

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**April 24, 1979.**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR**  
**VOTE 20**

**ITEM 1 Continued**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. When we called it 5 o'clock we were on item 1.

Item 1, as amended, agreed.

Items 2 to 4 agreed.

**ITEM 5**

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Minister, last year in estimates I was questioning you about some individuals going to a school where they are being paid part of their wages while they are away at school. We have one, I believe, in Saskatoon. Is this the right estimate for that individual? I may be in the wrong estimate. He's away at a school taking courses and you continue to pay him a portion of his wages.

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — I think you're making reference to the educational leave provisions that are common throughout the public service and I expect one of the members you may be drawing attention to has, or was, or will be, in the future involved in the industrial relations division of the department.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'd like to go just a little further with this one. One of them is in school in Saskatoon, I believe, and was involved in the CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) strike in Saskatoon with the job evaluation training program. He is on leave at 50 per cent of salary? Is that correct?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think you're making reference to S. Walter who is on educational leave and is finishing a degree in law at the University of Saskatchewan. I believe that is the one you are making reference to.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I would ask you to convey this to Sig Walters. I compliment him, even though he is not required to come back and assist in negotiations that are tough while he is on leave, of doing that of his own free will, I think that is remarkable. That was the only reason I wanted it brought up.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I will convey that to him. He is one of the very excellent people we have in the department, accompanied by many more of course.

Items 6, 7 and 8 agreed.

**Item 9**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I will put all my comments on occupational health on the number 9 vote. I guess that is the easy way to do it.

I am concerned, first of all, with both the legality and the ability of your department to

enforce the occupational health requirements in the new areas of mining in northern Saskatchewan, and all of the ramifications. As I understand it, presently, the federal government, prior to the election, was saying, that is our authority. They have, by default, allowed you to move in and look after it. You have done a better job than the federal department has normally done in the past, but I am concerned with your abilities in this area. I ask, first of all, is that part of the reason for the additional — sorry, I notice that there is a reduction in staff in one area and I am concerned.

In one area I notice there is an additional, and is that additional staff the man you refer to in Lac La Ronge?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member expresses some concern about our ability to do a better job than the federal government. I have to say that would not be difficult because of the fact the federal government in the province of Saskatchewan has two people: one who spends his time in the office while the other is a fieldman who, I think, was probably attempting in his own way to do the best he could under pretty difficult circumstances. We have, I think, had some good co-operation with respect to the attitude at Eldorado where they have, I think, complied with all of the requirements that we have set before them in terms of occupational health and safety.

The hon. member will know too, I'm sure, that the lease agreement we signed at Amok was one dependent upon the authorities of the mining company involved living up to the requirements of Saskatchewan's occupational health and safety provisions. I think we have to regard it as being a giant step forward in light of the fact that our labor laws in terms of occupational health and safety are, indeed, enforceable in the province of Saskatchewan in uranium mining with respect to the Amok lease which by agreement includes Eldorado, we have had a good working relationship and, accordingly, they have shown real willingness to accept the provisions laid down in Saskatchewan law. Probably only time will indicate what resources will be needed with the expansion of the industry, particularly in northern Saskatchewan, but we'll be governed by the influences of accelerated activity in the North.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I asked for something . . . and I may be out of line for asking what I'm about to request. My concern with the whole development in the North is obvious. I think the minister knows about it. And I think your deputy minister or your associate deputy minister, whatever his title is, knows my concern. I'm wondering if it's out of line to ask for a copy of any occupational health orders concerning the mining in the northern part of Saskatchewan — for a copy of those orders to be sent to me? For example, when there's a problem, the occupational health group will report to the department and know their findings are posted on the bulletin board at the plant, therefore, they are public information, but it's pretty tough for me to get up there and pick them off the board.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I presume, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is asking for any orders that are issued by the Occupational Health and Safety Division after the occupational health and safety committees have had an opportunity to look at it, have failed to resolve the problem and have referred them to the department for resolution. It's the future orders which are issued that the member is interested in, in particular, I would gather.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — In particular, Mr. Minister, I would like those, yes. But, if it is feasible (and I may be out of line in asking for this one), because they are public documents that the occupational committees have and they do post them on the bulletin board at every

mine site and so forth, would your department be able to send me a copy of the reports?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'm a little unclear on what it is the hon. member is asking. He's asking that any corrective orders issued by one of the occupational health officers in the department relative to uranium mining be forwarded to him, a copy of that corrective order. O.K., that's one question.

The second question is: is the hon. member asking for the follow-up material relative to the action taken by the company in question in conforming to the order that was issued by the occupational health officer. We are just wondering what kind of a problem we get into in following up and supplying the member with all of the subsequent material that comes about as a result of the original order being issued. It may involve, you know, a fair bit of material that may be totally irrelevant in the final sense. I am just wondering if you can . . . we don't object to doing it but we wonder when you've received as much as you want, if you could just sort of clarify what your real wishes are.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not even worried about the follow-up material. What I am concerned is . . . when there is a problem identified, if I am notified of that problem then I will keep in touch with your deputy associate minister to see how the problem is being cured from there on. My concern is if there is a problem I would like to make sure that you people are aware of it and I would like to know that it is being looked after.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Mr. Sass agrees that he will make you aware of any orders that are issued and keep you in touch.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Mr. Minister, at the present time as I understand it under the occupational health and safety regulations there is no stipulated time whereby a company has to set up their committee. Is it the intention of your department to plug this loophole?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think the member will understand that under normal circumstances the occupational health and safety committees are set up voluntarily. It's only as a result of a set of circumstances that it will be drawn to our attention. Or the occupational health people in doing an inspection of the premises will discover that an occupational health and safety committee is not in place. I suppose to give an example of this the T.C. Douglas Building was an example where the occupational health . . . I anticipated the question . . . The occupational health and safety committee was not in place and was not functioning, and I think we could have avoided a good number of the problems relative to that particular difficulty in the event that the occupational health and safety committee had been in place and had been functioning properly. In an order of contravention which is issued by the occupational health and safety people under normal circumstances, the length of time which is allowed for an occupational health and safety committee to be established is mentioned and then they will be required — the place of business, the place of operation — to set up an occupational health and safety committee where there are more than ten employees in that place of business.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if I heard correctly. Are you saying that the occupational health and safety committee is a voluntary committee to be set up at the whim and will of the business or is it compulsory? Do they not have to have an occupational health and safety committee in all places of employment?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Occupational health and safety committees are required by law in all places of employment where there are ten or more employees. And the Department of Labour, in enforcing this legislation, has been diligent in attempting to pursue in all cases the failure to comply with that requirement. Obviously, there will be some instances where the committees are more active than others, and in some cases I expect where they are not functioning to the extent that we would wish. In the vast majority of cases the occupational health and safety committees are functioning and are overseeing the operation and I think performing a very useful and worthwhile service. I think statistics bear that out.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If you are saying that it is a requirement by law, why did you earlier say that it was on a voluntary basis?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think the record will indicate that I did not say that it was voluntary. It never has been since the passage of the act in 1972. It is a requirement by law to set up an occupational health and safety committee. If I gave the inference at all that it was voluntary, then I apologize because that is not the case.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, then to get back to my original question, there is no time required to set up a committee from the time the company exists to a given period of time?

**MR. SNYDER:** — No, the necessity is required by law to set up a committee forthwith, and you will appreciate the large numbers of establishments in the province where there are ten employees or more and there will be some slippage I expect on occasions. When it becomes the knowledge of the department, then the department moves in such a way as to require by an order of contravention that an occupational health and safety committee will be put in place and then specify in the order the length of time allowed for the committee to be established.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The only comment I would like to make on it, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that if it is required by law to be organized and set forthwith, then please tell me why your own department failed to do so in the T.C. Douglas Building and why it went for, I believe, something like seven months where the employees were actually suffering from a situation detrimental to their health and nothing was done to get the committee organized.

I can't understand why your own department — I could understand it if it was somebody else's department; it might be a little different — failed to comply with the law as required by the occupational health and safety law.

**MR. SNYDER:** — You know, I think the member has to recognize — when you say my own department, what do you mean by my own department? The government services were involved in terms of building the building. The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services had employees in the quarters that you're describing and the Department of Labour was not made aware of any problems until November. We were then first made aware of the fact that there were some difficulties and we moved subsequent to that in order to correct those problems which have been, I think, resolved to the general satisfaction of everybody concerned. But the Department of Labour was not made aware of those circumstances until November.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I would contradict that statement, Mr. Minister. The complaints came in to the occupational health and safety department in July.

**MR. SNYDER:** — No they did not.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Where were the complaints made then? You tell me! There were complaints made in July of last year. Who were they made to?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'm given to understand that people within the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services made some complaints directly to their union, to the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association, and we were not made aware of the problems that existed, until November of 1978. That was the first instance where we were aware of the fact that there was a difficulty involved in that premises.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I don't have the evidence with me, Mr. Minister, but I intend to look into the matter. I'm convinced that I'm correct in saying that the complaints were passed on to your department at that time, but, as I say, I have no evidence with me to confirm that fact.

Item 9 agreed.

Items 10 and 11 agreed.

## **ITEM 12**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, on this vote, (I believe this is the vote where the staff in the occupational health building do all the testing and so forth) are these the four people who are doing all the testing out in the back, if you know the area I'm referring to?

**MR. SNYDER:** — No, this should properly be found under subvote 10. We can revert to it if you wish or handle it any way you wish.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — My concern is (I thought it was 12; I apologize for that one) the associate deputy minister has been on his little crusade, for lack of a better word, for the labelling of hazardous products for people in industry and I refer to paints and so forth . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would love to read it. I'll ignore the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) and stay to the topic. The minister is aware, I'm certain, of the associate deputy minister's comments in the press and he has spoken out well on the concerns of labelling of products such as paints and other toxic chemicals. In fact, there was a motion earlier today on the blues discussing that with the amendment made by the government's side. I personally agree with the associate deputy minister on his crusade because I think he's on the right track. I'm wondering if the department, as it is not law in Canada and in Saskatchewan, is slowly building up a file or a log so they can advise people in Saskatchewan who deal with hazardous chemicals of brands, and things to be careful with, and some of the antidotes that are

available though not listed on cans yet?

**MR. SNYDER:** — We believe considerable progress has been made over the past number of months. I think the hon. member will know of some regulations which have been passed with respect to the handling of anhydrous ammonia, for example, and there have been a number of other bulletins which have been issued for the agricultural community with respect to pesticides.

There has been some extensive work on the dissemination of information on PCBs. We have been successful in the department in having a technical committee of the CAALL (Canadian Association of Administrators of Labour Legislation) which meets annually. We have been instrumental in having a committee do some, I think, very forward looking work in order to impress upon the federal government the need for the establishment of an arrangement where all chemicals imported into Canada and imported into Saskatchewan from other provinces will have a labelling provision in order that people who are dealing with toxic and hazardous chemicals will be able to determine the nature of the commodities which they are dealing with. So I think we've gone a considerable distance over the last number of months in particular, and it is still very much on our order of priorities.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — One final comment, Mr. Minister. I think it is only proper to thank your deputy minister and your associate for the assistance they have given me in any labor or occupational health problem I have brought to them in the past year.

Item 12 agreed.

### **ITEM 13**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being called out of order on this particular subject, I would like to reply to the minister who has twice now taken the opportunity when I was out of the Chamber to attack me on an unfair labor practice, a charge which was laid against me some time ago. May I proceed in that vein, sir? We are talking about employment practices.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I fail to see where it is relevant to the item under discussion here.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I missed item 1 since I wasn't here. The other time that I was attacked on that particular subject I was out of the House. I'm looking at this particular item, and it says, "concerned with labour policy and employment practices." I'm wondering if, perhaps, this isn't the time when I can reply to the minister on that particular subject?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There are, I suppose, two ways in which I can handle this. I can ask permission from the House to refer to item 1 again and handle that question at that time. That's the only way I can. I'd have to have unanimous agreement for this. Those in favor of returning to item 1 say aye.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Aye.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Those opposed say nay. Return to item 1.

**Revert to Item 1**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to correct the minister on several of the statements that were made the first time that he discussed my situation (it was a personal situation and it occurred several years ago). I will admit, to begin with, that there were several charges — not one, but several, some 15 or 20 — I can't remember how many unfair labor practice charges were laid against me on which I was, I don't know whether the term was convicted or whatever you use, in saying that I was found guilty of one particular situation where I released an employee.

I had my reasons for doing so at the time. I think this was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I believe the minister's reasons for attacking me at the time were because of a statement that I made in the House where I accused his Labour Relations Board of being biased. I stand by that statement that at the time the Labour Relations Board you had was very biased.

In the particular case that you are referring to, Mr. Minister, if you had all of the evidence with you, and you may have read all of the evidence, you will recall that those members of the board who were not appointed by your department, but were appointed by management, found very much in favor of our company.

I have it, and if you would like it read into the record I will make it available.

The charge that was finally used (if I might use that word) was one where the decision was brought down by the chairman himself.

I have never had any problems with labor organizations. I'm dealing with one at the present time. We had negotiations last fall where everything went very smoothly. I am very, very much in agreement with labor organizations and labor unions.

The main issue, if you like, of the day which you keep referring to, Mr. Minister, was not a question of the labor union itself being there. It was not a question of unfair labor practices being laid against my company (phony charges I might add, in every, every instance). It was rather a question of whether or not the employees of that company wanted a union in the place of business. The petition (if that is the proper term) that was used, again, was as phony as it possibly could be. The evidence and the proof of which, when your department finally after two years of harassment, and my employees finally agreed to have a secret ballot vote that we had been asking for for two years. When your department finally agreed to allow that secret ballot vote which you had been refusing all of this time, it turned out that 80 per cent voted against wanting the union in that place of business. That was the only argument that ever existed in that particular case, Mr. Minister, and it is unfortunate that you will bring into this House, a situation that as I said, was phony, a situation where my employees of the day were harassed by your union organizers (let me make that very clear) and where it wasn't wanted.

I am managing a company today that has a union; they want a union and God bless them, they have it with my blessings. Please understand that I never, as you have insinuated, at any time, opposed a union in my place of business or any other place of business. I firmly believe that where employees want to be organized then they have every right to be so organized, but where they don't want to be organized, have every right not to be organized.

That is the difference and the main difference of philosophy which I have argued with you before, and that I have finally, in the case you keep referring to, won the battle.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to go into any detail with respect to the problems of the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) in days gone by. My only reason in raising this was because I thought the hon. member levied what I regarded as an untrue and unfair attack on the Labour Relations Board during this session of the legislature. I expect that there are a lot of people who have been convicted of different offences who regard the magistrate, who was sitting on his case, as being unfair and unbiased to him.

All I'm saying is that the Labour Relations Board, I believe, is the best Labour Relations Board that has been seen in the province of Saskatchewan. It has a chairman who has integrity, I think, that is unquestioned by anyone. The seat that you are sitting in was occupied by the Leader of the Opposition just one year ago, during my estimates. The Leader of the Opposition at that time chose the same unfair tactics and indicated that my deputy minister was the one who was giving the Labour Relations Board their marching orders. I think that is a scurrilous thing to be suggested by anyone in this legislature, that a man, a legal person, a learned person and a member of the bar, should be accused of directing Mr. Sherstobitoff, another person I regard as a person steeped in integrity. I get a little tired and little upset about vicious attacks that are being made upon the Labour Relations Board and if you choose to operate in that way, that if you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen or some of the heat will be returned to you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — If you can't stand the heat, don't play around in the kitchen. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go into the details of the case. I think the record speaks for itself. They're not my words and the suggestion by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) that I should step out and repeat them has very little relevance.

Of course, I will step outside the House and read from the records of the Labour Relations Board the written reasons provided by the chairman which indicate a set of circumstances that people can judge on their merit. I don't propose to stand here and debate with the hon. member indicating that he is somehow evil and I am not evil or that the opposite situation is true. I just don't propose to involve myself in that kind of a situation. But my concern is the unwarranted, untrue attacks that are being levied against the Labour Relations Board (which, in effect, has a large number of people) by the hon. member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau), by the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver), your fearless leader during the last session of the legislature. I'll allow the record to speak for itself and the quotations that I read into the record earlier in this session were direct quotations from the transcript of the proceedings and the material that was provided. It's all a matter of public record and I don't propose to go into it in any depth at this stage.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would only add to that statement that, yes, I would let the records speak for themselves too. Only bring all of the records in to let them all speak for themselves and that would be the difference not just those that you choose. But we can take all of the records of the case or the many cases involved and let them speak for themselves and you'd find a much different reply or decision than what you've insinuated and suggested that happened in that particular case. I



can't speak for the leader of the — I'm not sure what leader of the opposition you were referring to and I wasn't here and so I don't know what you're talking about. I repeat the attack I made on your Labour Relations Board. It was, and I insist and I will always insist that it was definitely a biased Labour Relations Board. I'll tell you why I say that. Go back into your records and I'm not referring to your present chairman because I don't know him. But what I am telling you is this: go back into your records, Mr. Minister, and you tell me how many cases under the previous chairman's regime were won by management and how many were won by the labor. I think you'd find in the records something like 99 per cent were won by labor and 1 per cent won by the management and that's why I say to you that it was a biased Labour Relations Board. You speak of — if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen — I agree with you. That's why I'm replying to you here tonight because the heat doesn't bother me and I will reply to you on those terms at any time on a subject as that. I'll go one step further, Mr. Minister, if your Labour Relations Board, and you're saying that it is not biased and I'm saying it was and I don't know about today's but I'm referring to the previous one and you know the one I'm talking about, then why is it that whenever a decision was brought down it could never be appealed? That's part of the law of The Labour Act — no appeal to the decisions brought down by your Labour Relations Board. It's right in your act . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not referring to Alberta. I'm referring to Saskatchewan. I'm talking about the Labour Relations Board that you have here in this province. I don't care what the rest of the country is doing. This is what I'm concerned about. I suggest to you, sir, that if it was so fair, and if it was so unbiased, then you wouldn't be afraid to carry it further and allow appeals to a higher court when decisions are not acceptable by either party. And you don't allow this under the act and under the law the way it is today. I still say to you that the Labour Relations Board — and I will repeat it as long as I live — the Labour Relations Board that I dealt with at the time that you're referring to was a biased Labour Relations Board.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the reasoning of the hon. member has to be described as pretty warped reasoning, if he suggests that the reason why there is not an appeal from the Labour Relations Board is somehow an indication of the fact that the board was biased. You know, the hon. member will know that regardless of where you travel in Canada today, and I think probably in the United States also where they have jurisdictional authority, there is not an appeal from the Labour Relations Board on the question of fact. On the question of law, yes, but that is for a very real reason. First of all, the courts of the land don't want to have their docket cluttered up with a host of problems such as that. Secondly, it would be a matter of relegating to the courts of the land matters which I think are not properly dealt with by the courts because of their lack of understanding and, in effect, their wish to be freed of any obligation to adjudicate. The whole decision, with respect to certification, unfair labour practice and things of that nature must come to rest at some point in time.

Appreciate the fact that your Labour Relations Board is made up — it's a quasi-judicial body — of representatives, equal numbers of labour and management people who will probably be found in your committee rooms — the management ones — and they will not be found in mine. So let's just assume, and I think with a great deal of assurance, that the management people on the Labour Relations Board will be adjudicating carefully and, I think, in a judicious fashion. To allow for that situation to go the court of appeal, to the Court of Queen's Bench, or to the Supreme Court of Canada, I think the member would have to agree, would do a great disservice to the whole proposition that I think we should all be here attempting to defend. I think it would create a set of circumstances that we certainly could not live with, and certainly every provincial jurisdiction in Canada agrees with the premise that allowing matters of that nature to

be appealed to two or three different levels of judgment would do a disservice.

I think the member's reasoning, if he'll think about it for a moment . . . I would have to indicate to him that that is not an appropriate way to go and would not be acceptable either to the working public nor would it be acceptable to the majority of employers.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Question of how do we relate this change now into the rest of the budget? Will somebody look after making sure . . . does Mr. Smishek look after that, or how does that get done?

Item 13 agreed.

Labour Vote 20 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

**DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN  
VOTE 26**

**ITEM 1 (Continued)**

**MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** — O.K., Mr. Minister, last night, I think, before we got on to the aircraft and got bogged down a little bit, and I think the bogging down was just with all due respect, because the answers weren't forthcoming quite as quickly as they might have been. So, with your co-operation tonight and given those answers, we've got several questions on several subjects that we would like to go into and with Mr. Chairman's consent here we can ask these under subvote 1 and then we'll go through there. Is that acceptable, Mr. Chairman?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Agreed, agreed.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., I was asking before we got into the aircraft about some of your programs, your training programs in the North. I would like to ask you now about the options north program in terms of the numbers of people that you now have in managerial positions. I don't think we got into the managerial segment of that last night . . . the number of people, northerners, in managerial positions working for your department at the present time.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, if his question refers specifically to the options north program, I must explain the Options North program is set up to train people for northern administrative positions and no-one has graduated from that program as yet.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., we'll go back on that then. Anyway, I would like to know how many people would be classified as northerners (under the definition of northerners that we're both aware of) are among those you have now in managerial positions? In that I don't include people who are foremen on crews and so on, but I mean in management positions. How many northerners would you have?

**MR. BYERS:** — Within the department, you're asking?

**MR. McLEOD:** — Within the department at the present time.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't have that specific information here split out as to northerners and non-northerners. We can provide you with that information but we

don't have it split out here.

**MR. McLEOD:** — That's fine. That would be acceptable. Just provide that, you know, in a relatively short time. And also, along with that, just give a description of the job that they're in and so on; when you're in that it shouldn't be much of a problem. But provide that and that will be acceptable.

**MR. BYERS:** — Yes, we'll provide you that information.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — To the hon. member. Can you give for us the number of SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) recipients under the DNS as of January 30th of this year? I would like to know how many of those recipients have also received other grants through DNS and for what purpose would they receive those grants? I would also like to know what number of those recipients have taken various job training programs up there, of whatever nature?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, may I revert to the first question of the hon. member? I will then take the questions from the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane).

Northern employees in supervisory positions — I will give them to you in two categories, public service and labor service:

Resources - public service, 15; labor service, 16.

Social service - public service, 12.

Economic development - public service, 15; labor service, 13.

Administration - public service, 4; labor service, 1.

Personnel and training - public service, 3.

Extension service - public service, 2.

Academic education - public service, 1.

Northern Air Service - public service, 1.

Property management - public service, 2; labor service, 10.

Engineering - public service, 1; labor service, 1.

Materials management - public service, 3.

Road construction - public service, 2; labor service, 1.

Northern housing - public service, 5; labor service, 15.

Those are northern employees in supervisory positions. The total - 125.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle asked the question and I was getting information for him. Do you want to follow up on that then?

**MR. McLEOD:** — When you said supervisory positions, are you not including foremen, you know, foremen on say crews on part time work or anything like that?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, foremen are included.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the questions of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), first, the number of social assistance plan recipients as of January 30, 1979: there were 900 clients or family heads in January of 1978. The latest statistic we have is July of 1978 when the number was 722.

I want to draw to the attention of all hon. members that the number of family heads, as expressed as a percentage of the population who were supported fully or partially by the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, the dependency rate, in 1973-74 it was 30 per cent, in 1977-78 it had dropped to 16 per cent. Number two — the number who received grants through DNS and for what purpose. You'll appreciate this will take a bit of research but we can provide you with that information. Do you have in mind any specific kind of grant?

**MR. LANE:** — I am advised in the department that you have absolutely no way of monitoring your programs to determine whether or not they are successful in taking people permanently off the poverty cycle. You have to monitor those grant programs to find out your starting point, the number on SAP, whether they have taken the programs and whether or not they are permanently employed. Because if all we are doing is creating a vicious cycle up there in temporary employment programs and they are back on Saskatchewan assistance, then obviously there's a failure. I thought that you would have that information at your finger tips, quite frankly, because you seem to be very select on what information you have and not the stuff that counts.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the figures speak for themselves with respect to taking people out of the poverty cycle when the percentage of the population dependent on social assistance for their livelihood has decreased from 30 per cent of the population in 1973-74, to 24 per cent in 1974-75 and to 16 per cent in 1977-78. This illustrates some success in getting people out of the poverty bind. Secondly, it is the intention of the government to provide training opportunities to all adults who are eligible to enter training programs. The number who are entering it are certainly substantial.

**MR. LANE:** — Except that what you are saying is in complete contradiction to your own annual report and I am going to show you page 26. I don't know whether you have read it.

After a number of years of decline in the number of persons receiving social assistance expenditures, there has been an increase in both areas in the fiscal year under review.

Some of the reasons you have given are the poor fishing and trapping conditions as well as legislated increases in SAP allowance per recipient. Now what that means to me and I think what that means to any right thinking individual is that you are, in fact, in your own department, first of all misleading the House on the information you have given, and it's completely hogwash. Secondly, you're saying that one of the reasons for the increase in the number of SAP recipients in the north (in your own annual report) is because you are giving away too much money. Now, if there has ever been an indication of a failure of a program, that has to be it. I don't know what it takes for the

members opposite to understand! Billions of dollars have been spent in five U.S. states finally proving that one of the things about guaranteed annual income is that people don't want to work. It took billions of dollars to come to a conclusion that anybody with the slightest iota of common sense could tell the bureaucrats.

I suggest to you . . . and I don't want to hear you shaking your empty head when I'm talking to the minister here . . . I just want to tell the minister that your annual report is completely contrary to what you have been telling the House.

Secondly, one of the reasons for an increase in the number of SAP recipients is because you're giving more money (legislated). I think this indicates that you're not doing something right. I think that you may in fact be creating a colonial atmosphere in the North of more money to keep more on welfare.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle can rant and rave and claim there is no success but there are 125 people in supervisory positions who were not in supervisory positions six years ago.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — May I say to him that the numbers which I just gave him are inflated. The 722 clients in July is really an inflated figure because the people who are in the alcohol rehab centres (may I tell the members opposite) are included in those numbers. The reason is CAP sharing.

In 1978-79 there were 125 users of the alcohol rehab centres; so they're counted in the 722, which brings the actual number down to around 600. The numbers were four to five times that high five or six years ago.

**MR. LANE:** — I just got your annual report. Your annual report states that there has been an increase in the number of persons receiving social assistance. You give some of the reasons. You've got poor fishing and trapping conditions as well as legislated increases in SAP allowance for recipients.

If that's one of the causes of the increases in the number of recipients, then I say to you that the system is wrong. That in fact . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm taking the annual report, that in fact what you're doing by giving more money to SAP, by your own words is encouraging people not to work. You say it in your own annual report.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are encouraging people to work. We are providing the work for them to do. The member says there's an increase . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It's in your annual report.

**MR. BYERS:** — All right, that there is an increase in one year. The increase happens to be 1 per cent and with a 722 dependency rate that's an increase of 7 families, on the average in 1 year.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Just one thing to add to that. Where you say in the annual report, the slowdown of employment in the North combined with poor fishing and trapping conditions . . . I would submit to you that in the last years and including that year, 1977-78, your fur prices were excellent and on the increase in the North. So that can't be a reason for that . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! We could do with a lot less assistance here, if we want to proceed with the business tonight. I ask you to co-operate with the Chair. Let's try to get through some of these estimates.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I couldn't agree with you more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister you had given the figure of 140 supervisory positions in the North, of northerners?

**MR. BYERS:** — 125.

**MR. McLEOD:** — How many permanent positions do you have in the DNS civil service?

**MR. BYERS:** — When this budget is approved, 464 including all clerical and stenographic staff.

**MR. McLEOD:** — What you are really saying is that in the supervisory positions I was asking you for then, you are including people who aren't necessarily permanent positions in DNS?

**MR. BYERS:** — Yes. The numbers I gave you under labor service are permanent labor service positions.

All right, just to clarify for the hon. member. I gave you the statistics under resources, under public service and labor service. The public service are the permanent positions of the department. In other words, they make up the 464.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., I just want this final clarification. What I am talking about here, Mr. Minister, is, of the 125, some are in what you call, labor service. In that labor service, the people in so-called supervisory services positions aren't necessarily permanent employees of your department? Is that right?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I gave the hon. member a breakdown under public service and labor service. The public service column is the permanent establishment, the 464. The labor service will be people who may work 12 months of the year but they are in the labor service. I hope that satisfies him.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Let's have one more run at this. All I want to know is, the number in labor services. Can they, the people you categorized as being in supervisory positions before, actually be temporary employees, is that right?

**MR. BYERS:** — No, they are not temporary as we define temporary, because they can work 12 months of the year in labor service. For example, a foreman on construction, road construction or housing construction, can be in a supervisory position in labor service. He can work 12 months of the year; he is not part of the permanent establishment of the department. He is not one of the 464 of the permanent establishment.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Just one last question. So really, what you are saying is that you have got a good deal more than 464.

**MR. BYERS:** — He's not part of the permanent establishment of the department. He's not one of the 464 of the permanent establishment, yes.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I have just one last comment. So, really, what you're saying is you've got a good deal more than 464 people who work actually full time in DNS? O.K., we won't prolong this too long, but . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — Because we deliver our own projects and programs, housing road building and the like, yes. The answer is yes.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., that's fine. I would like you to explain a different topic now. I would like you to give me the guidelines for your education leave program within your department for your employees.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, the guidelines for educational leave in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are identical to the Public Service Commission.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Are there no special educational leave provisions for people, say northerners, who would be moving into your DNS employ who would get some special circumstances?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, there's no preference, in that sense, for northerners.

**MR. McLEOD:** — In the part of your report on the fisheries branch under resources, it says a great deal of the programs delivered by the fisheries branch were directly to support the fishing industry. We'll talk about it in terms of funds first of all. How much money was put in there specifically for the ice harvest in the North in that year?

**MR. BYERS:** — None. That program in the last several years has been funded through the FFMC, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I have another question on yet another topic. Can you give me some information regarding your employee housing subsidy? What would be the average cost, in these estimates for the coming year, to an employee for accommodation in DNS housing, those that are provided? Right.

**MR. BYERS:** — We expect that the gross subsidy in the coming year will be in the order of \$1 million and there are about 490 houses.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Certainly you may not be able to provide this, but I would like you to provide that information, the average cost. I know that they're broken into apartments and single-family units and so on, but I would like you to provide that information if possible. I'm sure it will be.

**MR. BYERS:** — You asked for (if I understood your question right and I wrote it down) the average cost for employee. I'm telling you that we're budgeting for a gross subsidy of about \$1 million and there are in the order of 490 houses. So, that's the average subsidy per house.

**MR. McLEOD:** — That's fine. I'm sorry, I misunderstood. O.K.

Has there been any significant change since last year, since the year we've just been through in terms of the amount of subsidy provided?

**MR. BYERS:** — The changes in the housing subsidy program are really twofold: (1) the employees in DNS houses were notified that effective April 1 they would be responsible for the utility costs. (2) to offset the utility costs, which in the future will be paid by the employee, the department did not increase the rentals effective April 1. Those are really two changes in the program.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., one final thing on this. Could you provide information as to the range of the highest subsidy provided and the lowest? If you don't have it there right now, it's fine, but if you do — the highest and the lowest subsidy.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, this is a fairly detailed question the hon. member's asked for, the highest subsidy and the lowest subsidy, and there are many factors and houses in many communities. I think, rather than hold up the House, we'll provide you with that information. You want the high and the low.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Right. The apartments, houses and mobile homes.

**MR. BYERS:** — High and low? Apartments, houses, and mobile homes for the fiscal year 1977-78 or 1978-79? 1978-79, I would take it.

**MR. LANE:** — May I ask the hon. minister what the potential loss to northerners is, from the charges that have been laid through the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) administration of the RRAP (Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program) on behalf of CMHC (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation) and what action the government is taking to give compensation back to those people who suffered losses?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe the question that the hon. member has asked is now before the courts.

**MR. LANE:** — Is your refusal to answer because the matter is now before the courts?

**MR. BYERS:** — Yes.

**MR. LANE:** — And you are entertaining no questions on this matter because it's before the courts, is that correct?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I understand the rules of this House to be that it is inappropriate for a member to comment on a matter that is before the courts.

**MR. LANE:** — Well, it's not been the practice in the past. We've heard several comments on matters before the courts, led by members on that side of the House and members on this side of the House, when it comes to all your court cases with your resource company. My question is that when those court cases are settled, are you then prepared, or is your government prepared, to allow questions on your administration of the RRAP? I'm assuming you're refusing to answer that one because you'll want to hide it. Let's just get one thing . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not answering the hon. member's question because he is asking a question of a matter that is before the courts, and he is asking me to comment on what I will do after the decision is rendered. At the present time the decision has not been rendered and therefore I will not respond to the hon. member's



question.

**MR. LANE:** — I didn't ask you what you would do after. I asked you if after the court cases you will be prepared at that time to answer questions from the opposition. Because let me tell you that if you try to give a defence, it's not under the year under review or try to skirt around it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it's already before the courts, for heavens sakes. Where have you been? Charges were laid. Do you want the names or . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, please. I'm quoting from 335 in Beauchesne:

Members are expected to refrain from discussing matters that are before the courts or tribunals which are courts of record. The purpose of this sub-judice convention is to protect the parties in a case awaiting or undergoing trial and persons who stand to be affected by the outcome of a judicial enquiry. It is a voluntary restraint imposed by the House upon itself in the interest of justice and fair play.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — So that's the ruling.

**MR. LANE:** — Honored more in breach than otherwise, Mr. Chairman. I just want to warn the hon. minister — and I'm assuming with the cabinet shuffle that there will be more changes with the various cabinet ministers and whoever happens to get saddled with DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) and you're going to be questioned when those court cases are finished and you're going to be in question pretty intensely and you better not come before this Assembly without your facts and without your records because that was a scandal of the gravest proportions and it involved the operations of your department. And I think it's one of the blackest days in the history of your department when you allowed those particular procedures to be followed so be ready to answer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I think the hon. member realizes the ruling that I have made and I ask him to adhere to that and I think that we must entertain a new question. I entertain the member for Meadow Lake.

**MR. LANE:** — I'd like to ask the minister some more questions on the recent announcement of the manpower secretariat, if you'll entertain them at this particular point and we can get off subvote 1. What about after further questions but doing it under this particular subvote? The press release indicates that, in addition to other activities, the manpower secretariat will be preparing and negotiating all future leases with mining companies. Now, first of all I would like to know in detail the names and the qualifications of the personnel involved in the manpower secretariat? And I'm sure when you announced the secretariat that you had people in mind and for something as important as this you, in fact, had the qualifications determined.

Secondly, I would like you to explain for the Assembly what, in fact, you mean by preparing and negotiating all future leases? That seems to me to be a mineral resources project as to leases with the mining companies and perhaps you can explain that before questioning is continued.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, the response to the first question concerning the qualifications of the people to run the manpower secretariat. There will be three positions — a director, a research officer and a secretary. None of the positions have

been filled at this time. The positions have been advertised by the PSC (Public Service Commission). The advertising ended, I believe, last Saturday. The competition is now closed and the selection of the personnel for those three positions has not at this time been made.

Why will the manpower secretariat in DNS be assigned the responsibility for negotiating future leases? That's a government decision.

**MR. LANE:** — You know, maybe you'd better have a cabinet meeting or a caucus or something and tell him to read his own material that's gone out.

One, he didn't understand what was in his annual report and tried to argue with his own annual report, which was a great devastating battle in this Assembly, as a cabinet minister fought with his own record. Secondly, now we take a look and he decides to tell us that no one has been hired in the manpower secretariat. But you take a look at the news release, April 19, by the same minister, "some employees have already been hired by the new body." Now for heaven's sake will you make up your mind and shape up and give us the information for which I asked you before.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, the acting deputy minister of economic development has been in charge pending the appointment of the permanent staff.

**MR. LANE:** — So that some employees which you have already hired consist of one employee, not already hired, is that what you are saying?

**MR. BYERS:** — No, I am saying that the assistant deputy minister of the Economic Development Branch has been performing this role pending the permanent appointments of the staff to man the secretariat.

**MR. LANE:** — It's your own press release. Do you read them? Oh sure, sure he does read them. Some employees, maybe there are a lot of big words here for you - some employees - double e, s on employees have (referring to the plural as opposed to the singular) already been hired by the new body. In fact, what you have done is you have transferred one person over by the sound of things and you haven't hired anybody, in which case the press release is not accurate.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the assistant deputy minister of the Economic Development Branch and his senior resource officer and his staff have been handling the duties of the secretariat since it was announced in December. We are now in the process of recruiting the permanent staff for that secretariat according to the rules of hiring which are followed by the government through the Public Service Commission. There is nothing unusual about them.

**MR. LANE:** — You know it is typical. I suppose it is not the first press release which has come out of the government opposite that has been thoroughly inaccurate. When you're talking about future leases with mining companies, are you in fact talking about mineral leases? Is that what you are talking about?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, we're talking about surface leases.

**MR. LANE:** — Now what constitutes the factors in a surface lease? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Above ground, I didn't want to confuse him.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan gets its legislative mandate to negotiate surface leases under The Provincial Lands Act.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What more do you want, Gary?

**MR. LANE:** — Well you seem to be a little gun shy. I'm trying to figure out exactly what activities you're going to perform here and you're throwing a stone wall already. You know we've got a whole Department of Mineral Resources and I ask you the question as to the expertise and what not that you're hiring, who have been dealing with mineral leases for I don't know how many years in this province. Mineral leases are one of the most complex areas of the law. They take a great deal of difficulty to draft up, and they are complex. Now it appears that you're handling this whole activity which the Department of Mineral Resources has been doing. You have three people, all of whom have been hired but don't exist. They are going to do this all in the North when we're embarking on what the Premier calls one of the great leaps forward in the province of Saskatchewan, as we get into mineral development. You're going to do it with three people, all of whom are non-existent.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, if I might give the hon. member a very simple explanation of how the authority has been delegated prior to his coming to this legislature, under various statutes. The authority to negotiate the surface lease is granted by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan under The Provincial Lands Act. Anyone who want to move onto any property in northern Saskatchewan cannot do so, Mr. Chairman, without a permit from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. That's where the surface lease comes in, if someone want to undertake mining, then they get a mining permit from the Department of Mineral Resources. They will get their environmental permits from the Department of the Environment. They will get their surface permits from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Now perhaps that is a bit complex for the hon. member for Qu'Appelle to understand but it's a very simple division of responsibility.

**MR. LANE:** — I made my mistake, as I'm sure the press gallery did, and that was reading your own press release. Because that particular press release also says that these three people who have already been hired but don't exist, will have other duties, such as co-ordinating the efforts of other agencies such as labor, mineral resources and environmental departments. So, using your own words, all you are doing is slapping another doggone bureaucracy on top of the one you already have, another level on top of people who will not be qualified to do any one of the particular areas.

All I ask is that the members of the Executive Council here please pass on our plea for the Premier to have his cabinet shuffle early so that we can get a minister in charge of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan who knows what he is doing.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I can understand partly why the hon. member is upset and does not want to understand. It is now becoming clear. It is because the surface lease agreement with Amok, for instance, contains provisions for employing northerners on the job. It deals with matters like the business opportunities, to see that the contracts for gravel hauling and construction and the like, go to northern businessmen. It is now becoming clear that the hon. member is confused or disagrees with this policy because he does not approve of a program that gives northern people a share of the stake in the northern industrial development.

The way he tries to waffle around this is to try to put a misinterpretation on a program

whereby we are setting up a secretariat, where we are providing staff, government employees, provided in a budget that he will vote against because he is not in favor of the government requiring northern business firms, northern mining firms, to employ a percentage of northern people on the job. Nor is he in favor of the new entrepreneurs of the North who came into existence under this government getting a share of the business activities.

We saw that earlier in this session, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) tried to make a fuss because a group of northern contractors got the job of putting the windows and the doors in the Turner Lake School. So, the Tory position is well known; we know how they support northern employment initiatives. We know how they support northern business initiatives; they have no initiatives of their own for this. When we set up a secretariat to ensure that northern people will be the beneficiaries of the jobs and the employment opportunities in northern Saskatchewan, they ridicule and scoff at it. Because the remarks of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) tonight can only be interpreted to mean that he is opposed to setting up a manpower secretariat in northern Saskatchewan to see that the northern people and the northern businessmen get their fair share of the action in northern Saskatchewan.

**MR. LANE:** — I would like to tell the hon. minister that, in fact, any other common sense thinking government or minister, if they were going to establish a department, would first of all decide what they're going to do. We've had 17 different answers, six of which conflict with the other 11 that you've given tonight as to what this particular three-man secretariat with three non-existing people does. Three people now are going to save the North, according to the Minister. Three people are going to do all of the mineral leases for the North. Three people are going to do all of the business negotiating in the North. Three people are going to make sure that all the northerners get the jobs. Who are the Holy Trinity that you're appointing? And I ask you, and I asked you at the outset, who were the people? What were their qualifications and for some reason, you got all gun shy.

The reason is that you don't know what you're doing with this manpower secretariat. You haven't made a decision. Your press release itself conflicts with everything that you've said. You've already said you've narrowed it down in your latest answer to just Amok, when the press release says it is negotiating all future leases with mining companies, not just Amok and that you're supposed to be a co-ordinating body.

And all I say to you is that any other government that's going to set up a manpower secretariat would do some common sense things like, first of all, determining what they're going to do, deciding on the personnel qualifications and at least be able to tell the Assembly what they're looking for, instead of taking the approach that you have. You're so ashamed of what you're doing here and so embarrassed that you're afraid to give us the qualifications of the holy three and afraid to tell us what they're doing. I suggest to you that that type of attitude and that type of approach slapping another bureaucracy on top of everything else is not sound government and it's not sound management. If that's the type of government and that type of bad planning that you hold up with pride in the North; then I said to you, yes, we're opposed to your bad planning. We're opposed to your mismanagement and I say to you, we're opposed to the stonewalling and the fact that you're afraid to give us answers to some very simple questions.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not hiring some babes in the woods to run

this program. The director is to have a minimum of a master's degree with extensive experience in business and mining.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Master's degree in what?

**MR. BYERS:** — Well it could be a master's degree in Business Administration. I don't have the PSC (Public Service Commission) qualifications here, but a minimum of a master's degree say in Business Administration, is the minimum qualification.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — I thought you would have come into the House prepared by having read the PSC ad. I perhaps took too much for granted. The Research Officer III is to have a master's degree with a minimum of three year's experience. The secretarial position is a secretary to the director in our office.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Minister, you have just given us a long dissertation about the northern businessman. I asked you a question today in question period regarding some northern businessmen that I have some concern for and which I hope you would have some concern for, and those are the small sawmill operators. At that time you told me that you were quite sure it wasn't the Department of Northern Saskatchewan who informed them they would no longer have any contracts, timber leases. The timber leases I am speaking of which they have had in recent years are within the NAD district (Northern Administration District). That's north of the Meadow Lake Provincial Park.

I have a copy of a letter here from a Mr. Allen, in your resources branch. It does in fact inform these people, individually. At the end of the letter it says: "I regret very much to be the bearer of bad news." I regret very much also that your department is the bearer of bad news to these people. I am asking you if you care so much about northern businessmen (and I consider these people to be just that) you would do as I asked you today and undertake to provide some compensation for them. They are sitting there with \$50,000 worth of investment and no place to sell their equipment. It is no good because of a decision taken by your government that there will be no more forestry operations in that area, in the type of operation which they have been dealing with for over 20 years in some of these cases. I would like an answer on that please.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we seem to go through this from time to time in this House where the opposition persists in asking questions of a department and the department is not responsible for that particular area.

The cutting rights for the portable sawmill operators which the hon. member refers to, are not issued by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. So let's be clear on that. They are issued by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, so when you suggest that DNS says, I'll kick them out, or whatever words you want to apply, that is simply not the case. The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources issues cutting rights for timber in southern and in northern Saskatchewan, and not this department. These portable operators may well be able to obtain employment for Saskatchewan Forest Products or for the Meadow Lake mill. I do not know that. They are free to apply to the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources for timber-cutting rights or to cut under contract for someone who does have timber-cutting rights. I hope the hon. member will not suggest in this House or beyond the walls of this Chamber that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is somehow responsible for issuing them timber-cutting rights because that is simply not within our jurisdiction.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Agreed.

**MR. McLEOD:** — No, definitely not agreed. You say to me that these people with the portable sawmills would be able possibly to apply to Saskatchewan Forrest Products and so on. You very well know that Saskatchewan Forest Products is no longer in operation in the area where they have been operating and where they live, because that mill now has been taken over by your department, been transferred to your jurisdiction. There's no Saskatchewan Forest Products mill anywhere near their location. I can give you that information without your asking your officials about that. I know that. Now, I would ask you if a Mr. Allen does work in fact for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan resources branch?

**MR. BYERS:** — Could I have the name again please.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. S.W. Allen, manager, Forest Operation Program.

**MR. BYERS:** — I regret to inform the House that Mr. Stew Allen who was employed by Northern Saskatchewan, I believe in the latter part of 1978 to manage the DNS forest operations, passed away very suddenly, I believe it was Sunday morning.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I am very sorry to hear that, but the point here is that it was under the jurisdiction of your department. That's the point I am trying to make without bandying around the name of any individual. The point is that the letter was written under the jurisdiction of your department and it said, "We do have limited volumes of wood available for logging contracts at Green Lake, but certainly not enough to keep everyone going". Now if he says we, who is he talking about? Is he speaking on behalf of DTRR in that case?

**MR. BYERS:** — Well first, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan gets its cutting permits from DTRR (Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources). At the present time, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan does not have enough timber allocated to engage these small contractors.

Now, when that mill gets going (when the octagon log operation is in full operation), if we do require more timber because of market demand or other factors, and the volume we desire from that operation is available from DTRR, I believe that the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) would be quite willing to enter into contracts with these portable contractors to do the forest harvesting. I hope that when that octagon log operation is in full swing we will rely more and more on the private logging contractors. Right at the present time when DNS is putting that octagon log operation together there, we can't be certain as to the immediate employment opportunities for those small contractors. I don't want to make any guarantee that there will necessarily be employment opportunities for them, but it is our intention to have our timber supplies provided by private contractors. If the timber will be allocated to us for that purpose there is a very good chance that some of those contractors can be engaged.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K. Can you give me some indication of how much timber you have had allocated by DTRR to your department in what we would call, just for a rough description, the southwestern portion of the Northern Administration District? In other words, north of the boundary along the Meadow Lake Provincial Park, north of communities like Goodsoil and Pierceland, in that area north of there but inside the DNS area?

**MR. BYERS:** — The amount which has been allocated in terms of square miles, acres or hectares?

**MR. McLEOD:** — What I want to know, have all timber cutting operations been suspended in that area for next winter? Will there be no timber operations in the area which I have just described for next winter? This is the area these people which I am referring to have been operating in for a number of years.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the timber permits are issued on an annual basis. Until this mill is operational we can't estimate what our needs will be. We don't know what the demand for octagon logs will be. We hope to get from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources an allocation of timber that will meet the full demands of that mill.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Just one last thing on this topic . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — With respect to your question on the availability of timber in the southwest NAD to be harvested? We'll get you that information.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Yes, you can provide that at some later time. Just one last comment, you have attempted to give some assurance at some time that if there were private contractors, they would be there in the timber harvesting operations. My concern, basically, and theirs, is not only with the harvesting operation but it's with the investment they have in the sawmills. Obviously, from what I understand of your Chisholm log operation their sawmills wouldn't fit into that operation at all. So, their sawmills are set up for the sawing of rough lumber. That may not be much of a compensation for you.

But, I would ask you, once again, if nothing can be done for these people, that you consider very seriously some compensation for these people because there's no question that that investment is great. Certainly, we're not talking about a lot of operators but we shouldn't always be thinking about the quantity, we should be thinking about the people involved and it's a serious thing for them.

I have another question, Mr. Minister, regarding the minister over here, who keeps yelling agreed. Considering the fact that the Churchill River is such a major artery through all of northern Saskatchewan, did your department have any involvement at all in an environmental impact study regarding the Esso resources project at Bonneville, Cold Lake along with the Department of Environment and, possibly, tourism?

**MR. BYERS:** — The Department of Northern Saskatchewan had a member, I believe, on the environmental review board that looked at that project. There was a person from the department on the environmental review board.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I won't ask you to give any long description of that now. Can you provide me with any information your department has now regarding that project and the consequences it will have for the Churchill River system and so on? Can you provide me with all the information you have on that in your department now, or at some later date?

**MR. BYERS:** — I'm told that submissions are not complete and that they're over in environment.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Submissions have been handed to the big fellow over there, have they?

**MR. BYERS:** — They're also confidential.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., I have something I'm sure you'll be ready for. It's been going through all the departments up to now and has to do with the salaries, something we have been asking all the ministers who have come up so far. Certainly you will be ready for that.

Could you tell us the salaries of all the people in your permanent employ in DNS who earn over \$25,000, in the three categories, the 1978-79 estimates, the '78-79 actual and the '79-80 estimate?

**MR. BYERS:** — We can provide you with that information.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I have one more point about another thing I raised in the House previously. I'd like to know the amount of funding in the present year for that newspaper in Beauval, The Regency News, the Natotawin. Would you give me the funding in the present year and also the proposed funding which will be covered in the estimates that are under consideration?

**MR. BYERS:** — It is proposed that we will fund Natotawin until June 30 and funding will cease at that time.

**MR. McLEOD:** — The amount, please?

**MR. BYERS:** — It is \$15,000 for this fiscal year, that is, roughly \$15,000 from April 1 until June 30.

**MR. McLEOD:** — It indicates in your annual report that there was an independent study done or an evaluation of that project. I believe that has to do with Natotawin. Is that the case and can you give me the name of the independent consultant body that did that study and a copy of the results, please?

**MR. BYERS:** — We can provide you with the name of the person or firm who did the study and the recommendations contained in the study. Yes.

Items 1 to 4 agreed.

## **ITEM 5**

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — I want to ask this one. There are four people in that department and the amount of money went up only \$630. Did they not get any type of raise? Are they not doing their work? What's the problem here?

**MR. BYERS:** — One of the former employees was at the top of the salary range and I'm told his replacement is at the bottom of the range and that accounts for the smaller increase.

Item 5 agreed.



Items 6 to 12 agreed.

### ITEM 13

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, last evening you said you'd get some answers for me and this is the estimate you wanted me to ask you for them.

**MR. BYERS:** — Would the member like to restate his question, please?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Last evening the minister indicated he had awarded a contract for helicopters using the rate book as established by each of the companies and on that basis, without putting out a tender, he has given out a contract for two years. Is that correct?

**MR. BYERS:** — The original contract provided for a two-year extension and the department exercised the option to extend the existing contract for two years.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister. You awarded a contract to Athabasca Air for helicopters for 200 hours using the rate book which they put out to everybody without a tender. Is that correct or incorrect?

**MR. BYERS:** — The extension was not put out for tender.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — O.K. You didn't put the thing out for tender but the rate that you have accepted is \$20 higher than the older tender. Is that correct?

**MR. BYERS:** — I just want to refresh the memory of the hon. member — the original contract was tendered in May, 1976. It was for a period of three years and the rate was \$220. The option in the agreement allows the department to make the adjustment (in this case from \$220 to \$240 an hour) due to increased operating costs, without tendering. The legal advice on this transaction indicates that the renewal of the lease is perfectly consistent with the agreement.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I don't argue that the agreement you had with Athabasca and what you have followed, is incorrect. That is not the point I am arguing with the minister. What I am suggesting to the minister is, you have taken the standard rate book which they put out for anybody to use. If they use a helicopter for one hour or 500 hours, you pay them at that rate. That is what you have accepted. You have not gone for tenders in any way, shape or form on this new contract.

**MR. BYERS:** — First, we had the option to extend — two years. We exercised that option. I understand that in charter rates like this, companies have to file their rate per hour for a specific plane with CTC (Canadian Transport Commission) or whatever the appropriate federal regulatory agency is.

It is true that it was not tendered but the department had access to the rate book and the figures in the rate book are that Athabasca Airways was the lowest of the companies in the charter business.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, we agree with everything you just said. The key point in the whole issue is you cannot extend a contract under CTC (Canadian Transport Commission) rules, first of all, which has been tendered for a new price. That's the first point I make and I've checked that with CTC. I've given your people a copy of the first 28

rules that are required to be on all leases or tenders regarding this. I don't think there's a dispute on that one.

My point to the minister is that what you're telling us is that you've accepted the retail price. You've gone and looked, for example, at a car which was well over-priced in the window and that's what you've accepted to pay. You haven't tendered at all. You haven't tried to get the best rate for the people of Saskatchewan to save the money. Is that basically a fact or not?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, we got the best rate. It was \$2.40 an hour; the others were \$2.85, \$2.50, \$2.70, \$3.05 and \$3.25 respectively.

Secondly, the hon. member claims that we cannot extend a contract without tender.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You can extend it as long as you don't increase the rate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who does that apply to?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Canadian Transport Commission rules.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — A bus or a charter?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order!

**MR. BYERS:** — Thank you. The hon. member says that we cannot extend an agreement and increase the rate because that's contrary to some CTC rules. That is his claim; that is not the opinion of the legal advisors, so he can take whatever action he likes. We got the best legal advice we could get on this and the advice we have is that what we did is legitimate.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I'll make one point and maybe I can get it through that thick thing you carry between those two ears. Government services, the Department of Revenue, I would assume DNS, and everybody, when they want to get a good rate, put out to tender, and have everybody bid. You don't go and look at what the retail price is and accept whoever has got the lowest retail price, no matter what it is. That's not what you accept. That's what you've done. You haven't gone out to find out the best price.

I tell the minister, if you look at some of the contracts around, you will discover that tendered contracts are coming in much below the \$2.40 on many contracts that are existing within the province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, by not tendering, you automatically made your government waste money because you're not being efficient by tendering for the lowest, cheapest price. You're taking the retail sale price of whatever you're buying.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, with regard to his opening remarks, may I say that flattery is like smoke; it will not hurt you unless you inhale it. That is his opinion. We have well-qualified lawyers who disagree with the hon. member for Rosthern.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, are you saying to me that by tendering you never get a cheaper price than the retail price for services? Is that what you're telling this House?

**MR. BYERS:** — I have given the facts several times to him. I wish he would absorb them. I cannot be more explicit and definite.

The rates approved by CTC are published in the rate book or wherever they list them. The company to whom the extension was granted had the lowest rates in the CTC book. If any of the other actors wanted to get in on the business they could have had lower rates and we might have looked at them.

Item 13 agreed.

Items 14 to 16 agreed.

#### **ITEM 17**

**MR. McLEOD:** — Just in time, that's fine, Mr. Chairman. I know we're trying to hustle here.

Mr. Minister, I realize the Saskatchewan Northlands Agreement is a large, encompassing document and so on. Is there any chance of you providing a copy of that agreement to us?

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, the Northlands Agreement is a public document. We've got one and the feds have one. We'd be glad to give the hon. member one.

Item 17 agreed.

Items 18 to 28 agreed.

Department of Northern Saskatchewan Vote 26 agreed.

### **DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN VOTE 27**

Item 1 agreed.

Capital Expenditure - Vote 27

Items 1 to 7 agreed.

Northern Saskatchewan Vote 27 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

### **HERITAGE FUND VOTE 27**

#### **ITEM 1**

April 24, 1979

Item 1 agreed.

## ITEM 2

**MR. LANE:** — I would like to ask the minister, if you weren't taking funds from the heritage fund for this project, and the same thing with the Beauval Pinehouse road, are you saying we would never have such a project? Is that in fact what you mean?

**MR. BYERS:** — No, I am not saying we wouldn't have them without the heritage fund. This is a decision of the government to invest a portion of the heritage fund money in northern development and the proposed expenditures for Key Lake and Beauval, Pine House development roads, if approved, represent using the heritage fund for northern development purposes.

Item 3 agreed.

Department of Northern Saskatchewan - Vote 27 agreed.

Supplementary Vote 27

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

Department of Northern Saskatchewan - Supplementary

Vote 27 agreed.

## LEGISLATION VOTE 21

### ITEM 1

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Chairman, during the 1976-77 session, there was a sessional paper given to the House when in the year preceding we had agreed to hire a gentleman to come in to look at our legislative office. It was Sir Barnard Cox. He filed his report. I understand that because of the election the committee that was set up to handle the report and make any recommendations became null and void. With that in mind, I would ask the Premier, who is responsible for the legislative office, if he is considering reviewing the duties of the office and the provinces on each side of our boundaries which we normally compete with for staff and doing what I would call a small job evaluation study to make sure that the staff of the Legislative Assembly is brought in line — I'm not suggesting it be totally brought in line with the Cox report — with the rest of the people that serve other Legislative Assemblies for the same type of functions, as we do in private industry. I think in Crown corps we look at what Alberta pays and what Manitoba pays, and their duties and how they correspond. I sent the Premier one piece of information I have received. I suggest I would ask for a commitment from him to at least consider the provinces that neighbor us and other areas that he may think pertinent, because I see no other way to handle this Sir Barnard Cox report except that way.

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — I think the hon. member is correct in the fact that Sir Barnard Cox did recommend that the Speaker and the Clerk have a particular status, the Speaker roughly equivalent to that of a cabinet minister and the Clerk roughly to that of a deputy. That's a point of view which we as a government don't share, but that

was certainly one part of the Barnard Cox report. Another part of the Barnard Cox report, another way to interpret it, would be that whether or not the salary of the Clerk and let's say the Deputy Clerk is at the level of a deputy, it ought to be tied to some other external thing so that it is not something which is negotiated or in effect set by the executive arm of government. In a sense that's what happens with out-of-scope salaries.

With respect to that latter point of view, I have some sympathy with it. And this is not as irrelevant as it sounds. With respect to the Ombudsman's salary, we were tending to seek the same sort of thing and have introduced a bill which will tie it to the salary of judges of the provincial court. We made some steps in that direction last year by attempting to tie in the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk within the sort of pay hierarchy of the public service, and I think in that regard we have moved in the direction of the Cox Report. The question is whether or not we've got it slotted in at the right level, and that's the essential question you ask. My information is that the salary is marginally above that paid in Manitoba and more than marginally, not a huge amount but significantly below that paid in Alberta. About 30 as to 32 as to 40 is the sort of figures we are talking about. I say to the member that I am not prepared to give a commitment that we will accept the Cox Report in their equivalency idea. I am prepared to say that we have and we will continue to seek a bench mark which is not arbitrary. That's certainly what he was aiming at, and I will undertake to review to see whether or not we think we are at the right level, particularly as between ourselves and our neighboring provinces. I have not done an exhaustive review, but I will have a look at it to see whether or not we are at the right slot.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Premier, I thank you for your words. I used only in my bit of research one individual because it was the easiest one to identify in each province. I suggest that maybe within the whole department while you're looking that you check it re the rest of the civil servants and on both sides of us. We, in the opposition, have the services, as the Legislative offices serve both sides and is not really responsible to any individual even though it seems that way, and I don't disagree with it totally. Somebody has to be responsible for the department. Therefore, it's placed in your hands. The Cox Report suggests it should be out of your hands. I'm not sure I agree with that or not. It's a totally different situation and I have my druthers about it too. I go back to my union involvement and I say that job evaluation usually puts a person in the right peg where he belongs when you compare him to other areas, as the rest of the staff, I assume, and I say that for your legal clerks and so forth all the way down the line. They have nobody officially bargaining for them, and that's basically my concern and I think that was the concern of the Cox Report, so I give that to you and leave it that way.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you. I may advise the hon. member that the way the Assistant Clerk and the Clerk are set up now is that they go on a pay range so that the last step in the assistant's range is one below the first step of the Clerk's range so that if we had an experienced Assistant Clerk and a new Clerk, the new Clerk would get \$29,200 — the next step up, a thousand dollars more than the Assistant Clerk. That makes sense from the point of view of the deputy. Whether the whole thing is at the right slot is an arguable point.

**MR. LANE:** — Except, I think the Premier will agree, that it's time we got a handle on this and some criterion was established. Either some relationship to a deputy minister of some level so that it's not an annual thing. I think the Premier will agree with the fact that we should relate this so the Clerk, in fact, knows and can make whatever decisions the Clerk so wishes. But, I think it's time we got a handle on this and made some decisions. I

am sure the Premier would agree with that.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I have no quarrel with that. This salary has moved up a great deal and quite properly because it was quite low when we came to office.

A lot of water has run under the bridge on senior staff salaries since 1971, not only here in this government but everywhere if you look at the figures. Teachers, I know, have obtained quite remarkable and marginally justifiable increases. So, I take the point of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that we have got it sort of in some slots now where we have definite comparisons. I think we need to take another look at it and then advise the House what our comparisons, our bench marks, are so that you know what we are doing.

**MR. LANE:** — Another point I would like to make though is just that it's a particular matter that makes it difficult for all concerned. I think, to just reinforce my argument, that the sooner we have some outside criterion the better we'll be.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It's not an easy thing to discuss this fully and frankly with the Clerk here, at my left . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You think they'll be interested in that. Well, I just hope you will tell them that I was looking at the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) when I said that.

Item 1 agreed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Do you care to introduce your new staff?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I fell into a trap because I didn't think I needed to introduce the Clerk or the Assistant Clerk. The Acting Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk is Merrilee Charowsky, who is sitting here and she has been carrying on on her own because we haven't been able to get her an appropriate colleague, notwithstanding the fact that it was supposed to be a dull session. I see Bill No. 102 coming up and that represents a great deal of work. As you all know, as I've already been free to admit, we did not have as much work done last fall as we ordinarily do with respect to legislation and accordingly, a good deal of pressure was applied to the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk. I am very pleased at the way that she and her staff have been able to respond to the pressures and to give service to the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

Item 2 agreed.

### ITEM 3

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll take the opportunity to introduce Christine MacDonald, who I am sure, is known to all of you.

**MR. LANE:** — The Premier has commended the Legislative Counsel. I would like to, speaking on behalf of all members, thank the Legislative Librarian and the staff for their excellent co-operation and also, for the very mild mannered wrist slapping that we get when we don't return the books as promptly as we should which I think we are all guilty of, but to the Legislative Librarian and her staff, we would like to say thank you for the co-operation and the assistance and the same to the Legislative Counsel and of course, normally, the Clerk, we do that each year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

Item 3 agreed.

#### **ITEM 4**

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say that Mr. D. Tickell is unfortunately, not able to be here and I have here with me the assistant to the Ombudsman, Mr. W.K. Barker.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Does the amount here reflect the bill that we have before us or does this mean that you will have to bring in an additional amount?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It is not reflected there. These estimates were prepared before we had decided what the bench mark was and we put in, I think, a 6 per cent figure, or something like that, across the board on these before. This will represent significantly more than 6 per cent. We searched around for an appropriate bench mark and it struck us that the judge of the provincial court was probably as good as any. We'll have another opportunity to debate that and it means a couple of thousand we're short.

**MR. LANE:** — I would like to direct a question to the Premier with regard to the ombudsman. When the ombudsman was established, of course there was a certain level in the civil service beyond which the ombudsman could not investigate. I will assume that the Premier now has the confidence in the ombudsman and his operation that we could, in fact, extend the investigating powers of the ombudsman to all levels of the civil service and I would ask the Premier, is the failure to do so indicating a lack of confidence or what is the reason that it has not been so extended?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think if I were frank, I would say the failure is just that there seem to be so many other things to do this session that we didn't think it urgent to open up The Ombudsman Act other than for the routine matter of salary. There are some drafting problems to expanding it. I think by and large everyone agrees that people who report to a minister, who are executive assistants and the like, should not be included and a number of provinces have formulated this in one way and a number in others. We just didn't come to grips with the drafting problem. It wasn't an indication of any lack of confidence in the ombudsman. Certainly, we haven't seen many instances — many, if at all — where our terms of reference have inhibited the ombudsman but this is no reason why we shouldn't review them and expand them because we don't have any hang up on it.

**MR. LANE:** — Would it then be fair to request the Premier that that matter be considered for the next session, that this one matter be put into the hopper for serious consideration if there's no hang up about it? It's been one, I think, draw back and criticism of the ombudsman and perhaps it's time that we got that cleared up.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I don't want to give an undertaking to introduce but I will give an undertaking to consider.

Item 4 agreed.

**MR. LANE:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. The revision of statutes is a matter that's come up with the Attorney General's estimates, in general terms in the past, and perhaps we

haven't had the success that we've wanted, Mr. Premier, but it strikes me that when we deal with the revision of statutes we're falling further behind our ten-year deadline with every revision. Other jurisdictions, I refer to Manitoba as being the first in Canada to have the computer printing of statutes. It has struck me that it's long overdue that we have computer printing of statutes. I think the convenience and the speed are well worth the cost. Perhaps the Premier can advise why we've been, I suggest somewhat laggard in pursuing this aspect. Manitoba has had a system, I think a system that even Ottawa now is adjusting to. Why in fact are we not proceeding with that program?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think the short answer is that we were watching to see whether or not it seemed to work elsewhere. We have generally reached the conclusion that it does work, that it would be worth our while. We have, over the last six months or so, done a number of studies on this. We rather think that we are going to launch a program for the computerization of statutes. We estimate that it will cost around \$50,000 to launch. It is not in this budget but that would not inhibit us if the studies which are going on make it look like that's the way to go. I think that will be the answer.

It will largely eliminate the cost and the problems of revisions. It will provide more up-to-date service because you revise as you go along. The office consolidations and some of these things are a good deal easier to handle. By and large I think that we're convinced that that's the way to go. I hope that the revision which we have completed last year is the last which we will complete on that basis.

**MR. LANE:** — If the Premier would entertain a suggestion as well that in addition to the computer printing of statutes at the same time we go with the computer printing of regulations. I suggest that because we are now getting to a stage with regulations — and I realize that doing immediate computer printing of regulations is not quite as practical as doing the statutes — but even with a delay from integrating departments, I think it would be a far superior system than what we have now. The regulations are just horrendous trying to follow them through. Perhaps that area . . . I'm not sure that Manitoba does the computer printing of regulations. I'm just not sure but I would certainly urge the Premier that that area be seriously studied.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I have been following the revision of statutes material because it's been going across my desk. It's an area where I have thought we were primitive, not only in Saskatchewan, but, everywhere else. Only updating our law for 10 years is a matter of some interest to me. I have not been following with the same care the provisions with respect to the revision of regulations, although that's an interesting area because we had a try when we put the first regulations act in, as you remember, and the government which followed us had some more tries. Our regulations are archaic. About the only thing you can say for them is that they are better than most places. But, that's still not enough.

The legislative counsel advises me that she has put forward a proposal for the computerization of regulations. She acknowledges it would take some time but it's all a part of this. We would certainly look at it because if we can do that it's obviously going to be a service to the public who have to find this law. It will undoubtedly assist us in keeping our regulations in a tidy shape, which they are not now, and they're not anywhere. Obviously somebody can do better and it may as well be us.

Items 5 to 13 agreed.

Legislation - Vote 21 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.