement and move into an agreement where the staff is now beginning to settle down and some of them are building their own homes. We are developing a policy where we hope that they will more than build their own homes and will move into their own housing accommodation and we will have then one system rather than two or three where we are providing staff housing. There are no rental accommodations for staff and housing will be owned by the government, by the department or they will be in their own housing.

That is the reason why we undertook the contract with a legal solicitor, to give us an opinion with respect to the contract as to whether or not we should consider that and whether or not, if we did that in terms of presently and I say this, there are vacancies. There are vacancies in the apartment blocks. We have to hold a certain number of vacancies. I believe there are 17 vacancies in apartments or whatever have you, but we have got 26 or 28 in the staff complement. In order to be able to advertise for a person to come to La Ronge to take on a job you've have got to maintain something for him to live in when he gets there so there has to be a certain amount of accommodation to get persons in La Ronge or businesses in La Ronge to build private accommodation for which we could rent the facilities. We had six or eight tenders or offers to build. Delta Holdings Limited was the best offer that we got to build. I forget — 22 houses and 48 apartments, something like that. That got us underway. We got into a — the history of this you know about. Delta ran into some financial difficulties; ran into some labor difficulties; it didn't get the housing accommodation finished as they had indicated that they would on time. We were under an obligation to get the department decentralized, therefore we moved into those accommodations. We couldn't get anybody else to build. We couldn't get private people to build so then the government had to make a decision as to how it was going to house the staff in the North.

We then came to the conclusion that it was necessary to change the original policy and

to build staff housing, to build our own houses and so then we moved into the area of providing our own staff housing facilities. We have subsequently built houses in La Ronge and we have bought trailers for La Ronge and we had apartment blocks constructed for La Ronge. Now we find that the housing situation in La Ronge is still in a difficult situation, not only for the department but for the public. The public doesn't have housing accommodation. They are continuing to move into La Ronge, the SMDC, exploration companies, other kinds of business people going in to service the that remains empty in order for us to be able to accommodation and advertise for staff people who come. We are thinking that it may be better for us to — the public in La Ronge sees these apartment suites empty and they don't understand and they don't know that there is a vacancy there for us to fill and we have to have a certain number of vacancies. So we are being criticized from that point of view. The public in La Ronge see that there are vacancies; there is a demand for housing accommodation and the government sits there with vacant apartments and vacant houses and they won't release them.

So we are thinking that even though we believe that we have a good agreement with Delta Holdings Limited, we think we should now (because we were forced into a situation to build our own) maybe move out of the Delta Housing agreement and move into our own housing agreement. And the reason for obtaining a solicitor was to look at the agreement to see whether or not, if we moved out of any of the accommodations, the agreement would thus be broken. The solution has not yet been finalized.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, you might have said it but when was that decision made to start moving out of the Delta properties? Are you saying that you have maintained a vacancy rate of 17 apartments or houses in the Delta properties all along? When did this vacancy rate start occurring? Was that when you started moving your people into the DNS's own apartment blocks?

MR. BOWERMAN: — There has always been a certain amount of vacancies. As I said, we had people coming, people whom we were hiring. We had to maintain vacancies. But as some of the staff started to build their own housing, as we have provided housing for ourselves, that vacancy rate has increased. So now, you could fill the apartments in Delta and leave a trailer vacant, or leave a house vacant if it was owned by the department. There is no difference. But what I am saying is that if we really cleared the thing out, it may be that the community of La Ronge is better served. The public of La Ronge is better served and the community is better served, if we back off from the agreement that we have with Delta and Delta is able to lease that to the demand which is going on in La Ronge. Now, you may have objections to that. Be that as it may. That is the reason: that is the logic; that is the basis for our going through the process.

MR. WIPF: — No, Mr. Minister, I don't have any objections to that because obviously Delta wants out or wants DNS out at this time. I believe they want out for the reason I stated earlier because when they got caught in a good contract, as far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, it cost them nothing but money. I believe that at the rate they are getting they are going to go broke in a year or two. When do you expect to be cleared out of the Delta properties?

MR. BOWERMAN: — We don't make any predictions. It depends on the advice we get

and we make no predications. It doesn't say that we are going to clear out entirely. It is just that we are saying that on the basis of the demand that we have for housing and the maintaining of certain vacancies, if that agreement is still valid—we believe that it is an agreement which is a good one as far as the government is concerned, but if there is a possibility where the department itself can see that it can give up two or three houses or 10 or 11 suites or whatever it might be and return them back or not rent them from Delta under the agreement, then I think it is only responsible and proper that we should give consideration to that fact — if it does provide to the community some better facilities for the public who is coming in and the public to whom they might rent those suites and houses. So that is our position. It doesn't mean to say we are getting out entirely. There are no commitments one way or the other at this point.

MR. WIPF: — The contract that you have with Delta, is it an umbrella contractor do you have to rent them suite by suite or apartment by apartment or house by house? Or do you have an umbrella contract for the apartments and an umbrella contract for the houses?

MR. BOWERMAN: — It is both. We have a house by house, unit by unit agreement covered by an umbrella agreement of some kind. I don't know what it is.

MR. WIPF: — Well, do you expect that when this agreement is broken (and it will have to be broken by mutual consent or else by the government), do you expect that there will have to be any restitution paid to the Delta Holdings people for the remainder of the leases?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, that is why we hired the solicitor, to tell us whether or not we would have to. to tell us whether or not we are obligated. But I suggest this, we will not be making any fast moves with respect to moving out of the accommodations. We believe that we have those accommodations. We believe that the agreements are legal and we can stay in or we can move out. If we decide to stay in, we will stay in and if we decide to move out. it will be because we think we are accommodating not only ourselves, but we are accommodating a public interest in La Ronge.

MR. WIPF: — One final question on this. If it comes that the department is going to move out of the Delta Holdings Property and they are going to have to end up making a lump sum restitution payment - last spring in the Budget Debate we were talking about some of the small contractors that went belly-up during the construction phase of those apartments and those houses. I am wondering, at this time last year we talked about the department buying them, buying them with clear title and having the mechanics' liens taken off— if at this time there would be any encouragement on your part or the government's part to try to help pay off some of these small contractors that went broke?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No. We have enough problems of our own.

MR. WIPF: — Do you? Would you elaborate on those problems, please?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Not without the advice of a solicitor. But I feel that the government is not obligated in this area and it is another operation. If our solicitor advises us that we have some responsibility here we will carry out the advice of the solicitor.

MR. McMILLAN: — A question. I would like to know how many employees you intend to accommodate in your new office building?

May 18, 1978

MR. BOWERMAN: — About 90 per cent of the staff that is in La Ronge now will be accommodated in the new building and that will mean that the other temporary trailer type units that we have there now will be moved out . . . one for the time being, but they are eventually going to go.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, what is that in numbers?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Approximately 250.

MR. McMILLAN:— The 250 employees in that building would be, roughly, in allocation of 300 square feet per employee. I would like to know how much of that building is specifically designed for office space and how much of that is designed to accommodate equipment or other non-usable office space?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, we are using the same accommodation standards that are used throughout the government, the Department of Government Services uses, with respect to this building or any other public buildings.

MR. McMILLAN: —Well, their standards are 1 50 square feet for an employee, not 300. Now, obviously, of the 7,207, maybe some of that space that you intend to create isn't designed to accommodate people. I would like to know how much of the space in that building is designed to be office space, because at the rate that we are going now you are about double the Government Services requirements.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, we are building for the future. This government always builds for the future. Nevertheless, the fact I answered the other member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake— is that SMDC, I believe, has space in the building. I believe that the Attorney General's Department is going to have some space there. Probably there will be some board rooms and there will maybe be some federal kinds of persons in there. I don't know. I am sure that there will be space available for others besides the department.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you pretty well have room for 500 and you are going to put 250 in. I am sure that before you go ahead and construct it you have made arrangements to have that extra space filled. Now, what sort of worries me is your comment about planning for the future. I think if you find yourself in the position where you have space for 100 or 150 people that you don't have there, you might be sort of tempted to fill the space up. That may have been the easy avenue in the past, simply to just go out and hire more people and fill it up. Fine. better to have them working for the government than on welfare, so we will make them co-op managers, advisors and rehab worker I and social service worker II and just fill the office and just tear the offices all up and you are going to pay them a little more if they are working for you than you do if you pay them on social assistance. That's my concern. So your office building then, is twice as big as it really needs to be apparently, but that is because you are building for the future.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Our expectations for the development of northern Saskatchewan is far beyond the imagination of the member for Kindersley. He has never believed since he was elected to this Legislature that this government was doing anything in northern Saskatchewan. He wouldn't even believe that there is a La Ronge there. I am indicating to you that I look to the North with a great deal of optimism. I look to the North with a great deal of optimism that in the future there will be in La Ronge a city or a population

that will probably double what there is there now. Not only that but if that is going to be the capital of northern Saskatchewan I am sure that in the next five or ten years down the road. long after you have left this Legislature, by the will of the people of Kindersley, we will be building for a future that you don't look forward to.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, the minister makes reference to my perhaps limited imagination, but I would like to ask him if he ever had a really horrible nightmare and woke up and found that it was true. That's what really concerns me. I have long had nightmares about what you were doing in northern Saskatchewan with respect to administration and I kept waking up and finding they were true. It wasn't a question of my imagination. I have a fairly vivid imagination and I have to utilize it to its utmost in order to try to find some general good coming out of your administration in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Now, we faulted you many many times for your seeming, carefree — and if I may be so bold, gay attitude towards the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We really faulted you for that because your answer to problems there has simply been to beat those problems to death with the public tax dollar. That is not a responsible approach to take towards the administration of any government department. Your approach if you have people who are receiving social services is to take them off that direct payment, give them a title and employ them in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, whether they show up for work or not. If you have a community that doesn't have any economic development your first answer has always been to whistle in about four civil servants and then pile the money in around them and create some employment there whether it be in the service sector or not. Under some circumstances that may be the only answer but I say that your new government building there and the fact that you are building it twice as big as you need is the clearest example we can find or anyone could find of your attitude towards the development of northern Saskatchewan, that is just to sail in and pound up a big building and stuff it full of people to cure any potential unemployment problem you may have in northern Saskatchewan and not be that concerned about where the money comes from. Now you know that I have never stood in this House and suggested that you weren't doing anything in northern Saskatchewan. On the contrary, I have stood up on many occasions and suggested you have been doing far too much in northern Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, if you didn't do anything in northern Saskatchewan, northern Saskatchewan would probably be better off. I have long said that the money you spend there in a capital manner is generally money well spent. The money spent for the construction of roads, schools, sewer systems and communication systems, most of which you do in conjunction with the federal government — and your airports, I say that is good work. That has never been our great criticism of the DNS over the years. Our criticism has been one civil servant for every 7 or 8 people; that has been our criticism. Our criticism has been the number of government vehicles there, your 13 government aircraft that fly every direction at once most of the time in northern Saskatchewan. The immense amounts of money that you spend in order to feed your administration up there, that has been our great complaint. Here is the most classic example of your attitude in that respect and that has been just to sign the requisition forms.

Now, if you took the money that you spent on administration there and tighten it up. really tighten it up, I think you would find two things. I think, firstly, you would find that a lot of bureaucracy you've developed in northern Saskatchewan is unnecessary and by eliminating much of that, peeling off the dead weight, you might have more money to apply to worthwhile capital projects in northern Saskatchewan. That's one thing. The

second thing you might find out, if you peeled off a lot of the administrative dead weight up there, is that the North itself, would respond far more quickly to the programs that you people are trying to develop there. You create a tremendous amount of confusion with your civil service in northern Saskatchewan, some of it necessary, much, I suspect, unnecessary. You create a lot of confusion, you create a lot of hard feeling, you create a lot of conflict between your administration and local administrations in the North, between different levels of local government in northern Saskatchewan and between different organizations. So I say, if you want to do anything, if you would like to start a new year's resolution here in May, which might make you a better man for it, you might seriously consider revamping your own personal approach to the administration of northern Saskatchewan and you might start by reassessing the direction you are headed with your new government building.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, I had some questions asked of me about getting the position open for the directorship of Northern housing. Is that the right title I'm going under, directorship of Northern Housing, which Mr. Markowsky is filling that position at this time. Do you know what position I'm talking about?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Director of Housing.

MR. WIPF:— Director of Housing, O.K. At the time of the advertisement apparently .Mr. Minister, this was advertised for an Engineer 4 position and, I understand, that the man who is in that position now does not hold degrees in the engineering field and that you have three or four experienced professional engineers who applied for that job. Can you say why the engineers who qualified for the job were not brought in? Just before you start I do believe that the man who got the job has architectural training instead of engineering.

MR. BOWERMAN:—It is a civil engineer 4 position, equivalent to civil engineer 4 but it doesn't have to be a civil engineer 4. It is equivalent to that. The person that holds the position has got two years of architecture; he has 6 or 8 years in his own business. construction business: he is a managerial person; he is not an engineer in the sense of being a qualified engineer but it is not a technical position; it is a managerial position. We think the man is well qualified.

MR. WIPF: — Was this man a Saskatchewan resident?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. Mr. Minister, I understand that in January some work to draw up material for northern housing operations was farmed out to an architectural firm in Prince Albert, or contracted out to an architectural firm in Prince Albert. Can you tell me the reason for this or is this a general deal with the DNS that they will hire outside contractors or architects to do this when they have architects on their own pay roll?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I only have one architect in the department and he certainly can't do the work that is required of him.

MR. WIPF: — I have about five minutes of questions left on item 1 and I want to go into the Home Improvement Grant area.

Mr. Minister, what criteria are needed to get the Home Improvement Grant and what qualifications do you have to meet in order to get this grant? Can an employee get a

grant?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The program is managed in the North the same as it is managed in the South. You are talking about the \$ 1,500 that improves a person's home and a part time employee can receive that assistance.

One of the problems that you are going to home in on this, one of the problems is because you have a government employee who is also getting a government grant. The fact of the matter is that we have northern native persons who were complaining and their housing conditions are not up to standard. And so we have the problem of whether he is employed or not. We attempt to provide some assistance. I hope that you are not objecting to that.

MR. WIPF: — The criteria are the same as in the South?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, it is.

MR. WIPF: — In the northern public housing how many people living in these are in arrears, or have been in arrears, and I am not talking about for three or four months, but how many residents in the public housing have been in arrears for two years, three years in arrears of payment?

Mr. Minister, while you are looking that one up maybe I could add just one more. In the public housing I understand that we had a problem in quite a few people moving into public housing before signing mortgage documents and we are having a great deal of difficulty collecting, getting them to make payments.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I could tell the member that there is, indeed, having to try and catch up on a housing program that was in place before we came into office, that many of the assignments were never done and many of the titles were never written up. It has been an ongoing program to try to bring that matter forward. Much of the rent was never collected. Some of the houses, in fact, that were built during the Liberal Government days, were built in such a fashion that there is nothing left of the house now and not because the people have destroyed it, it was because there was no ventilation; there was no ventilation under the floors; there was no ventilation in the rooms and as a result the humidity and moisture has rotted the walls and rotted the ceilings and floors in many cases. Those houses, in some cases, never had any rent paid on them. There is no question that there is a difficulty in the area of collecting rents, but we have . . . No, I have some figures here. Of the 472 loans . . . the officials say that we could virtually say that they are all in arrears technically, by the fact that they are not right up to date. We have, as a result of going back to 1964, improved the loan payments, the monthly payments on these by 25 per cent of the last year. But I can't tell you what that would be. (472 total?) O.K. That would be total loans to date, 472. We have picked up 156 made payments and we have increased last year to 191. So we are beginning to gain some momentum with respect to getting a regular monthly payment system worked out with those persons that are in houses.

MR. WIPF: — One final question, oh, I will have another one after. Mr. Minister, how many people live in DNS houses who do not work for DNS?

MR. BOWERMAN: — About three or four. We have one in the town of La Ronge for a recreation person, one for their municipal person I guess. Maybe the Northern Municipal Council has moved out and one exploration company is renting a house.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. Mr. Minister. That will be my questions on item 1 here. There is only one thing that I would remind you of. I have still have not received the answers to some of the questions I asked earlier, put on the order paper, and one was to do with payments made to fix a lady's house up in the Buffalo Narrows area. I'd like if you could, to get the . . . (Inaudible interjection) The one written question that I had put down was payments that were made to fix a Dorothy Petit's house in Buffalo Narrows, I figure it is, work done by Leon McCallum . One of the reasons why I wanted that is because there is a memo out from Mr. Costiuk outlining that, if you are working for the department or for the government, you can't do outside contract work. You can't do work for someone else and get paid. I understand according to some pieces of paper I have received, that this one gentleman did do work on a home, a DNS employee, hired by DNS to work outside of his own hours while he is employed by the DNS. Yet there is a memo out as of May 17 last year, re: Employment. Outside and/or Business Interests. I thought that was a bit of a conflict there. (Inaudible interjection). I don't know.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I can't understand why the order for return, that you don't have your order for return. I think it was answered. I think the answer to that question was that the information that you were seeking on a certain work order, there was no such work order by the number which you recorded on that particular question for return. I know the issue about which you are speaking and that has to do with some work which was done by one of the department employees for a person who had received a house through the Northern Housing Program and the employee who went to do the work for the person who had the house was paid through the department invoice system, I wish the member would appreciate that those communities are not just full of carpenters and tinsmiths and electricians and the kinds of repair people who are needed; most of them who are employed in those communities are employees of the department. So if anybody wants some work done who are they going to go to? We have tried to be flexible; we have tried to accommodate and we may have caused ourselves some problems because of it. But the particular situation that you are referring to is a straight matter of that kind of situation. Who else would they call on?

If the fellow was born and raised in that town and is known to the woman and she doesn't have any other male about the house to do the work, what else was she to do? She called on him; he went ahead and got approval before he did it and we see nothing wrong with it.

MR. WIPF: — Can you tell me — in August, 1976, this house had sustained some damage by fire and the DNS I understand at that time, had refused to do the work on the home (it was a private home). Then on August 1, DNS decided to go in and do the work. The thing that is of concern is the memo that comes out and says that employees can't be working outside of their regular hours doing moonlighting jobs. There are other employees rather concerned about this because they would like to do a little moonlighting probably on the side but it is contradictory to the Public Service Commission's Act.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I don't know what the member suggests that we should do. You present a situation. I absolutely make no apologies for that. It may well be technically incorrect but when you have a woman who has a house that is half burned down and needs some help, what are you going to do? She needs a carpenter to repair or to fix and we have them employed and there is some sort of sophisticated policy that says you can't moonlight and you can't do this and that. Then he goes and repairs a house—yes, it may well be technically wrong, if it is then I guess we will have to bow to that decision.

But so far as we are concerned working in the kinds of situations that we find ourselves in in that country, we are going to have to do some things which are practical and have a practical approach and are flexible and sensible and responsible.

It would be totally irrational and irresponsible of the department to say, sorry Mrs. But you will just have to remain in that burned home unless you go out to Meadow Lake or to Prince Albert or to Saskatoon and hire yourself a carpenter to come in and fix it. It is just totally intolerable to think of a suggestion like that. I make no apologies for that particular situation. I know the one that you are talking about; I don't know all the details of it at this point in time. I am prepared to dig it out and discuss it with you or with anyone but I make no apology for it.

MR. McMILLAN: — I would like to ask the minister some questions with respect to Indian land claims and I am under the impression that he is the minister responsible. Right on? O.K., can you tell me how many different settlements you have reached at this time?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I don't think that there have been any settlements finalized and by that I would mean that the land has been transferred, that the federal government has surveyed it and in fact, claims title on behalf of the particular Indian reservation. I think that it would be correct to say that there has been none gone to that extent. There have been lands transferred; there have been orders in council transferring various parcels; there have been land selections made; the process is under way in a number of areas both south and north but there have been no finalizations on any land.

MR. McMILLAN: — How many thousand acres have you come to an agreement on with the various bands that you have been negotiating with. I understand the technical difference between having finalized the transfer and having come to some solid agreement with respect to the allocation of lands. I would like to know, firstly, how many -I think it was probably one million acres that was to be granted -I would like to know how many thousand, or what percentage of that you people feel that you have reached an agreement with at this time?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, I would have to answer that I don't think there are any acres which we have come to full agreement on, the finalization. Some bands may have only selected a portion of their full allocation. We may have come to an agreement on the selections which they have made, but let's say that they select another 15,000 acres some place. Their full entitlement is still not complete. We may disagree with the second selection and, therefore, the total process may break down.

There have been lands selected over which, I think, we have tentative agreement on those lands that have been selected, but for us to say that there has been agreement reached on that, or that the selection process that we transfer or that we have agreed on a 100,000 acres or 200,000. I think, it would be presumptuous of me to give you any figure on the number of acres.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you yourself admit that you have a tentative agreement on the given amount of land in Saskatchewan and I would like to know, just exactly, how much that is. I realize you can't tell me to the nearest acre, but I would like to know how these things are progressing and one of the best measuring sticks - if you have, in fact, not reached a tentative agreement with any Indian band over the disposition of any lands, then it is progressing at the rate of nil, zero per cent. I would be interested in knowing what rate you have proceeded with the disposition of these lands.

MR. BOWERMAN: —Well, the negotiation process, even if there hadn't been any lands, come to any agreement of lands, there are a great number of subjects which must be dealt with even before the agreement on the acres of lands. I think, regardless, if I told you there were no acre agreements, that is no agreement on acres, that it would not be a nil agreement, because there have been many understandings and agreements come to with respect to the final choice, selection and allocation of land. I can't give you the number of acres. I could go through the list and say, for example, at the Fond-du-Lac Band, they are wanting, for example, to change one reserve. No. 229, they are wanting to exchange that reserve for another land location just north of their settlement of Fond-du-Lac.

They have also made a selection of about 38,000 acres. There is no reason why that land - yes, there is. There is some mineral land involved and nobody is objecting to the transfer of the mineralized area, but they haven't accepted it as such.

There is a matter of whether or not the other lands that they select - there is a parcel of 15,000 or 20,000 acres, which is in part of the Athabasca sand area and it includes the McFarlane River system. We are not agreeing on whether the transfer of the McFarlane River will take place, we are disagreeing on that. Now, that doesn't mean to say we are disagreeing on all the acres, but we are disagreeing on a very narrow part of it. I can't tell you there is a disagreement on the land. That is the kind of complication involved here.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, is it safe to say that you have reached tentative agreement on 300,000 acres of land?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, I think that would not be a proper figure for me to consent to even though it may be close.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you appreciate the problem that I have in trying to determine how these negotiations are proceeding. On the evidence that you have given me here, they are not proceeding at all. You are hassling it out but you have made no progress. That is all I can assume because you have not even reached — you will not give me a figure tentative agreement on any properties.

I would like to ask some additional questions. I assume that it is in the neighborhood of 300,000 acres that you may have reached tentative agreement on. Do any of the tentative agreements involve property which is currently occupied at this time by anyone other than that Indian band that you have been negotiating with? Does any of the property that has been involved in the tentative agreement to date, being occupied at this time by anyone other than those people who were involved in the negotiations— 300,000 acres tentatively agreed to — I want to know if that is all unoccupied land or if in fact some of that land is currently occupied by someone other than the Indian band negotiating it or the government of Saskatchewan.

MR. BOWERMAN: — The problem is that you want to assume some things that may not in fact be true. A mineral claim within a 38,000 acre parcel of land is land which has an interest by a third party. The process therefore, in answering your question—yes, there will be land which has been on agreement to by the persons or companies that hold the mineral claim; they are prepared to have that mineral claim transferred with the land providing that the Indian band will accept the conditions of the mineral claim.

Now the Indian bands go back and decide whether or not they will accept the conditions of the mineral claim. It is a long process and it will continue to be a long process. The member suggesting that there are going to be any short-run kinds of solutions is way off base.

MR. McMILLAN: — I do not believe I said anything of the kind, Mr. Minister. I am only trying to identify the complexities of the problem because you know them better than I do and the only way I am going to get well-educated about them is to probe your mind about them. Now the question of the allocation of mineral resources and mineral rights, under mineral rights agreements, have been allocated to Gulf Oil or Amok or anyone else. That of course is a complex problem and that is in fact a separate problem to the one I am probing.

I am asking you that with respect to any of the tentative arrangements you have come to to this date, are there any third parties occupying the land that you have tentatively agreed to turn over to the Indian bands? How many and under what circumstances do you see coming to some easy solution to that problem?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I do not see any easy solution to that problem. There are mineral claims held by various companies; there are some private leases in terms of — the former Liberal candidate is one of them who is on the Elizabeth Falls; he has some property that is being requested or selected by the Black Lake Indian Band, the Chicken Indian Reserve. So there is another parcel. There are two of them there. I cannot think of any other areas. The Indian bands, in some cases, with respect to Stoney Rapids — I understand there has been a recent selection of the lands around the outside of the borders of Stoney Rapids, that would not be permitted. We would not permit or offer them to select those lands because we believe that the people of Stoney Rapids, many of whom are direct ancestors of those who have treaty, have obviously got to have the opportunity to expand and to carry out and enjoy their livelihood in the North as well. So there are a great number of complications with respect to it.

MR. McMILLAN: — I am not so much interested in those arrangements you have not agreed to yet. I am more interested in like the ones you say about Stoney I am more interested in the ones you have come to an agreement with. Now if the Indian band and the provincial government have come to an agreement of the Indian Band and the provincial government has come to an agreement for the disposition of a given amount of property and some individuals currently residing on the property, either residing on it or utilizing it under maybe a lease from the Saskatchewan government to run cattle on it. I would like to know what procedure you are going to take to come to some solution with respect to the problem. Let's say the guy has a 30 year lease on some A land at the south end of Green Lake. You have come to an agreement with an Indian Band that that would be part of the property. What do you do then? The guy's got a 30 year lease and there's 20 years left to run on it. What do you do? Do you go in and tear up his lease? I would be interested in knowing what you are going to do under those circumstances.

MR. BOWERMAN:—The member is asking a question with respect to our policy. I think I could have given it to him and shortened up the discussion a bit. The obligation that the province has with respect to the setting aside or fulfilling of outstanding Indian Land Entitlements in this province, is an obligation which comes to us under the National Resources Transfer Agreement of 1930. The only obligation we believe, the province believes, the only obligation which the province has under that agreement, is that it will fulfill outstanding Indian Land Entitlements out of the unoccupied lands of

the province — unoccupied Crown lands of the province. That is the only obligation that the province has. We said when we were initially approached by the federal government, to resolve these outstanding entitlements that in order to resolve the issue, in order to try to get it resolved and get it out of the way, we would move in and negotiate a further extension of lands that might be selected by Indian Bands. So we added to the unoccupied Crown lands, the potential for Indian Bands to select out of the occupied Crown lands of the province, providing the federal government puts its federal Crown lands on the table to be selected as well. There has been an agreement on that, so then that extends the areas that the Indian Bands may select their entitlements from — unoccupied Crown lands, occupied Crown lands, both federal and provincial. In addition to that we have said, that it is clearly we believe, a federal responsibility. I Indians are to select lands other than unoccupied and occupied Crown lands, if they are to go to patented lands or titled lands, that is the sole responsibility of the federal government, to purchase that title. There is no obligation to the province. So therefore, if an Indian Band selects some lands that are patented along side of the Indian Reserve boundaries, some people have offered to sell to Indian Reserve Bands, then we believe that it is a federal responsibility.

With regard to the occupied, and that is the question you are raising with respect to someone who has a lease on a quarter section of agricultural grazing land or agricultural farm land. We have said that the occupant must be satisfied. We must satisfy the conditions of the occupant or satisfy the conditions of the lessee. In other words, if you have a 30 year lease as you indicated, and you still have 30 years to go on that lease, you many not want to give up that lease. Therefore, if we were to transfer that Crown land to an Indian Band. they would have to honor your lease for 30 years, if that was agreeable to you. In addition to that, when you gave up the lease and there were improvements on that land, (you had put a fence on it, or buildings or dugouts or you have broken up some of the land to cultivate it) those improvements would be the responsibility of the Band or the federal government to purchase. I say the Band, let's say the Band has a 10,000 acre entitlement and it chooses all improved land, all cultivation land. Then it may trade down acres for improvements. In other words, it may end up not with 10,000 acres of land as its entitlement but it may consent to end up with 5,000 acres of cultivated land. That carries on with respect to mineral leases, to any bonafide lease which is a written agreement between the province and the lessee. All those agreements for leases are termed to be occupied Crown land and the lessee must be satisfied.

MR. McMILLAN:—I would like to ask the minister if any of the agreements that you have tentatively reached to date have involved any occupied provincial parks or regional parks. Have you come to any tentative arrangements to date?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No. none. There have been some selections but there are no agreements with respect to that.

MR. E. ANDERSON(Shaunavon):—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, in the southwest, in the Cypress Hills precisely, are you doing any negotiating at this time with any Indian bands for reserve lands?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The hon. member asks with respect to the southwest. There have been one or two or three bands which have selected lands; they have selected lands within the Cypress Hills, the west block of the Cypress Hills. There is no agreement. They have selected more acres than they have entitlement to, and therefore, we can't resolve at this point in time what portion, if any, of the west block of the Cypress Hills

would be allocated to entitlement. We haven't got to that stage yet. There is a disagreement between the federal government and the band, which is making application, as to what the population criterion is. They have selected their population criterion at the time of treaty, when population was greater than it is now. There is an agreement that the population date as far as Saskatchewan is concerned — we think we have an understanding that the date will be as of December 31, 1976.

MR. ANDERSON: — I understand, Mr. Chairman, the west block of Cypress Hills is now land which is held by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources and makes up what is known as the forest reserve or west block of the Cypress Hills Park. Therefore, is the land, which you are negotiating with the Indians, tourism or park or recreation land at this time?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, it is occupied Crown land, no matter who administers it; it is occupied Crown land — the same as leases held by ranchers, pasture leases held by ranchers or grazing land. That's occupied Crown.

MR. ANDERSON: — In this case, I understand, it is occupied Crown land because it is held by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources who also has a yearly agreement with a grazing association in the southwest who have a little over a 50-year tradition of using this as grazing land. This is the area which is being negotiated now, I understand.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, we haven't got to that point because we still haven't agreed on what the acres should be. Therefore, we don't know what area they are to select; they have selected, I believe, all of the west block of the Cypress Hills. We believe that that selection is greater than what it should be, so it has to go back and they have to readdress themselves to that situation. What are they going to do? What lands are they going to select? Let me say, first, in the case of the west block of the Cypress Hills, it is occupied Crown land and therefore the province itself must first decide. Should we transfer the land? We don't our obligation is there, although we consented that we would make available that land providing it was satisfactory to the province and the lessee. So first the province must be satisfied.

Secondly, if that land in the west block of the Cypress Hills Provincial Park has a lease on it, that is, an ongoing lease for 30 years, then the lessees must be satisfied as well.

MR. ANDERSON: — As I understand, the problem lies in that the Renewable Resources only puts their leases out on a yearly basis, while these families that are anxious to have use of that land for 50 years, since it is on a yearly basis in fact, it would be somewhat easy to shove them off.

I understand that the west block of the Cypress Hills also contains some federal Crown land in the name of the Fort Walsh National Historic site. If you include all of the Cypress Hills west block you will be including this parcel of land. Has the federal government given any guarantee that they will turn over this site that they have spent about \$1 million on at this point in time, do you know?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, I think it is not good that we should speculate about this issue. The federal government as I indicated — that is occupied federal Crown land. It is up to the federal government to decide whether they will make that available or not and I can't predict whether they will or whether they won't. I am not going to predict that. I just say that that is the ball park we are in and the negotiating area which we are in and

that is the policy under which we are operating.

MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, isn't it also true that in the west block of the Cypress Hills, what you would consider the west block, there are also quarters and half sections that are deeded and owned as ranch sites so that they are not unoccupied Crown lands or occupied Crown lands as such but are—yes. and the sad part of it is that the people who are living there are using grazing land that is on a yearly basis so that in fact, if agreement is made by the province to let their occupied Crown lands become part of reserve, you would leave people sitting on quarter sections in the midst of a reserve which would put them in — well. not an untenable position but an interesting position when you — what would your policy be toward those people be if they did not wish to move?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, I think we get back into the area of what is going on now with respect to that short grass park down there. It is the same kind of a situation basically and I can't foresee any reason why. if the land was being allocated and it was being accepted and the lessees were all satisfied, the person would sit there on a quarter section of land in the midst of an Indian reservation. He would likely sell it. He likely wouldn't agree to any leases being given unless he was to sell. The purchaser will have to be the federal government on behalf of the Indian band.

MR. ANDERSON: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure you would agree that these gentlemen would really not be giving much trading stock up because at any given point in time, the Department of Renewable Resources can refuse to give them a yearly base. They then have no grazing; they have nothing to trade; they have a half or a quarter section of deeded land and who is going to buy it? They obviously would be forced off very nicely without ever having any type of negotiations because if they do not apply every year and get a renewal, they have no claim on that Tourism and Renewable Resources land. Certainly, I must say, it makes some of the people in the area, you would find, very uneasy.

A further question, Mr. Chairman. Is there any Indian band expressing a desire or interest in negotiating for any of the land in the Val Marie park land area at this time to make it part of a reserve?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Not that I am aware of. I am not aware of any selections that have been made within the Val Marie park or the proposed Grasslands National Park. I think not and I am not aware of it.

MR. ANDERSON: —As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, there has been no interest, as you say, expressed by any Indian bands to your department in the grassland area of Val Marie park. They have never approached you and no Indian bands have said this would be an area to be considered?

MR. BOWERMAN: — That's correct. If they had have, we would have that on record.

MR. ANDERSON: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if there are more bands than the — expressing interest than the Nikonee which is 168 in the Maple Creek area? The lucky man I believe that has no reserve land but stays on the Red Feather and portion of the Piapot. Are they the three reserves that wish to have land claims settled in the Cyprus Hills area or are there other bands interested?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Those are three of the bands that come to mind and there may be

one other. I think the one other may be Thunderchild which had some interest or something, I believe, in some of the lands, I am not just sure, but I think one of them has withdrawn its request from the area so I can't define it other than I know that there have been land selections in the area.

MR. ANDERSON: — Mr. Chairman, as I understand it there is a disagreement between the time of taking census, whether it be the 1890 census or 1880 or the more recent. If we take the more recent census to be fulfilled by the bands who express interest, how many acres, in total, would that be in the leased?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I don't have this information here. I would be glad to talk to the member about it, but the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is really not directly responsible. I have two or three staff which have been assigned to me to do the work with respect to Indian land entitlements. I don't have the material here. Those staff persons are not here. The department won't have the information. I can't expect them to give it to me.

I think that the selection on the bases, I am now talking right out off the top of my head, and from memory, I think the selection on the basis of the disputed population, that if you take a December 31, 1976 population figure, I think the allocation is about 10,000 acres; if you go back to 1860 or 1870 or whenever it was, I think it goes up to 30,000 or 40,000, or something like that.

MR. ANDERSON: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk to you on this. I am sure you would appreciate that the people in the west block area that are sitting on deeded land, grazing land, on tourism land, not knowing that the land has been considered to be used as land claim settlement land. Knowing they have actually no claim on their grazing rights because they are on a yearly basis, are feeling very uneasy. They would rather know if they are going to be considered so that they can make their plans for themselves and for the children and for this not to be hung over their heads. I am not blaming you. I am just saying it is an awful problem. I get approached on the basis that there are rumors running rampant and they come in and they don't know where they are at. I would urge the minister if you could get to a position where it is going to be used or not used. If an announcement could come into the area it would certainly ease the minds of a lot of people and quash a lot of rumors. I would like to consult with you. I know that you don't have the figures and as I say I am not blaming you. It is a problem we are faced with, but it is a problem in my area, that makes it very, very difficult for the people who are living in an area that has been so designated that it could become reserve land.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, we have had more latitude than we probably should have had on this, but I think it is informative for the members opposite to know it is not in the Estimates, nowhere is there any budgetary item here in the department Estimates. But I will give the undertaking to the member, I will invite you and invite any of those MLAs from that area, to come and explore with us, review the maps and the land selections that have been made in the areas down in the southwest corner, so that you are informed.

I can advise the member that I am going to be at a meeting at Maple Creek, I believe, it is a week from yesterday, on an invitation to discuss this issue with them. I would invite you to come to my office whenever the time is the most appropriate to both of us and we will go over the maps together. I have no reason not to do that and to provide all the information that you want to know with respect to it.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Chairman, I just have one question to the Minister on Indian Land Claims. I take it from your remarks to the member for Shaunavon a few moments ago that the government is prepared to use provincial park lands or lands that are Crown lands and are now being used for provincial parks in settlement of Indian land claims, should this become desirable, from your point of view. Is that correct?

MR. BOWERMAN: — We have already said that we are prepared to consider it. We obviously have got to come down to the point of what will be the selection. Once we know what that selection is, then we obviously will have to deal with the question. But when we said that we would make occupied Crown lands available, we put them on the table so they could look at them and select from them. We obviously made the commitment there, that park lands were on the table but the agreement or the provision is, providing that the lessees are satisfied, providing that the occupants are satisfied and providing that the province of Saskatchewan is satisfied that we can, reasonably and responsibly in trying to live up to the commitments which have been made, maybe allocate some of the west block of the Cypress Hills; I do not know. We cannot do that until they have actually made some of their selections, so we are in the process of that. In answer to your question, yes we have obviously considered that issue. We are prepared to consider it. I think it would be fair to say that we would not be prepared to give up the total west block. I just do not think it would be publicly acceptable to the occupants.

MR. MALONE: — That one park comes to mind, of course, but there are others as well that are close to existing reserves, that I am aware of, such as the park in the Pelly constituency that we all came to know so well last year and the park in Souris-Cannington seats, Kenosee. Are those parks available again for settlement?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes again, they are up for selection. They are occupied Crown land and the same answer would apply. I can tell you that there have been no selections either in Greenwater Park or in Moose Mountain Provincial Park.

MR. MALONE: — You mean the Indian bands have just not . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — They have not selected lands in those areas.

MR. MALONE: — Just one other question then. Is the federal government in the same situation, in that they are prepared to let occupied Crown lands be used in settlement, and I ask you though you may not know the answer, is there any consideration to using Prince Albert National Park as land for Indian land claim settlements?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well I just happen to have read a letter over the supper hour from the Minister, Mr. Faulkner, who confirmed for me the federal position that federal Crown lands were on the table in the same manner that provincial Crown lands were on the table; therefore I would thus consider that what he has said is that park lands are on the table but the occupant must be satisfied. That is the discretion which they would have to exercise and use once the selection had been made. I can indicate to you that there has been a band that has selected some land, a small portion of land within the Prince Albert National Park.

MR. MALONE: — I think this is a very serious issue. There are tremendous social

implications in those areas, which I am sure you are aware of. When you talk about the occupant, do you mean the lessee?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I mean, in this case, the government.

MR. MALONE: — So in the cases of Waskesiu or Prince Albert National Park it would have to be the federal government that is satisfied and in provincial parks it would have to be the provincial government that is satisfied. You cannot speak for the federal, of course, but for your interests, say you — again a hypothetical question, but from what you have told me it may be a question that has some reality in the near future. Say that the Indians in the Kenosee area decided that they would like to take a chunk of Carlyle Park, or whatever it is called, what do you do? I mean. do you go down there and canvass the cottage owners to get their reaction? Tell me what your procedure will be, Mr. Minister.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, I want to say that there is no outstanding entitlement of the White Bear Indian Reserve. They have all their lands. They selected all their lands at the time of treaty; therefore they have no outstanding entitlements to select . . .

MR. MALONE: - Well any farm.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes. Let's say even a one of the bands from along the Qu'Appelle Valley wanted to go down and select some land in the Moose Mountain Provincial Park. All I can suggest to you is if the lands which they select are lands which have no cabin owners, they are out in the middle of the park some place and they are unobstructed by any other lessees or secondary kinds of lessees, the occupant being the province, the occupied Crown land is the occupant, in that case it would be the province and it must determine whether or not it could make available a half a dozen sections or a dozen sections or whatever the selection might be in that park, whether or not it would be prepared to give up a title or a transfer title to that property to the national government on behalf of the Indian Band. That would be a single determination by the province, it would appear to me. If it was to get into an area, as the hon. member for Shaunavon has spoken about, where the occupant was the provincial government, the occupied Crown, but they had subsequently leased it to somebody to graze or whatever, then you would have to satisfy both the province and the lessee.

MR. MALONE: — You say, satisfy the lessee. I don't think there would be any lessee who would be satisfied just for the obvious reason that he wouldn't want to move. You know, if he has been going to a particular cottage for 10 years and his family has been going there for years, not many of these people are going to want to move. Are you going to, if necessary, take measures to cancel leases, which I think you can in most of your leases, at sort of your whim. If you want to cancel them you can do so; you probably wouldn't but you have the power. Is this part of your game plan on this, if necessary, that you would cancel cottage owners, leases to make settlement to the Indian land claims?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, we don't foresee that happening. In the case of a selection which is being made at Stoney Rapids by the Chicken Indian Band, Black Lake, they are selecting lands which have - one parcel of land is owned, they purchased the land and so they have title to it and it's right along the Fond-du-Lac River at the Elizabeth Falls. The other is a tourist outfitter who is on a lease (he has a 21 or 30 year lease). A Mr. Semans has a 21 year lease on that property, therefore, we could not transfer that lease unless it was by the agreement of the lessee and the provisions of the lease were maintained. In other words, let's say that Mr. Semans agreed; he didn't care whom he

paid his lease fees to. He would pay them to the Indian Band once it was transferred. The Indian Band would say, we will acknowledge the provisions of the lease as long as it is valid. If there is a provision in there for re-leasing after that's ended, then they honor the provisions of the agreement. If Mr. Semans agrees that it should be transferred or can be transferred and he'll pay his lease fees to the Indian Band rather than to the provincial government, then there is no inhibitions or no reasons why we shouldn't transfer the land.

MR. MALONE: — What you are telling me, then, is in no way will you affect the existing lessees or existing people on the land. That is, if there should be a selection of that property and the lessee says, no, I'm not going to give up my lease then you will be bound by that decision. Is that what you are telling me, that you won't expropriate or cancel leases or anything else?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No expropriation or cancellation of leases. We have clearly stated our position with the bands; we have clearly got an understanding. As I said earlier, we believe the only obligation which the province has under the 1930 Transfer Agreement is to provide unoccupied Crown lands. We believe that that is clear; we believe that that is, in fact, clear. In order to try to resolve the issue, we went the next step saying, look, gosh there isn't much land left that's unoccupied that is of any value. Let's try to put in the moral fact that we do have some obligations here. We will try to resolve this issue. We laid on the table the occupied Crown lands, but with the reservation, with the stipulation that we would not just put them out there without any reservations at all. If there was a lessee interest, mineral lease, mining lease, ranching lease, cultivation lease, carbon lease, any lease at all, it would be subject to agreement of that.

MR. MALONE: — Of the lands that you have put on the table as you say, where there are leases, have the lessees been notified that that land has been put on the table, to use your words?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I think it would be fair to say not, other than the public statements that have been made. I think it would be unnecessary to advise all the lessees in the province of Saskatchewan that their lands are possible for band selection. I think it is an unwarranted kind of process that would bring about an unnecessary amount of concern. It just won't happen in some of the areas. The land will not be selected, so therefore, why upset persons about thinking that it will be. Really until the land is selected, until a band selects that land, I suppose it could be that everybody is living under that cloud of possibility. I think that until the land is selected it is something that we should not speculate about.

MR. MALONE: — Well, I wish you well. I think you are going to have some terrible problems with. I think you can acknowledge that as well. Just another point on this particular thing, and I will let the member get back in again. Mineral rights, will they be transferred to the Indian bands?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well the Indian Act says that the lands which are transferred must be unencumbered. I think they are departing from that. The mineral rights, as long as it is Crown land, it can be transferred.

MR. MALONE: — . . . Keep the Crown.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, or the Crown could keep. Well, yes it could, on the occupied Crown lands, it could keep them if it so determined to do that. Or, if there was Crown

land that had an oil lease they could transfer the land and transfer the lease if the oil company would agree to that. We are prepared to try to work these things out. It is going to take negotiation. Once the selection is made you are going to have to find out who is the lessee, what implications there are on the land and whether or not we can solve it. It has to be resolved between the band, the federal government and the province of Saskatchewan. It is going to be a long process.

MR. MALONE: — Without prolonging it too much further, have you put on the table, again to use your phrase, any land that has proven mineral value in it, uranium, oil, potash, whatever? I say, proven, I suspect any land has got something in it. But particularly in northern Saskatchewan where you are having uranium finds almost every day it seems. Has any land that has proven uranium ore or findings there, has that been put on the table?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, in the case of northern Saskatchewan, there is a little graphite mine off the south end of Reindeer Lake. The band expressed a particular interest, the Peter Ballantyne Band expressed a particular interest in having that little mine; it is a small one. It will be operated on a sort of a hand basis, not a very mechanized basis. They wanted that as part of their selection. We dealt with the persons involved. SMDC was involved in that as well as another company. I don't think we came to a formal, final conclusion. There seemed to be agreement it is O.K. if we can work out an agreement with the band, they were prepared to do so. I think now the band has decided that it doesn't want the area. I think that's what happened.

MR. MALONE: — The point is though can I assume it's government policy not to put on the table any land in northern Saskatchewan or for that matter, southern Saskatchewan, that has proven mineral claims there? Are you going to give them land in Key Lake? Are you going to give them land at Cluff Lake or any other area where there has been. (I am searching for a word but I can't get it) but it is where there is a determination, there is likely going to be uranium or gold or whatever and you know it, your records show it. Is that land going to be put on the table?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well I think the overriding policy statement is the position and I would have to say, yes, to that question. Yes, it is on the table. Yes, that land which has proven resource value; Key Lake, you mentioned that. I know but I am saying that if an Indian band went to make as part of their selection at Key Lake, then that land is on the table but it is occupied Crown. Therefore, the determination is going to be made by the occupant and the lessee in that case because the Crown is the occupant and there is a mineral lease on it. So it doesn't mean to say that just because we laid that occupied Crown land on the table and the Indian Band selected it, that in fact it will be transferred. That decision is going to be made on the basis of whether or not we can work out an agreement on the occupied Crown lands. But the initial statement of policy is that occupied Crown lands on the table therefore puts on the table lands which have potential resource value.

MR. MALONE: — Just a couple more questions. My understanding is that the settlement with the bands was arrived at on the basis of acreage, not value.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Pardon?

MR. MALONE: — The settlement is acreage, not land value.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes.

MR. MALONE: — O.K. Can you tell us, (I am not sure, you may have already done it) but have you disclosed specifically what land is on the table? Is this public knowledge? And if it is not, are you in a position to disclose it to us?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well I can. Occupied Crown land is on the table and therefore if you were to take a map of Saskatchewan and look at unoccupied Crown land, that is, land on which (by the interpretation of the courts) there is no occupancy, that's committed. We have no way, in my opinion, under the Resources Transfer Agreement, to make any deal . . .

MR. MALONE: — Let me rephrase what I am saying. You are right — everything is available; everything is subject to be given to the bands. But can you say what lands have been selected? Has that been made public as to what Crown lands the bands have selected? If you haven't made it public, are you in a position to do so now?

MR. BOWERMAN: — There have been some selections made and we have not made them public. The reason we have not made them public, I think, is because it would not be in the best interest to make them public — all of them. Some of them I don't mind. I have already indicated that some selections were made in the west block of Cypress Hills. But I think there are some land locations which would again cause unnecessary public interest because even though a selection has been made, I think it is by no means resolved that that selection would be accepted or acceptable and therefore I think it would be unwise to sort of publish the maps publicly, declaring what lands have been selected. It would cause unnecessary public interest I think and . . .

MR. MALONE: — I am not in a very combative mood tonight or something so I am not going to pursue it with you except to say that you obviously have a very delicate matter on your hands and you are obviously in a position where all hell can break loose, if I can put it that way. Once these things become public you are going to have to be in a position to prepare yourself for the heat you are going to take, justified or not justified. I think you are really sitting on a powder keg and you had better be ready for it, when it explodes on you. So that is all I have to say to you tonight on it.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well I appreciate your concern.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, in the Peter Ballantyne Band area they have asked for certain parcels of land and my question on that is, has any of this land been turned over to the bands in the northern administration district yet?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No.

MR. WIPF: — O.K. Mr. Minister, I have one question. I have to go back a bit where we were talking about this home that was repaired by DNS. I agree totally with you that in the northern communities they do not have tradesmen running around standing on each corner. However, I would like to know, why would the DNS repair and pay for work done on a private home and charge it to the DNS under the warranty number? The number is 9014401299. It's my last question, Gordon.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I can't remember the details of this particular house in Buffalo Narrows and the lady who was the owner. It has something to do with a . . .

MR. WIPF: — The lady at the time was an employee of the DNS.

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, I don't think she was. I don't believe that she was. I believe the person . . .

MR. WIPF: — Then, Mr. Minister, if she wasn't, is it a policy of the government to go to private homes, that DNS pay for and fix up private homes in the North and charge the material and the labor to the DNS?

MR. BOWERMAN: — But, look, the lady in question has probably received the house under the Northern Housing Program. You can call that a DNS house if you want to but it is a house that she is purchasing, you know, under the normal arrangements of the CMHC program. Now, as I said to the member, I can't remember the details of it and, I think, rather than speculate on this matter any further, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to either talk with us about it or put a question on the order paper with respect to it and then we can get at it. I can't give you the details exact enough and I just can't answer any more questions with respect to the details.

MR. WIPF: — My main concern on that, Mr. Minister, was if a person owns his own home, and you said you figured it was a home bought through the DNS or through CMHC, but if an individual owned his own home and worked for the DNS, would it be the policy of DNS if something happened in this home to fix it up and charge it, you know, have the DNS pay for it? That was my main question but what I'll do on this, I'll write you a letter on it.

MR. BOWERMAN: — . . . I'll try to get an answer for you but I may not be home.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, could you inform this house how big your air force is? How many aircraft do you have in DNS that are for fire fighting and how many are for the use of DNS? How many aircraft do you have involved with DNS, that you own, to fly personnel around? How many do you use for firefighting?

MR. BOWERMAN: — We have six tracker aircraft, two Beachcraft Barons, three 185 Cessnas, one Aztec and one Cheyenne. The Cheyenne is an executive aircraft as the Aztec is. The three 185s are used both on fish and game and forest patrol work. The Baron aircrafts are bird dog aircraft for the six fire tracker bombers.

MR. KATZMAN: — How many leased aircraft are involved in the North during the summer, for your department as well?

MR. BOWERMAN: — All of them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you have any leased aircraft besides what you own?

MR. BOWERMAN: — We lease two Cansos on a seasonal basis, and I believe three helicopters for fire patrol purposes during the summer.

MR. WIPF: — A question on that, Mr. Minister. When did you find it necessary to have a flight service between La Ronge, Prince Albert and Regina? When did that come in with the Cheyenne, flight 21 and flight 22?

MR. BOWERMAN: — When we obtained the Cheyenne.

May 18, 1978

MR. WIPF: — When was that?

MR. BOWERMAN: — 1977.

MR. WIPF: — Because last year on the Budget debate I asked if there were any scheduled flights in the aircraft and the answer — of course it was the Minister of Government Services then, but it was 'no' at that time. Did you get this Cheyenne after (I think it was March we were talking about this) March 1977?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well there was a time when the Cheyenne which was purchased for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was operated out of the central vehicle agency. It was then, at some time, transferred to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and it was after the transfer, or it may well have been before the transfer, that we accepted the scheduled flight between Regina and La Ronge as well as we established the scheduled runs between La Ronge and Buffalo Narrows and the points in between there and east. It may be that the answer was incorrect at that point in time . . . O.K., I was right.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 5 agreed.

ITEM 6

MR. WIPF: — One question on this. I don't know if it is the right item in your work that you are doing in the North to work in the field of alcoholism. Is this under the Health Services Branch?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — Can you tell me how money is allocated for that specific program that you have in the North at this time that is run by the DNS, without the grants which are made to the communities or other organizations that are working in it?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I was wrong when I said it was under Health, it is under Social Services. I will give you the answer as best I can. We make grants to the individual community alcohol rehabilitation centres. We have another fund, some additional money in there hoping, maybe another one will be established this year, if we can assist one in establishing this year. Any other funding with respect to the cost of the maintenance of the individual comes under SAP, Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. That's the way it is operated.

MR. WIPF: — One comment on this. I have had word from the west side of the province that the program is progressing very well and it is doing an excellent job up there. It probably could be looked at, as I understand it, as an example for the rest of the province and the community type of work.

Item 6 agreed.

ITEM 7

MR. WIPF: — Did you give me the amount of money that is set aside for the alcoholism

programming?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, \$48,000 last year, but that doesn't include the grants. It includes the staff in the department. It does not include SAP. It would be difficult to get the SAP, you would have to get a computer print-out on that. I don't think there is any other way you could get it. I can't give you the answer.

MR. WIPF: — Is there any money coming in from the federal government on this area?

MR. BOWERMAN: — They pay for persons of Treaty and Indian ancestry that go there. They share of course the SAP assistance under the normal SAP agreement. I suppose if there is any capital construction, it is not shared under the north lands. The grants to get the alcohol rehabilitation centres going and the assistance given is straight province.

Item 7 agreed.

Items 8 to 11 agreed.

ITEM 12

MR. McMILLAN:— Mr. Chairman, I would I like to ask the minister if he could give me just a general outline of what the Other Expenses include.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Sorry. If the member had been in his chair earlier because the answer is done there. I tore it up because I have given it once or twice all ready. I know that the member is very busy, is tremendously occupied. If you want me to go in there and get it for you I will but otherwise I will have to . . .

MR. McMILLAN: — In a general way, what did you spend it on? I don't need a dime by dime explanation.

MR. BOWERMAN: — It is for adult education. It is the training programs. Training programs for heavy duty equipment operators, for upgrading and for various programs of training.

MR. McMILLAN: — Does it include the personal expenses and/or a training salary to those people involved in the program?

MR. BOWERMAN: — It includes money to pay for the instructors. I think that is the question you asked. Heavy equipment training people, 70 persons involved; vocational training, all trades, 375 people: dental assistant trainee aides: training in government programs, university training, 30 people: northern careers plan. Technical Institutes, 140 people; Community . . . (I can't make my notes fit together here). You've got the most of it.

MR. McMILLAN: — My question was, do you pay people while they are on the training program? Much like Manpower?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes.

MR. McMILLAN: — At what rate?

MR. BOWERMAN: — At Manpower rates.

May 18, 1978

MR. McMILLAN: — All right. Is that expense shared by the federal government?

MR. BOWERMAN: — In most cases it is, yes.

MR. McMILLAN: - Thank you.

MR. BOWERMAN: — You are welcome.

Items 12, 13, 14 agreed.

ITEM 15

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Chairman, I really hope I wasn't awfully busy and the minister has already answered these questions because I would like to know, if your grants for economic development included any grants to teach the Indians in Northern Saskatchewan how to trap. Is that program involved in your grants here? Did it include grants to people for the purchase of trapping equipment, etc?

MR. BOWERMAN: — It includes fisheries support program, forestry support, economic development events count, miscellaneous grants, special ARDA grants, trapper program grants.

MR. McMILLAN: — I went through the Public Accounts book and I haven't had the good fortune of sitting on Public Accounts so I couldn't ask you about these payments directly there, but I would like to know. There are myriads of grants made to individuals in the neighborhood of \$200 up to \$1,300, \$1,400. Hundreds and hundreds of individuals. I would like to know under what program those grants are made? I was under the impression it was for the purchase of to aid these people in their trapping and/or fishing. I would just love you to satisfy my curiosity.

MR. BOWERMAN: — It's under the transportation subsidy and the fixed prices support subsidy. It goes to fishermen is what you are . . .

Item 15 agreed

Items 16 to 23 agreed.

Department of Northern Saskatchewan Vote 26 agreed.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE —VOTE 27

Items 1 to 6 agreed.

ITEM 7

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Chairman, one question. What educational facility are you acquiring.

MR. BOWERMAN: — School construction. I guess the word acquiring may be — acquisition is what you are saying. It is just construction of a new school.

MR. MALONE: — There is no existing institution that you are buying out?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No.

MR. MALONE: — What have you got acquiring for?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I don't know.

MR. MALONE: — You're the minister.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I just do what I am told.

Item 7 agreed.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE - VOTE 27

Agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

Loans, Advances and Investments agreed.

The committee reported progress.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Bowerman that Bill No. 15 - **An Act to amend The Northern Administration Act** be now read a second time.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the minister isn't available at this moment . . . (interjection) . . . Well, I wouldn't guarantee that the translation is going to be worthwhile, I'll tell you that . . . (interjection) . . . Mr. Attorney General and the minister beside him, I would far rather have tendonitis in my pitching arm than I would between my ears.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — As the Attorney General is well aware we've had some reluctance to proceed with this bill for some time now and it has not happened as a result of the discussions that we had with those members of the Northern Municipal Council in the North. The attitude they had is that while this bill in itself may not be an entirely bad thing. Mr. Minister if you will come and sit down, I am proceeding with that bill now that we have been unable to proceed with for several weeks and I really don't want you to miss this.

The great concern of the Northern Municipal Council has not named the effects of the bill itself because they agree in principle and I think that those of us on this side of the House who view the bill objectively will agree in principle, that there is really nothing wrong with a direct payment to local community authorities, the LACs in northern Saskatchewan. The bill facilitates this direct payment rather than transferring the bulk of the money through the Northern Municipal Council which has been the elected umbrella organization to supervise the activities of local communities in northern Saskatchewan.

The one great quarrel that the NMC had with the province of Saskatchewan other than the fact that the lack of financing through the NMC was no doubt an attempt to emasculate the NMC in retribution for all of the headaches they have caused the jovial Minister for Northern Saskatchewan, the one great complaint they had other than that was the fact that they were not given adequate time to study the effects of the bill and to proceed in advising the local community authorities and the LACs — everyone I talked to from the NMC, Mr. Minister, and if you did not hear it you did not talk to the NMC and that is probably why you and they have been at loggerheads for three years now.

Their great fear had been that they were not given enough time to consider the effects of the bill and to help work with the LACs and the LCAs for the transition of responsibilities over the finances. They have apparently asked, on many occasions, that they simply be given more time to see the LACs and LCAs put in a position where they could handle those fiscal responsibilities and that did not happen. They have been given an extra four or six weeks in this session to examine the effects of this legislation when it is passed and they have not come forward with any further serious questions than they initially raised with the question of the funding being transferred directly to local authorities.

The question about the bill emasculating the NMC is one that we have discussed in this House before. It is sadder than it is anything that the minister refused to work co-operatively with the umbrella organization for local governments in Northern Saskatchewan because if anything is going to facilitate the easy development and the easy political transition of Northerners, with the North, it is going to be the involvement of the local governments in northern Saskatchewan at every level.

The NMC has been working conscientiously with the LACs and the LCAs to try to act as the liaison between them and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to see that local interests were protected. They had a lot of problems in working not so much with the actual administration in the North, but with the minister. Many of those problems might have been avoided by a more temperate attitude on your part. They were not. The result has been today that this bill is, in large part, motivated by a desire to remove the NMC as the umbrella organization over the LCAs and LACs and put the minister and his staff in a position where they can deal directly with the local communities. I say that is unfortunate. It is unavoidable moreover and hopefully the new set-up, when it is in place, will work smoothly and hopefully the LCAs and LACs will not be bullied or pushed the way the NMC has been over the last few years.

I say again that the members of the NMC had no great quarrel with the principle of transferring the funding directly to the LCAs and the LACs. On that basis, members of this caucus, who would like on all occasions to reflect the interests of local government in Saskatchewan, have no great quarrel with the bill. We do express some sadness over the way it has been handled and the relationship between the government and the NMC over the past few years but, as I say again, that is only an ugly side to the development of the administration in Northern Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney that Bill No. 54-**An Act to amend The Liquor Act** be now read a second time.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I thought the

Premier was going to rise again, and apparently he isn't. I am not going to speak very long on this particular amendment, Mr. Speaker.

We put the amendment in to. I think, vividly demonstrate the hypocrisy of the NDP on this particular bill that we have before the House.

The NDP could care less about liquor advertising in Saskatchewan. The amendment to The Liquor Act as proposed by the minister, who I see is not in his seat tonight, was nothing more than a further harassment by this government of the Cable Television licensees by the CRTC.

If the government was really determined to get at the problem of liquor advertising, if indeed it is a problem, they would have acted many years ago. We have had liquor advertising on TV in Weyburn and Estevan for 10 to 15 years. The government did nothing during that period of time to prevent that advertising from being carried on. If the government wants to talk about advertising of liquor products in magazines or in their own publications, if they are against that, I suggest that they will be voting for the amendment that we have proposed.

The amendment basically suggests that a committee of the Legislature study the whole problem and determine whether it is necessary to prohibit liquor advertising of all kinds, of any nature, print, radio or TV. If the government believes in this particular policy they would accept the amendment.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they will use their majority to defeat the amendment that we proposed. One can only garner or decide from that approach from the government that they are hypocrites, that they are not concerned about liquor advertising at all, that they are concerned about getting, in any way they can. Cable Regina, Saskatoon cable and Moose Jaw cable.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members, if they are concerned about liquor advertising in this province to support the amendment as proposed by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on this bill because it is an important bill, an important bill that relates not only to the cable television industry, but an important bill as it relates to the liquor laws of the province of Saskatchewan, and I think an important bill as it also relates to the position which the Liberal Party, in particular, has found itself in now.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Leader of the Liberal Party, just a few moments ago, accuse this government of being a hypocritical government with respect to liquor advertising. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when we vote on this bill or whenever we get around to voting on it, we will have a decision made as to where the hypocrisy, lies, because when the bill was introduced the official position of the Liberal Party, in its first few days of opposition, was one of opposition to the bill because it was unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it that the Liberal Party took the position that they were opposed to this bill because it was unconstitutional. This amendment was proposed only after 10 or 15 days of political outcry by the people of Saskatchewan at the posture taken by the Liberals opposite, that this amendment was proposed as a

May 18, 1978

dodge effort.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about how the public feels about this. Make no mistake about how the people feel about it. When you get resolutions such as the Regina Board of Education, the Regina Board of Education, Mr. Speaker, the trustees of the Regina School Board opposing the position taken by the Liberal Party, or supporting the position of the New Democratic Government, when you get the Saskatchewan Alcoholism Commission supporting it, when you get the volume of letters that this government has received - Mr. Speaker. I have been involved in piloting legislation, a number of controversial piece of legislation to this House. I think that is granted by all members in the House - potash bill. Bill 47.1 haven't even piloted this bill. I want to tell you. Mr. Speaker, that I have received more individual letters of support on the position taken by the government than I have on any other controversial piece of legislation that we have had in the operation, or letters for that matter one way or the other. If the member wants them tabled, I will table the letters tomorrow. I'll table the letters tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill 46 — **An Act to establish a Heritage Fund for Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments to make pertaining to Heritage. I think I have already expressed our view of the Heritage Fund itself and the fact that this particular Heritage Fund is nothing more than a sham. I would like to compare that sham and that change of name to a particular arrangement, Mr. Speaker, that seemed to have been made today. In order to expedite the business of the House, and knowing full well that the voluntary Cattle Checkoff is a very controversial issue and a very controversial bill, Mr. Speaker, the whips agreed to expedite the business, upon the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture, because he knew that this was going to be a controversial bill and would take a week or 10 days — he agreed that if the business of the House were to finish by Friday or Saturday at the latest, that that bill would be withdrawn. The Attorney General reported that agreement to our caucus through our whip, and our whip agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The issue before the House at this time is Bill 46, An Act to establish the Heritage Fund for Saskatchewan. I fail to make a connection between the hon. member's remarks and the bill which is before us at this time. I ask the member to confine himself to the bill.

MR. COLLVER: — Fine. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. McMILLAN: — On a point of order. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the point of order?

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, I have never been party to any such agreement mentioned by the member and I am not sure if he should be allowed to continue those statements or not.

MR. SPEAKER: — That's not a point of order. The member for Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MALONE: — On a point of order. That is a point of order!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! The member is contradicting my ruling on it; it was not a point of order. Now, if the member for Lakeview has a point of order, then he should get up and make it, and not contradict the ruling that I have made.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is a point of order. When one member says that there was an agreement among whips (there are three whips in this house) and one of the whips rises and says there was no agreement, there is a point of order or a point of privilege. The rule is, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, the member affected must rise immediately; he can't wait to bring it up the next day. When somebody says something that in his view is incorrect, he must rise immediately on a point of order or a point of privilege, if you will. That is what the member did. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I say that is a valid point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I don't understand how it is a valid point of order, even after listening to the member for Lakeview. Now the member may feel that he is being misquoted or he may feel that something has been attributed to him that should not have been attributed to him, but that is not a point of order. That's exactly the point I was making; it is not a point of order. I was bringing the member for Nipawin to order because he was out of order. To the best of my knowledge, he should have been talking about Bill 46.

MR. COLLVER: — I could certainly clarify the problem on behalf of the member for Kindersley. The member for Kindersley is quite correct. There was certainly no agreement, no agreement from the members to my right. The fact is this, Mr. Speaker, that the sham that I'm referring to and comparing that to the Heritage Fund, the sham that we referred to before is the Heritage Fund. The shams that I am . . .

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the point of order?

MR. WIEBE: - The member . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, the sham that I am attempting to refer to here is the sham on behalf of the members to my right who today had an opportunity to have that bill that is affecting the voluntary checkoff and refuse to do so because they want to play politics.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. We have a point of order here.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I understand that we are discussing the Heritage Bill and not the cattle checkoff legislation. I think that the member for Nipawin should stick to the item that is before us.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that I have given the member for Nipawin ample opportunity to relate to the subject matter that is before us — Bill 46. The member has to confine himself to that. He can't go off on a tangent about some agreement of which I know nothing and present that as debate to the House. He has to stick to the principle of this bill.

MR. COLLVER: — O.K., Mr. Speaker, and the principle of this bill of course is the development of a Heritage Fund for Saskatchewan. The name, Heritage Fund and the principle is to develop a heritage for Saskatchewan. What we are talking about is a heritage and I'm trying to compare the heritage that is obtained through this Heritage Fund and the heritage of the cattlemen in this province who had an opportunity to have this voluntary checkoff bill withdrawn today. The members to my right, in order to play politics to allow this bill to be withdrawn because they wanted to go on playing politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, this Heritage Fund today is a sham, we have said this before and I'm not going to delve into that. I would like to take this comparison. The sham of the Heritage Fund compared to the sham of the members to my right in suggesting that somehow our caucus has delayed this Assembly when today, there was agreement between two parties on getting out of this House Assembly and getting this business concluded by Friday or Saturday, depending on the Minister of Agriculture's offer, because this bill came in late. He said it came in late and therefore I prefer to pull it out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the sham of that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order!

MR. ANDERSON: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This member is . . . we are not going to get out by Friday. Firstly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! That is not a point of order. Besides I think I was on my feet before the member for Shaunavon. I have warned the member for Nipawin three times now. I don't want to be put in the position of having to warn him again, to stick to the principle of Bill No. 46 which is before the House at this time. What the member is doing in effect is squandering the time of this House by talking about something that is not the subject before us and that is out of order.

MR. COLLVER: — Fine, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that the members opposite who are bringing in about this Heritage Fund and bringing about this fact that they are going to have this huge fund to use controls, use controls and are in fact, Mr. Speaker, going to . . . (interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, it used to be, Mr. Speaker, that we had problems across, it is problems behind that is causing the most problems today. Mr. Speaker, the double cost that has been performed by the NDP on terms of the Heritage Fund as it relates to the people fails in comparison with the double talk of the members to my right of the Cattlemen's Association.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Now the member has made several references to that matter. We can't get into the subject matter and discuss it. Unless, Mr. Speaker, draws him to order firmly and does not permit him to continue to make these references, or alternatively, let us answer them immediately, Mr. Speaker, that is the only way to treat the matter fairly. Now, the member is clearly out of order and continues to be out of order despite three warnings.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll just ask the member to hold his seat for a minute. I want to draw to the attention of the member for Nipawin Rule No. 25 (2):

Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman after having called the attention of the Assembly or of the committee to the conduct of a member who persists in

irrelevance or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or the arguments used by other members in debate may direct him to discontinue his speech. (I have done that four times to the member for Nipawin.) And if the member continues to speak, Mr. Speaker shall name him or, if in committee, the Chairman shall report him to the Assembly.

Now, I have given the member all the warnings I'm going to give him. He is on his last chance now.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do not intend to support this bill with reference to the Heritage Fund for Saskatchewan and I sincerely hope all members will join us in not supporting this bill.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I rose in this House introducing this particular bill. I noted to the members of the Legislature that in my judgment this was one of the most important pieces of legislation that this House is going to deal with during this session of the Legislature.

I am very proud that our government is establishing a Heritage Fund. It is a fund that not only will the people of Saskatchewan benefit from it now but future generations will be grateful and thankful for the action of this government in bringing about the Heritage Fund. It is a fund that will last in perpetuity. All the non-renewable resources will be pooled into this fund. A certain amount of it will be taken into consolidated fund. A certain amount of the money will be used for energy development. A certain amount of the revenue from this fund will be used for current development on such things as schools and hospitals, construction of roads but that is limited by this legislation to no more than 20 per cent that is left over after the consolidated fund is taken care of. And it ensures that a substantial amount of money will be invested into future revenue-producing things for the people of Saskatchewan.

I regret that both opposition parties have expressed opposition to this bill. I don't think that they have given the kind of study to this bill that I think it deserves. We heard the member for Indian Head-Wolseley say that what we should be doing is taking all the non-renewable resources and spending them today for current expenditures. He is, in effect saying, the dickens with the future, let's exploit all the resources, let's spend them now and let future generations fend for themselves. We as, New Democrats, believe that we have a responsibility to future generations, to manage our resources properly and fairly and to preserve as much as we can for future generations.

I am indeed proud of the way the New Democratic government has managed the resources. Mr. Speaker, I look back a mere seven years ago and what is the story? Under the former Liberal administration, the government, all it received was a mere \$33 million of revenue from all the nonrenewable resources. Seven years later, under the NDP government, we are going to be this year, receiving \$462 million from nonrenewable resources. All of that money is going to be used for improving the livelihood of the people of Saskatchewan today. And we have invested substantial portions of that money that we have been able to get from nonrenewable resources into potash, into further development of oil, into uranium and other nonrenewable resource development.

I think it is a proud record. It is a record that is going to mark these seven years as establishing a new policy of resource development, of resource management in this province that is becoming the envy right across the country and throughout North

May 18, 1978

America.

There are people coming in, asking us how we are managing to do it and I am glad that again, the New Democratic government is showing the path of another first and other provinces in the future will be taking Saskatchewan's example and taking our example for themselves to follow.

I regret that during this debate some regrettable statements were made. I think in time those members that have got up and spoken on this bill, when they reflect on the things that they have said, they will regret to see those statements in Hansard in future years.

We as a government are proud of what we are doing. It is a fund that is going to be totally accountable to this Legislature which is unequalled to that of any other province.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear. hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 70 - **An Act to amend The Election Act, 1971** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 72 - **An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it is about 9:47 o'clock and we can . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Call the bill, Roy.

MR. ROMANOW: — On Tuesday. We will call it on Tuesday. What I would like to do, unless the members do not agree, is to deal with the Public Service Superannuation Board which — If you say 'no, we don't want to do that', that is fine. We will just pack up the House but I propose to the House that we do the Public Service Superannuation Board; therefore I call Committee of Finance.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to continue down the order paper, go on to the next bill and talk about it as long as we can. That is what the Attorney General got us into when he got on to adjourned debates which I welcomed. We are ready to continue it. We are not ready to go back into Committee of Finance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well I kind of doubt whether we can, because we are not in Committee of Finance and I asked when the committee should sit again and I believe the statement made at that time was, 'at the next sitting of the House'.

MR. ROMANOW: — This House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: — It has been moved by the Attorney General that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

MR. ROMANOW: — I am sorry. Type up the motion. I would like to move this motion, by leave of the Assembly, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Finance:

That this Assembly adjourn on Friday, May 19, 1978, and stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 23, 1978.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:49 o'clock p.m.