

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

**April 24, 1980.**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**  
**GOVERNMENT SERVICES**  
**VOTE 13**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Thank you. That's the first time in this Assembly I've been called a minister. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, I received your photocopy of the office space which was dropped. Do you have a copy of the office space which was added or all space which was added? I wonder if I could have a look at that.

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — I guess we can provide that to you in a moment. My understanding was that it was Regina you are interested in particularly. This indicates the new building space which was acquired or occupied in 1979-1980.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — It is, as I tried to indicate a little earlier . . . When you replied to my question the other day you were referring to what your department, pretty well, as handling when you said there was a drop in inventory. I'm going to assume you would agree when I say that, in fact, total government space in the city has increased somewhat if you add those buildings you're not involved with. I notice you don't have, for example, on here the T.C. Douglas Building, was it the year before that it came on stream?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Right.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That was the previous year. Did that increase your inventory considerably that year, and then subsequently it came down because of these new buildings which came on stream then?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think it would be accurate to say that it probably increased the inventory of space for that particular year.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Those buildings like the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) came on stream actually last year, but that wouldn't be part of yours. Any other Crown corporation that has added . . .

**MR. SNYDER:** — That wouldn't be part of our space inventory, except for that space we might lease from the Crown corporations, from the SGI.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — But DGS (Department of Government Services) is not handling any space in the new SGI building.

**MR. SNYDER:** — The C.M. Fines Building is on that list and you'll find there is space leased for the highway traffic board in the C.M. Fines Building. We're attempting to tie in together the highway traffic board with the SGI operation.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I apologize. I was thinking of the SGI building and forgetting it was called the C.M. Fines Building. How many floors does that 1,553 square metres take?

**MR. SNYDER:** — A little bit in excess of two floors.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Minister, I almost forgot about a whole new set of buildings which are going up in Saskatoon and over the supper hour for some reason I remembered them (reasons I won't give you). There's a jail built near Saskatoon. I understand your department is building that one and the one at Prince Albert. Do they show in the space in this document I have, or will they show in the space document I have?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Construction will not show except in our inventory under construction. They will show after they are completed and don't stream and they'll become part of our space inventory. Do you have a niche or a corner picked out for yourself, Ralph?

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I remember there was a little concern (and I say this maybe with a little tongue in cheek) last year when they first were thinking of building it. The location was right in the wind's stack area of the chemical plants and they were removing discharge . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There was concern they were in the exact line of the emissions and that people in there might be injured.

Then the facts came out that the location is where it is now and not where it was assumed to be. It was rather interesting to watch the reactions of individuals that suggested, well, at least this will be one way to keep the cost down for the government when the chemicals came over. It was a rather interesting situation because it's not far from home. The people who said that? Some of the people in the area . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. No, Mr. Minister, you make the comment. I think if there was a vote tomorrow on the capital punishment . . . It is a very red-neck area on the capital punishment issue.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. I think the capital punishment issue doesn't have much to do with the government services debate unless we're talking about building gallows at these jails.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, what's the estimated cost of the one in P.A. that's being done and the one in Saskatoon?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The current estimate is \$12,690,000 for the Saskatoon Correctional and Remand Centre. I'll get you the P.A. one momentarily. And for Prince Albert, \$11,760,000 is the current estimate and expectation is they will be on target.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — I assume, maybe I'm incorrect, but shouldn't a portion of that figure show up in Vote 14 under Attorney General or under social services or is the majority of that \$10 million for social services?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Yes, social services. You are going to confuse estimates if you start dealing with subvotes. I should draw to your attention that in days gone by when we began estimates, and I refer this perhaps to the Chairman also, the practice was during subvote 1 a degree of latitude was used in terms of giving the questioner the opportunity to talk about almost everything that wasn't covered by another subvote in the estimates. We have strayed rather badly from that. I don't know whether by accident or by design. If you want immediate answers from the staff people . . . No, no, you don't know what I am talking about so don't wave me off until you know what I'm talking

about. The only point I'm making is if you want immediate answers from staff, then following the subvotes in the estimates book is the easiest way of doing it. They're all designed in such a way as to go from subvote 1 right through to the end of the estimate. Of course that makes it much easier for officials to keep track of the questions being asked instead of being all over the waterfront as we ultimately are. I think we've dealt with questions from every subvote at this stage and obviously it's a good deal easier to do it. I don't know whether the Chairman has any remarks to add in this connection but it is a practice we have fallen into. I'm not sure it is a good one, but as long as it expedites estimates I suppose that's the way to do it. From the standpoint of getting quick and efficient answers to questions which are directed, it is a lot easier for departmental officials in the event that you go from subvote 1 — administration — and through the piece. This makes it a good deal easier for our people, but I leave it with you and with the Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I don't know if the minister is raising a point of order or not. Did you want to do that?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Not really.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Well, I can kind of raise one myself. I think the general practice has been to ask more or less general questions under item 1 — make speeches, statements, generally beat up on a department, or that type of debate on item 1. The more detailed questions generally have taken place. I think, under the items as they come up, and that strikes me as probably being the best way to operate.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, just to address your last comments. We normally establish, when we're not sure where something is, by asking the question now so that we can make sure we ask the questions under the right vote.

Now I realize, Mr. Minister, that we have changed a little, mainly because we have tried to follow the total of your book rather than doing the buildings individually, and this may have caused us some problems. If it has caused your people any problems, I will apologize for that. It seemed to be the easiest way to go when we are covering the whole province in total figures.

But, back to the department — furniture and so forth is not basically, from what I understand, a subvote; if it is, tell me and I will wait for that area.

**MR. SNYDER:** — If you want to deal specifically with furniture, you will find it under our capital subvote dealing with furniture; the government services subvote, capital, is where you will find it.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — That's fine. I can wait for that. I'm glad that yesterday you picked up on what I was about to suggest to you (you indicated over the past years you had been looking at it and you were looking at it again to see if there was a way to put it into action), and that was the showing of your costs for what you absorb in your budget for other government departments. I personally don't mind seeing it as an in-and-out figure, if it must be. But the thing is, so that we could all work on a true cost we used the dental program yesterday, if you remember correctly, to show my concern. I understand your comments, and I accept them, and I'm glad to see you are hopefully, going to improvise something which will work in due course.

On that note, I have no more questions on item 1, but if I happen to make a mistake and

wish to retract, I hope you will allow me that privilege.

Item 1 agreed.

**Item 2**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, if you would like to read the number and just the total, that would be sufficient. The training branch — the expenditures are up. I would assume that is just the normal salary increase and so forth?

**MR. SNYDER:** — That is basically in negotiated and incremental increases.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — I will use this department, Mr. Minister, rather than ask about it for all the departments. We will do a little more study here. Increments — how many people in the year under review would be getting an increment? This shows 12 people. I am looking for a percentage. Is it 3 per cent or 4 per cent?

**MR. SNYDER:** — That is a shade awkward because unless a person has worked his way through the system and has arrived at the top of the range, he will receive an annual increment. It is a six-step range, and unless the person has arrived at the top of the range, he will receive that incremental increase each year, I guess, on his anniversary date. I can't tell you and I'm not sure that the departmental people have at their fingers the exact number of people who are at the top of the range. Of course, in the event of reclassification, they will find themselves in another range and will receive an annual incremental increase.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, that is what I was getting at exactly. Every year we get up and we ask about the difference, if it is just the annual salary increase, or increments in reclassification. I said we were going to use this one for an example, rather than do it in all the rest. What I am trying to establish is that if you have a lot of long-term staff, they are at the maximum and now they are just getting their yearly, newly negotiated rate.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I don't know what percentage but the bulk of our employees have not arrived at the top of the range. They are not employees with the kind of length of service which would put them at the top of the range. So the great bulk of them would not be at the final step.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Would it be through your whole department about that type of percentage?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Your bulk is in there. I am not hearing you.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Would that 3 per cent or 4 per cent which you indicate to be at the top and the rest not, be about normal in your department?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Of that number 12, my people tell me probably there are 2 who are at the top of the range and the other 10 would not be.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — The reason I asked that, Mr. Chairman, is because it was a nice, easy number to work with. It is \$30,000 and 12 employees. I have the feeling you are going to need a supplementary or you haven't put in the total amount of money you are going to need to give them both the increment and the percentage raise. I think the figure may be low. That is why I am asking — the percentage on increments.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Well, provided for in our estimates generally was a figure of 8.5 per cent. Assuming the salary adjustments generally would be 8.5 per cent. That was added into the overall budget with respect to permanent positions and other permanent services. In addition, you have to take into account there is a vacancy rate that ranges somewhere between 6 per cent and 10 per cent which covers off in large measure for some of the additional increases accorded to staff as a result of their incremental increases and salary adjustments as a result of the collective agreement. So between the provided for 8.5 per cent increase and the vacancy rate of somewhere between 6 per cent and 10 per cent, that covers off the basic dollar needs for staff.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Well, it doesn't quite work out. But what you're saying now is 6 per cent there, 8.5 per cent, increments are usually around 5 per cent, some are higher, some are lower, the difference. So 5 per cent and 8 per cent is 13 per cent and 6 per cent is 19 per cent. You need almost 20 per cent, is what you're saying, to fluctuate, but I don't think that's what you mean.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I don't think the hon. member understood what I was saying. I said essentially that we have provided in the estimates for a general increase of some 8.5 per cent. Additionally, there is a vacancy rate within the department, unfilled positions, that ranges somewhere around another 8 per cent (between 6 per cent and 10 per cent), of jobs that have been vacated and bulletined and have not yet been filled. Sometimes it's a considerable period of time before they're filled because the appropriate person can't be found for the position and accordingly that takes care of the dollar needs to take care of increased costs for staff.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Just to make sure I have it now. You budget for the full 12 positions and the full costing. Then because you have 6 per cent of the total of your department vacancy, you pick up a little there and that's how it works out.

**MR. SNYDER:** — No. I don't think I'm saying exactly that. I'm talking about within the entire department not just in personnel and training. We're using it as a specific example. But any vacancies which may occur in property and planning or operations administration or wherever — any vacant positions where moneys are not spent — that can be used in any portion or any subvote of the department.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — In other words, if the vacancy falls anywhere in Vote 13, then you can mix and match and that's how it works out. I understand.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Right.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 3 agreed.

#### **Item 4**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — The \$40,000 figure which was other personal services is now gone from your budget. What would the reason be?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The \$40,000 was in the budget last year for temporary staff to do a particular job which is not a recurring one. I think it was space needs or space inventory

and that isn't included this year. It was a one-short affair and that's why it's not included in our budget this year.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I guessed that was what it was for but is that now . . . Will you be able to update it with your present staff and continue to keep it inline with a computer now that you're caught up?

**MR. SNYDER:** — It's not intended that it will be done again this fiscal year in any case. I'm given to understand that there will be some of the continuing work associated with this program, but we will be able to absorb it with the existing complement of staff.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — That was my exact question, if your complement of staff could handle it.

Item 4 agreed.

Item 5 agreed.

#### **Item 6**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Are you doing any architectural work for buildings which are not your own — buildings you own or have a lease for, for example, a Crown corporation as we have the situation in Prince Albert, or architectural work for something like your joint project in Weyburn?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Ours basically will be architectural work which is being done to alterations of some leased space, a very limited amount of leased space. Basically it's in-house work for our own buildings, but there will be some architectural drawings and design work which will be done by our own people for in-house work predominantly, with some exceptions with leased space for minor changes and renovations.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — If the minister prefers, and if this question is impossible to answer here, we can take it in another spot, but in your architectural engineering branch do you do studies on, for example, we talk about the Westinghouse furniture things . . . Do you design the type of things you want and then the furniture people take it from there and find somebody to bid? We can handle it on the other end if you would like, but is this the type of work they're doing?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Well, initially, because of the nature of the program, the work with respect to the Westinghouse furniture for both Sturdy Stone and the T.C. Douglas Building was done by a consultant; but having a great deal of that work behind us and some experience gained over that period of time, we expect we will be doing that in-house work from this point onward.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — O.K., if this is the vote then, Mr. Minister, first of all I commend you on the system you have, because I think it's probably going to end up being the cheapest system there is because of the total flexibility and the open design you work with. It makes it cheaper to renovate, to fix up and to repair or change requirements of an area. So, on the opposition side, we hope you continue to look at plans which give you that flexibility.

**MR. SNYDER:** — We agree with you. We say and we believe that by this process we will be saving something in the order of \$1 million or \$1.25 million a year, which was

formerly spent in adjusting to different space needs in different departments and by having to move partitions here and there when we were routed out of leased space and had to move. This will help us we believe to effect a large number of economies which will represent savings of over \$1 million a year.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — One final question on this. I assume you will be working on the idea from now on of the open space concept, and you will be able to use these things for anything else you are designing. Am I correct?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Not every building is going to be designed for that purpose. A large number of our buildings — I'm thinking more particularly of buildings which have been in place for some time and do not have that wide-open space feature about it. The Westinghouse furniture really doesn't adapt very well to that unless it's a large, open area. But we believe, wherever applicable, that the Westinghouse furniture or that type of moveable partition which can be moved by a couple of men in a few hours can change the whole complexion, the whole nature of the layout in an office building. We believe that's probably the way we'll go — wherever the furniture is adaptable.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — No. I'm saying it's for new structure. I should have made myself clear. I hope you would continue the open space.

Item 6 agreed.

Items 7 and 8 agreed.

#### **Item 9**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not sure why the staff complement is so large. Is there some special reason? Is it because your department people are all placed here?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Well in the Regina legislative area district we're basically in a position where virtually all of the buildings we occupy are our own buildings. For example, the T.C. Douglas Building, the Legislative Building, the old health and the old administration buildings are all owned by us and serviced and staffed by our people. Apart from the fact that this is of course the seat of government and that a large concentration of people in this area need to be serviced, basically, it is because of the fact that the buildings here are our own buildings.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — I would assume then this would be the fellows who service this area for the needs . . . Is the mail service still part of your department or is that revenue?

**MR. SNYDER:** — You'll find that area when you get to revenue, supply and services. The mail room and those peripheral responsibilities now belong with revenue, supply and services.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, the question I am getting to (and it's always a sore point in Saskatoon when they talk about the Wascana area and the Centre of the Arts down here, and Saskatoon's Centennial Auditorium) is what full-time government staff you put into the maintenance of the grounds area. I assume from their plot there are none of your people in grounds and you just pay whatever the department pays toward the central body.

**MR. SNYDER:** — You'll know that the Wascana Centre Authority has the responsibility

for maintenance, upkeep and the other arrangements. If you refer to item 16 (if we can make a little move which is probably appropriate at this time), you will see that the ground maintenance of Wascana Centre Authority has \$1.4 million in our budget for that purpose, and another statutory grant to the Wascana Centre Authority of \$863,100. That's basically what you're looking for I believe.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Yes. I was just making sure there were no funds coming from this area. It was all in these later two supplements.

One other question if I may. Do you have any idea (I assume you will have to furnish the answer later) of the regular costs of the repairs that go on in this building? They must be atrociously high because of the continual changes. For example, if you remember in the last year or two you demolished, or gutted I guess would be a better word, the west wing, the south portion right to the bare walls and bare floors and did it over. Those costs must be high. Do you find that over 20 years or so they amortize out or do you do like the city of Saskatoon and not charge for the man hours, just the material? Which formula do you use?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Well, I think the hon. member will remember that a motion for return was provided. I think our people are in the process of assembling information that can be given to you by that process. Obviously if you're saying it's an expensive process to refurbish a building of this kind, of course it is an expensive process.

Refurbishing of this Chamber was an expensive process but this was a building that was built and completed, I believe, in 1912 at a cost of \$3 million. It would probably cost something in the order of \$37 million or \$40 million to replace. If we were talking in terms of today's values. Obviously, window replacement and a number of other things that have been done, stripping to the walls and finally insulating a building that was never properly insulated when it was built in 1912, represents a fair cost. There is no question about that. I think the details will be provided for you when your motion for return has been answered. I believe it has already been ordered.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — I don't want the floor by floor and office by office as the question on the order paper asks. What I'm trying to figure out is if you have a ball park figure. Every year, to do the renovations as you slowly move around the building, is it a half million dollars or something like that? And the second part of my question was, is your labor for these employees who do the work charged to the project? Or is it as the city of Saskatoon, my former employer, used to do, just charged to wages no matter what they are doing?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The internal refurbishing, for example, of the Legislative Chamber was done largely, except for some contract work, by the public works advance account. The total cost of course involves the cost of labor supplied by the public works advance account. Obviously the entire cost of refurbishing, which included a host of things including this new public address system or sound reinforcing system, comes into the total cost of the package.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, just to make sure I understand you, the cost of the labor of the individuals is charged to the account and is charged against any operation they are doing?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The figures that finally emerge and that you will receive when the motion for return is replied to will include the labor charge which the public works



advance account laced inhere along with the other charges for the electrical and other work. Incidentally, laying the conduit in the event we are inclined to put television in the Chamber will even be included in this scheme of things.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I understand from the member for Wilkie's benefit that a lot of that cable is already in for television if it is necessary — the conduit and so forth. So the cable can be pulled. What I was looking for, and I think the minister has given me the answer, is in the advance account you have some employees who don't show up on the list of employees here because they're charged to the advance account. That's why you have X amount of employees there. That's the group of the plasterer, the painter, the rug layer and so forth.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Yes, they don't show because it is an advance account which is, I guess, done different ways in different jurisdictions. In some other parts of the country they use something in the order of a Crown corporation, which is, I suppose, something remotely close to the advance account for this particular purpose. So these do not show in terms of our staff complement.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Could you tell me what vote I should ask for the amount of bodies and so forth under the advance account?

**MR. SNYDER:** — There is no vote. That doesn't come before the House. It's not shown on this subvote because it is an advance account.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — So then I guess I should just ask how many employees are handled under the advance account.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'm told the staff there varies depending on the workload, depending on the specialized projects being undertaken. Usually the permanent component there is about 80. It will be as high as 112, depending in a very large measure on the kind of work that's being undertaken by the advance account. They have, in the advance account, a large number of people who are specialized in certain fields, artisans who do some pretty remarkable cabinet work and things of that nature, refurbishing the Chamber. Some very skillful people do the kind of work you see done here with a good deal of success and a good deal of acclaim.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Is the Apollo warehouse in this area or was it in Regina east or west? I mean Gemini, Gemini warehouse, is it in this vote?

**MR. SNYDER:** — You can back up to the last page. It's in the Regina east district. That's where you find the Gemini warehouse, a storehouse of all sorts of materials for different agencies and departments. The Gemini warehouse is a leased space we use for storage for a host of things. That will be subvote 7 really, which we have passed.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, is there any thought to a storage area of the Gemini type within the government's own property rather than leasing? I think of all the things from the archives and things like that which are stored. Maybe some of your older buildings which you aren't using for staff would be handier than that particular warehouse, even though I realize you need railroad and big truck space for certain things.

**MR. SNYDER:** — We're finding that we'll always have a balance between leased space and owned space. For this particular purpose that Gemini warehouse has been found

to be particularly well adapted for our purposes; and the price is right. Accordingly, the department doesn't have any intentions at this precise moment of building. I think if we were to make out our list of capital projects which we believed were necessary, on a scale of 1 to 10, it would probably find itself off the end of the Richter scale because I don't think that's regarded as a particular or a special need area for us.

Item 9 agreed.

#### **Item 10**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — When you move into the new office tower in Weyburn, will that release rented space or owned space?

**MR. SNYDER:** — It will involve both. We will be leaving some space currently owned and occupied and there will be some lease space. Do you want detail on it? It's mostly owned space I am told but there will be some lease space we will be vacating also.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — What will happen to this owned space?

**MR. SNYDER:** — We have two particular locales, one of them out at the old Saskatchewan hospital. The office space has been determined to be pretty antique and not really adaptable in terms of current use for office space. There is a suggestion that there may be some need found for it with respect to training programs for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That's one of the things being explored at this point in time.

The other building which you may know of on Railway Avenue currently houses a number of agencies and departments including, I believe, health, social services and the Department of Labour. The understanding is that building will be demolished. It's an ancient building and probably has outlived its usefulness in terms of electrical, mechanical and other features. I am told it will disappear from the landscape within 90 days.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, the new building is a joint project. Who is the joint partner with you?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Oxford developers are the partner, if you can refer to them as a partner. They were the developer which was involved in the project from the beginning.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — I understand during a bill we discussed earlier that in the Weyburn situation you bought out some people. Somewhere along the line I picked up a statement (I'm not sure exactly where it came from) that most of the people you bought out remained within the community and reinvested in the community, so the dollars all stayed in Weyburn. Nobody pulled and ran. Am I correct in this piece of information?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Yes, that's right. We are more than delighted and I think the hon. member for Weyburn will echo this. Every one of the businesses that was disturbed in any way has rebuilt and reinvested; not one of them went out of business or went elsewhere; 140 some new jobs appeared in the entire process. In general terms we think it has been a rather remarkable success. And not only that, it has had the effect of having businesses in the immediate area spruce up their operation. It has had the effect of rejuvenating the whole downtown core which has been a real advantage to the Weyburn downtown business area.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Just before you have a problem with breaking your arm patting your back, I think we should also say the same thing happened when a private developer did the whole thing in Saskatoon when they built the centre down there; it rejuvenated all the businesses around the area and created new employment. The CNR didn't take their money and run. They stayed within the area as well. So it happens on both sides. Go ahead, Paul.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I'd just like to pursue the line of questioning on that Weyburn downtown development. You said the Oxford group is from Edmonton. Is that correct or is that Toronto?

**MR. SNYDER:** — No, they are headquartered in Toronto I understand.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — What interest does the government have in that development; what interest does Oxford have? Start with that question.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I provided all of that. It's all on the record from yesterday. I gave an indication of the cost analysis and the fact the Government of Saskatchewan had begun the whole operation by land assembly in the order of \$4.6 million. It's all on record. If you want me to repeat it I can, but you can read it in the Hansard.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Perhaps just one final question. What attempts had been made to negotiate with the Saskatchewan firm at that time?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I would have to remind the member this was something in the order of three years ago. The Department of Government Services did not have a direct involvement in terms of that sort of negotiation because of the direct involvement of the Department of Municipal Affairs. I understand Department of Finance and municipal affairs had direct involvement in making the arrangements and the consultation that took place prior to choosing the Oxford group. I understand there was an offer submitted by a number, but pretty limited involvement by Saskatchewan developers I am told. So the Department of Government Services did not have a direct involvement with respect to the developer that was engaged.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You say a number of proposals had been submitted. I really would like to know if any proposals had been submitted by a Saskatchewan firm or if they had been asked to submit a proposal on it.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Our understanding is that at that time, some three years ago, there were no Saskatchewan developers which submitted a proposal. I wouldn't want to stake my life on it, but that's the recollection of our people. The suggestion was there was limited interest from Saskatchewan. I think there has been a good deal of expertise acquired by Saskatchewan developers over the last 24 to 36 months, but that I understand was not that evident three years ago.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That isn't saying very much for the developers and the contractors we have had in this province for many, many years. I am sure the developers in this province will certainly take objection to the statement you have just made, Mr. Minister. I think the government, (and I'm looking at the minister over there who has a grin on his face) should start taking a darn good look at the Saskatchewan developers and keep that business at home. I don't know why it is this government seems to favor out-of-province developers for these very lucrative projects that are coming on stream in this

province. We have the case of the Regina Cornwall Centre; we have the Weyburn one. I believe the Swift Current one (I stand to be corrected on that), I believe the one in Prince Albert, and I don't know how many more. Isn't it about time you started negotiating, and not necessarily waiting for local developers to approach you, but for you to approach them? What is it the developers in this province have? Is it bad breath, or odor, or what?

I know they are capable. There are firms large enough in this province to handle this work. They have the expertise. I don't agree with the minister when he says they've developed that expertise in the last 24 months. They've had that expertise for many years. I say this to you and I say this to the ministers across in this government. Unless you start taking a look at spending that money which you are so easily spending in this province and start spending it at home, two of the people of this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Minister of Urban Affairs has a twisted sense of humor.

I've asked this government on numerous occasions now to ask for proposals from local developers, to give advantage and recognition to them, and I get jokes from the Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Minister, I think it's high time we recognize the abilities and the capabilities of local developers, and started handing some of the lucrative contracts to them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — I don't believe, Mr. Chairman that the member for Regina South is saying anything we on this side of the House don't concur with fully. In the event that Saskatchewan developers are able to provide a product for us which will fill the needs of Saskatchewan and will do it at a cost which is competitive, then we're certainly more than anxious with respect to a sort of buy-Saskatchewan policy. Certainly, I don't believe there's anyone on this side of the House who'll disagree with that sentiment.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, just one more comment on that. The minister mentions buy Saskatchewan products. This could become a bit of a joke in itself; look at not only these lucrative contracts you've handed out, but also all the advertising. Look at your own buildings, which you were responsible for. Take, for example, the Tommy Douglas Building. You went to Toronto for that work and that was your department — for the signs. Internal and external signs for that building. I understand, were done by a Toronto firm as was the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) sign for change of the logo.

One more comment on that, Mr. Minister. You said a minute ago you'd be happy to go to local developers if they could handle it. Well, I don't know of a project in this province which couldn't have been handled by a Saskatchewan developer. You name me one which couldn't have been. I don't think you'd be wise in starting to name any developers in this province which couldn't handle that.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think we have to respond to the hon. member and suggest he direct his questions to someone who had some direct responsibility for it. Obviously, not having had the responsibility for making the arrangements with the developer, we have no intimate knowledge of the terms and conditions. I indicated to you earlier, this was not a decision made by the Department of Government Services but was made, I think probably for excellent reasons, by both municipal affairs and the Department of Finance at that time. I'm sure there was a good, sound and logical reason for the

decision they made.

With respect to the signage, you were saying (I am not sure of the actual connotation) something about the signage at the T.C. Douglas Building, that we were supposed to have gone elsewhere for. Our people have no knowledge at all of what it is you are talking about because any signage done with respect to the T.C. Douglas Building was not contracted for out-of-province.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Would you mind telling me who did it? The information I received was that it was done. I had it in fact in my file somewhere. I had the name of the contractor from Toronto who did it.

**MR. SNYDER:** — August 3, 1979, contract no. 38, fabrication of interior signage and directories, T.C. Douglas Building, Regina, ABC Engraving and Regina Visual Display (both Regina-based firms).

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — What was the cost of that contract?

**MR. SNYDER:** — \$47,554.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — O.K., who did the designing?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Gordon Arnott was directly involved. He may conceivably have had some consultants advising him, but Gordon Arnott was the architect who was directly responsible and ABC Engraving and Regina Visual Display.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — As I said, I stand to be corrected, but I will check my files and come back with the name of the firm given to me that actually manufactured those signs. Obviously, I was given wrong information. I will check it out.

**MR. SNYDER:** — We can't give assurances the persons with whom we contract do not do some subcontracting on their own. It is very possible that Gordon Arnott and associates contracted with someone else for some of the additional work that could conceivably have been done out of the province. But we have no way of knowing that. We contract to them. They make whatever arrangements are adequate for their purposes.

Item 10 agreed.

Items 11 and 12 agreed.

### **Item 13**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — There are 42 employees; there were 25. Explanation?

**MR. SNYDER:** — McIntosh Mall.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — O.K., now this is McIntosh Mall. They are not as they are in the other accounts. They are not like the other 80 or 90 people in the advance account.

**MR. SNYDER:** — These are basically caretaker and maintenance people who are and will be employed during this fiscal in the McIntosh Mall. That will replace, of course, the people who were doing this sort of work in leased quarters in other parts of Prince

April 24, 1980

Albert.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, this is strictly the maintenance staff in this building and around this area. Is this what you are informing me?

Item 13 agreed.

Item 14 agreed.

### **Item 15**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — In Swift Current, with I believe it is called the Wood Building or something, there were problems, I understand, with the footings and so forth. I assume by now that problem has been resolved and the costs have been doled out to those responsible. What are they?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think the answer for that has been provided in an order for return. Yes, that has long since been solved and more appropriate pilings were put in place. That's something like a 24 month old problem that has been solved and the building is finished and officially opened.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — At the time you told us there was no cost back to you and that's why I was just asking again. To this date you haven't been asked for any more costs?

**MR. SNYDER:** — No, that's not entirely true. There was some cost to the government, but the part charged to the government was the incremental difference between putting in the new piles and the cost of the original piles had the appropriate piles been put in place in the first place. That is the cost that was absorbed by the Department of Government Services. The additional cost such as blasting off the caps and that sort of thing was not charged. I believe it was Western Caissons that were held responsible for what was believed to be an error in judgment on their part. Accordingly they absorbed the additional costs, except those costs that would have been incurred had the appropriate piles been put in place in the first place.

Item 15 agreed.

### **Item 16**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Now 16 and 17 are what? They are both to the same party. One, I guess, is strictly grounds and the other is buildings or what?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The \$1.4 million represents the normal operating maintenance and the \$863,100 represents development, which will be new washrooms, new landscaping and new turf, things of that nature. Things of that nature will be absorbed in the \$863,000; the \$1.4 million is normal maintenance.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Where does the landscaping for the T.C. Douglas Building show up?

**MR. SNYDER:** — You'll find that under capital when you turn the page. It's under capital expenditure.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Which vote? Give me a vote. Just a minute while I find it under capital so I'll know where to ask about it.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Item 4 will be where you'll find it, in that \$4,739,400.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — There are no charges other than the grounds caretaking and the additional improvements you referred to in your statement, am I correct? There are no funds here for say, the Centre of the Arts, around that building?

**MR. SNYDER:** — My understanding is that we do share in the cost of the landscaping work on a pro rata basis. You'll know of the tripartite arrangement with the university, the province of Saskatchewan and the city of Regina. If you're talking about the maintenance in that sort of operation, such as the Centre of the Arts, that's largely the responsibility of culture and youth. You'll have an opportunity to get them directly. I don't know if they follow us tonight or not.

Item 16 agreed.

Items 17 and 18 agreed.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, earlier you made a comment, when you were speaking to the member for Regina South, about effective savings by using your department to do certain things for other areas because you had the expertise. Your department used to be the purchasing agent, if I remember correctly, and is not now any more. While that's the case, I wish to make a comment. Who does the purchasing of all the furniture and so forth in this building, and are you charged for it in this particular vote? Do you purchase it or is it purchased and then billed to you?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. I made a mistake here. This last vote isn't designed to elicit any questions. What item did you wish to discuss that under?

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — It's O.K. I can do it under Capital Expenditure.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would that be O.K. then? I was out of order in allowing that.

Government Services Vote 13 agreed.

## **CAPITAL EXPENDITURE VOTE 14**

### **Item 1**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — What are you going to construct or build for the Department of Agriculture?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This particular expenditure for agriculture represents space to be occupied in the southwest wing of what is popularly known as the Administration Building, the building directly south of the Legislative Building in this legislative area complex. This \$552,500 represents the cost of providing that space for agriculture.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — The building is on the grounds. It's a government services' building. You're going to charge it out to them? Try it one more time. Are you doing something special for them in that building, which they're paying for?

**MR. SNYDER:** — It's just a simple matter of identifying this because this space is to be occupied by the Department of Agriculture on completion. It will not be charged to them. It's a capital outlay and merely identified here for practical purposes to indicate

that this is money spent for space that will be provided to the Department of Agriculture in the Administration Building.

Item 1 agreed.

## **Item 2**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Why the extra \$1 million? He's not worth it.

**MR. SNYDER:** — This represents court renovations in North Battleford, and the court house in Regina. The cash flow this year represents something in the order of \$380,008 and \$375,004 (for the court house in Regina) for a total of \$756,000. And the total of Attorney General is \$2,194,900.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Excuse me, Mr. Minister, what is the rationale behind spending over \$2 million for the Attorney General when in your own words the Attorney General is closing and has made the decision to close several court houses in the province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. SNYDER:** — There have been a number of projects approved with respect to court house updating, refurbishing, and construction. Among the new projects approved were the court house addition in Saskatoon at a total cost of \$4,000,000, with a cash flow of \$194,008 this year; court house relocation and renovation in Prince Albert, another \$750,000, with cash flow of \$45,000; and court house addition and property purchase and construction in Regina. There will be a total figure there in excess of \$6 million. Something in the order of \$1 million is basically for land purchase during this fiscal year. This makes a total cash flow this year of \$2,194,000.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Minister, you undoubtedly heard earlier the member for Indian Head-Wolseley talking about the heritage of the buildings, the court houses being closed down in the province of Saskatchewan. Is there not some means by which some kind of a trade off can be developed by which those so-called historical buildings can be exchanged to create a situation in which this kind of expenditure for new court house facilities is not possible?

What we're hearing is that court houses are closing in Saskatchewan and the government is spending \$2 million for new facilities. Doesn't that seem to you to be a little bit ridiculous?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think the hon. member has to have cognizance of the fact that there has been no announcement made at this time to close Moosomin, Arcola, or wherever it is you're talking about. I don't know. That question would be more properly addressed to the Attorney General. I don't know what the ultimate plans are.

I think that what you should do, if you believe that the changes, additions and renovations to the court houses are unnecessary, is talk to some of the judiciary. Perhaps you do. In any case it would be a good idea because they don't agree with you that in any way the services provided in the Saskatchewan court houses are adequate for a whole bunch of reasons that I needn't go into. But you should have a chat with some of the judiciary because they wouldn't agree that it was improper or unwise for us to make some investment in the judicial system, which I think in many instances is archaic and in need of updating in a very major way.



**MR. COLLVER:** — As the minister is aware, I have had many discussions with the Saskatchewan judiciary of one kind or another and I'm certain the minister will understand that's not the information I have been given. It is not the facilities that are outdated. It is the administration that is outdated, but that's a matter I have to take up with the Attorney General and not with you.

I would think that the minister responsible for government services, who has available to him this amazing array of talent he has boasted about this evening, and for which they are spending huge sums of money, could possibly make up some kinds of trade-gifts when he knows there are going to be closures of some kind in the Attorney General's office. Surely that's right. We know there are going to be closures of some kind. The Attorney General has announced that in this House. Doesn't it indicate a lack of planning in your department not to have some kind of idea how you can trade off the closing of court houses against the expenditures of (in the minds of most people in Saskatchewan, \$2 million is a huge sum of money) huge sums of money for new facilities?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think the member has to recognize the fact that the court houses in our province are not portable court houses. And that represents a few problems for us. But I think you have to take into account as I mentioned to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley that we have given a good deal of thought and have expressed a good deal of concern with respect to heritage buildings. The Minister of Culture and Youth will be introducing or has already perhaps introduced legislation with respect to heritage buildings. A good deal of emphasis is going to be placed upon the whole question of refurbishing and retaining historical sites in the province of Saskatchewan. I think we are prepared to do our part, along with the Department of Culture and Youth in order to make sure heritage buildings do not fall by the wayside unnecessarily but are not necessarily retained just because they are old.

I think we have done a good job. I think the Land Titles Building in particular, where SaskSport is housed, is a rather remarkable example of taking a beautiful building and maintaining it for a very useful purpose.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I couldn't agree with you more and I commend the department for the excellence of its work on the Land Titles Building in Regina. However, if a little more planning were put into the situation today, perhaps we wouldn't be back here next year talking about \$2 million net expenditure on the Attorney General's department. You might be saying to us, we have been able to take some of these old court houses and convert them into government offices in these various centres. We have been able to take some of these old court houses and convert them, retaining their historical significance, into liquor outlets in these various centres. We have been able to take these various outlets and convert them into educational facilities in these various centres. And, in that way, exchange an expenditure on the one side for the expenditure, the huge expenditures we're seeming on behalf of the Attorney Generals' department.

All I am suggesting to the minister is that perhaps a little foresight might prevent what's been happening in Saskatchewan for the last number of years. And that is, historical and old buildings in small centres being shut down and turned into ramshackle shacks, while at the same time new ugly liquor stores and government buildings are being constructed in these same towns. And it seems to me to be a tremendous waste of money not to plan ahead and see that the Attorney General's closing facilities and that they can be exchanged for these new facilities that you're constructing on his behalf.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I can't help but agree with a great deal of what the hon. member is saying. And I don't believe his suggestions head us in a different direction from that in which we are pointing ourselves. For example, the member for Shaunavon will tell you that we are proposing to do a major overhaul of a beautiful old building in Shaunavon, the Shaunavon court house, and in that particular community we've got something in the order of \$198,000 which we propose to spend. That's the cash flow for this year, with a total expenditure of something under \$0.5 million for refurbishing what we believe to be a beautiful old landmark. This is something we are going to continue to do over a period of time.

Item 2 agreed.

Item 3 agreed.

#### **Item 4**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, you indicated this would be the place to ask questions about furniture. Furniture in this building about December or January became very hard to get. The information passed to me from officials within your department is the department had run out of money and had to wait until the new budget came to pay for and purchase additional furniture that was to be ordered to arrive in the new year. Is that a correct statement or have I got my facts wrong?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think the question the member asked initially was, do we buy furniture? You made some reference to the purchasing agency. The purchasing agency, as the member indicated, is now located in revenue and supply. They do our purchasing for us and we do the allocation.

I think you are perfectly right when you say that from time to time we find ourselves in a position where we have spent our budget. Accordingly, like every good household manager, when you spend your budget you have to wait until payday before you have some more money to spend. That obviously was the case and that is not an unusual set of circumstances.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I'll see if I can keep my two friends here a little quieter and we'll get into it. You suggest you ran out of money. You had to wait for furnishings. But yet I look in other estimates and I see we're going to have to vote for \$1.5 million. That will come up later. But what I'm concerned about is that we buy furniture, charge it to the next year, and then each year keep running out because we have had to buy something this year and pay for it out of next year's budget.

Now for three months you were out of money, is the situation as I understand it. So anything you ordered during those three months, you couldn't take receipt of until the new fiscal year when the new cheque came in, as you said, and then you pay for it. But how often does this continue? And do we end up next year having four months when we run out of money? And the next year five months? Or is this the first time it has happened?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I don't know what the member is suggesting with respect to ordering furniture this year and not paying for it until next year because if that was what the member said, that's not the method of operation. On occasions I suppose if we had an unlimited amount of money, the demands and requirements made would be excessive

and so we allocate for furniture what we believe to be an appropriate amount. Sometimes demands are greater than others. Accordingly there will be times when we have spent our allocation. That is not an unusual set of circumstances and we really aren't making any apologies for it.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, in going through government departments we always seem to get a supplementary estimate sheet of overspending. Of course your department is no different; we have one for you. It comes down to a very fine point. I think you gave a truthful answer; I appreciate that. You said you had to wait until more money came. I use this example because it is an obvious example, and amounts to millions of dollars. The land bank for example, last year spent \$13 million more than it had; this year it has a \$25 million budget. Does this mean there is only \$12 million left for them to spend in the next 12 months? You say good housekeepers quit when the money runs out. I agree with you. Land bank is the reverse example.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Whose estimates are you handling tonight anyway?

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — No. What I'm asking is hopefully you aren't going to be in the same boat they are, where they've spent the years' budget . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order. I hope you're not asking the minister to explain why the land bank spent \$13 million more.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — That is my example. I hope he is not in the same type of situation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Question?

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Yes. You're guaranteeing me you're not in the same situation where you are spending next year's money and then you're short next year again as the land bank has done?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'm not ready to concede what the land bank has done or hasn't done. I'm here for the purpose of attempting to justify the subvotes we're dealing with under the Department of Government Services. I hope you will bear with me and allow me to talk about my estimates and not about land bank.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — I will rephrase the question for the minister's benefit. Am I to assume that because this year you were short and you had to wait as a good housekeeper would (as you said), that next year we are not going to see you waiting four months, and the following year five months, because you're spending it faster than it's coming in and more than was allowed to you by the votes of this Assembly? In other words do you believe (as you seem to indicate) you spend what you've voted for? You don't go out and spend money that was never voted to you normally and as a procedure each year you spend the money before you get it?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think you have to appreciate that times and circumstances will change. Obviously you know, if we get a bunch of MLAs for space for opposition members and then need some furniture and you're busy making overtures to the Department of Government Services, it may very well be we will make some overexpenditures. It might even be we would go to treasury board to ask for an extra appropriation for a particular purpose. We have had occasions during the year to go to treasury board for overexpenditures on such things as a co-op store which represented to us (in North Battleford) a particularly good buy. You know, under these

circumstances I don't think you need to be, nor should you be constrained by . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Say, can you let me finish? I'll be just tickled to death to listen to anything you have to say.

In the event there is a particular need, it's economic and makes ultimately good sense, then I don't think I'm going to put myself in a position where I am going to guarantee you we will never spend another penny over and above that which we vote tonight. We'll come back. We will be obliged to justify expenditures that are made.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — My point was that it wasn't a fiscal policy for this to be happening. As long as you seem to be indicating it isn't the fiscal policy to happen every year, it's one of those situations caused by unforeseen circumstances, fine. I'll buy that.

Item 4 agreed.

#### **Item 5**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Hold it. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned I should ask about the grounds over here under this vote. The Tommy Douglas Building, I should be asking under here? You can send it over if you like. You don't have to give it to me now. That is the cost of the landscaping around the Tommy Douglas Building. You said it is in this vote, if you could send me the information.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I don't know if we have it grouped. The cash flow this year or the total cost of the project — total cost of the landscaping?

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — The landscaping, total costs, and the cost for this year. Last year, you did the grounds work. You levelled it out a bit. This year you'll plant the grass and so forth.

**MR. SNYDER:** — We can make that available to you.

Item 5 agreed.

Items 6 and 7 agreed.

#### **Item 8**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Is this for jails? The \$10 million?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Saskatoon and Prince Albert correctional institutions.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Total cost for both jails when the project is complete is what? \$23 million, you said?

**MR. SNYDER:** — In the order of \$24 million, that's a good round figure.

Item 8 agreed.

Item 9 agreed.

Government Services — Capital Expenditure — Vote 14 agreed.

**Government Services  
Supplementary  
Consolidated Fund  
Vote 14**

**Item 1**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — The member in front of me says, is this a good housekeeping award of \$1 million? What was the overexpenditure?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This overexpenditure has to do with the correctional institutions, and was because of good weather and ability to continue with construction into the winter months. You'll know that earlier in the season we had some particularly mild weather which allowed construction to continue, so this construction was advanced and an additional \$1.4 million appropriated for that purpose. The two correctional centres.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — How much in P.A. and how much in Saskatoon? Do you have any idea?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'm sorry, I erred, in Saskatoon only.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I assume the \$1.5 which was advanced is still within the budget of the \$23 million. Am I correct? So these aren't additional funds? They are from the original projected total, but are just coming on stream a little faster than you expected?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This won't in any way affect the total cost of the budget. It's an expenditure which was made earlier than expected because of the advance in the construction work, because the construction work and the completion date will arrive sooner than we expected. The correctional centre in Saskatoon will be finished in advance of the estimated time it was expected to be finished. But it will not add to the anticipated or estimated cost of the building.

Item 1 agreed.

Supplementary agreed.

**Government Services  
Supplementary  
Heritage Fund  
Vote 14**

**Item 1**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — What's the money for? What's the project?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The money, which is coming from the heritage fund, will be used for the Saskatchewan Research Council lab in Saskatoon and we act as project manager for that particular piece of work. You'll find it on page 123 of your estimate book under government services, construction of a resource research facility — Saskatoon.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, do you want to do Vote 8 or do you want to do this — which one do you do first?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — We're dealing with the supplementals for last year, 1980, from the heritage fund, which is found on page 8 and it's \$1,054,900 for a research facility in Saskatoon. The next one will be page 123 that I'll be dealing with.

April 24, 1980

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask the question sort of double — the \$2.2 million under 14 on page 123 and the \$1.5 million, when was that voted for the project? When was it voted to build the project in your department? Or is this the first vote and you've started early?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This is the one that you are voting this year> This is your vote this year, provincial lab \$300,000; the construction of resource research facility, Saskatoon \$2.2 million; restoration of Saskatchewan House \$822,000; restoration of Northwest Territorial Government Administration Building \$7,000, for a total of \$3.3 million to be voted this year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! Just so that no one is confused. We aren't dealing with page 123 of the estimates at this time. We are dealing with the supplemental estimate, the last year budget, 1980, \$1,054,900. It's on page 8 of the supplementary book.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Normally, we see it in the estimates first as we do on page 123, but we are seeing a supplementary vote on. When did we first vote for the start of this project. I don't remember it in last year's budget, so why do we have a supplementary? That's the problem, Billy. It's page 8 of the supplementary.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I understand this is a project that was given to us midstream. Do you want the answer or are we going to sit there and chuckle? Well, it was . . . You sit down dummy.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I'm sitting here . . . Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Take your point of order.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I am on a point of order. I am sitting here with my honourable colleague from Indian Head-Wolseley who happened to say something to me that was humorous and I laughed and the Minister of Labour called me a dummy. Now then, if you heard that then a retraction is in order. It's unparliamentary . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. I think we were rolling along pretty well here in estimates and I would like to finish these estimates in the spirit in which we started. I do believe that to refer to another hon. member as being a dummy is unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. minister to withdraw without qualification.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I withdraw, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. COLLVER:** — A question rather than a point of order. It was my understanding that members must speak from their chair. Is that true or untrue?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — No.

**MR. COLLVER:** — You can speak from anywhere?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Yes.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you very much. I have just one question then for the minister. Mr. Chairman, if I may? I wonder if the minister is aware of the implications of his

comments on midstream?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'll allow myself to be drawn into that one. Tell me.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, I'm glad the minister would have someone tell him what midstream is. But the minister will be aware that when a doctor is taking urinalysis for whatever purpose, there is always the midstream analysis the doctor takes and I am sure the minister is aware of that. It proves a very unfortunate illness if it's wrong. I think in this particular implication the minister has been talking about, the midstream reference is not particularly appropriate. That's why I believe all the members laughed. I don't think the minister quite got the implication of what he said.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman. The point I was attempting to make was that the program or the construction of the resource research facility in Saskatoon was given to the Department of Government Services midsummer, midseason if you like. Accordingly, we were obliged to go to treasury board for approval and received approval from treasury board to use something in the order of \$1,054,900 for the construction of the research centre. This money is being provided, I understand, from the heritage fund.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, first of all, I remember correctly, SEDCO announced this project at the university campus. I assume we are talking about the same project. Are you suggesting they started something and then dumped it in your lap?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This was announced initially by SEDCO because it's being constructed in the industrial park on SEDCO land. That was the reason as I understand it for the announcement to be made by SEDCO.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Well, SEDCO makes all the foofaraw and gets up and takes all the credit. Then they dump it in your lap and you have to bail them out. Are you charging SEDCO as you're not allowed to by the rules, but are you at least charging them for the mess they left you?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order! Let's not visit back and forth across the House. Let's try to get these estimates done.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I believe the hon. Member is confusing two buildings in somewhat the same locale. There's the SEDCO centre built by SEDCO. This is the Saskatchewan Research Council building which I believe SEDCO did announce. I suppose their reason for announcing it was because there was some coordination done. The research council building was contracted and is being built. It was not a mess left by anyone. It's a building being constructed by the Department of Government Services, or the operation and management is being done by DGS.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Who's going in the building?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The Saskatchewan Research Council.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Is this Dr. Katz and his group of people who have been doing your work? Who are they?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This is the Saskatchewan Research Council. Dr. Pepper is the director of the Saskatchewan Research Council.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — What facilities were they in prior?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This is an additional facility over and above that which has been part of the Saskatchewan Research Council operation previously. Its involvement will be directly in resource development aimed particularly at uranium and potash. That's the main scope of the new operation and the new research council facility.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Who in the end is going to pay for this building, the taxpayers? Or is mineral resources going to pay the costs of the research to protect the citizens? Who is going to end up paying for this, the taxpayers?

**MR. SNYDER:** — As we indicated to you, the money for the Saskatchewan Research Council centre is being provided out of the heritage fund which, as the member will know, originates from resource development, from revenues from oil, potash and other resource revenues. They will retrieve some of that expenditure from agencies and industry that make use of the facilities they are providing and the experiments and research facilities provided by the research council.

Government Services — Supplementary — Heritage Fund — Vote 14 agreed.

**Government Services  
Heritage Fund  
Vote 14**

Item 1 agreed.

**Item 2**

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Is that for Regina?

**MR. SNYDER:** — This \$300,000 will be a vote to provide for the new provincial lab building out by the Plains Health Centre.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I understand (and correct me if I am wrong . . . I am not wrong very often, I'll tell you!) You are going to be proven wrong more often than I am with the trouble you are causing in Saskatoon with the telecable people. So stay out of it.

Mr. Minister, I understand all laboratories around the province are going to be moving into the one in Saskatoon at the san. The people have already been given their notices and told they may have to move into the one in Regina (for the benefit of the people behind you). Is this the reason for it?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I can't give you any assurances with respect to who moves out and who moves in and what the arrangements are because it is a program of the Department of Health. You will have to direct your questions to them. We do not have any knowledge of that.

Item 1 agreed.

**Item 3**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — On that item, Mr. Minister, are you planning any further expenditures on it next year, or is this going to be the completion of Saskatchewan



House?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The expectation is we may not spend the entire \$822,000 but that will not mean the full restoration. There will probably be another subvote for Saskatchewan House next year for the completion. It is unlikely the restoration will be completed during this fiscal year.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Do you have any idea of about how much it is going to cost to completely restore it, including the furnishings?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think it will be necessary to do a little digging. If we can provide that information to you in written form, we will get that to you within the next few days. Is that agreeable?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you. Yes, it is agreeable. I am curious. I think the people of Regina are curious to know how much you are going to be spending on that because it is certainly a historical building. What success are you having in locating the furniture for that building? I read an article in the newspaper just recently saying it is quite difficult to find and to replace the furniture which was in there originally.

My final question on it (I may as well throw them all out at once), is it the intention of the government to return it as a Lieutenant-Governor's residence?

**MR. SNYDER:** — The question, I think, the member asked first was, what success were we having with respect to furniture and refurbishing and gathering up furniture that was in keeping with the era we are attempting to duplicate. The bulk of this (with some co-operation coming from the Department of Government Services) is basically the responsibility of the Department of Culture and Youth. They have people who are operating in that general field. But in addition to that you will notice a plea in the Regina Leader-Post, only a few nights ago, asking for people who had period furniture applicable to that particular era to be in touch. They would gladly accept donations and, I thin, even be prepared to pay out good, hard cash for some antique furniture that would fit into the general environment of Saskatchewan House.

With respect to whether the building will ever be used again by the Lieutenant-Governor, I am not at all sure that decision has been made. But I haven't been given any indication that is part of the overall plan. At least nobody has given any indication to me that is what is proposed.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I just thought of another question on it too. I noticed from the newspaper article there was a greenhouse being built onto it. For what purpose is the greenhouse being built?

April 24, 1980

**MR. SNYDER:** — When the premises occupied by the Lieutenant-Governor of the day were built there was a greenhouse attached to it. This was to restore a greenhouse formerly in place. It's expected the greenhouse would still be used for that purpose. It will be used as a greenhouse.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I realize you'll be growing plants and so on in it. But what I meant was, are the plants, flowers and so on going to be grown for the yard around or just for indoors or for what purpose?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think maybe culture and youth is in a better position to tell you about the programming and what is intended. Government services has a more direct mandate for the construction of the premises rather than the programs that go into it.

**MR. R. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, the member mentions the Lieutenant-Governor living there. I understand that may become his office.

**MR. SNYDER:** — I haven't heard any proposal or suggestion that it's to be intended to that it's part of the overall plan of the development of Saskatchewan House. I'm not saying that's not a possibility. I just don't know it to be a fact.

Item 3 agreed.

Item 4 agreed.

Government Services — Heritage Fund — Vote 14 agreed.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE  
FINANCE  
VOTE 11**

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance):** — The member for Thunder Creek isn't here, but I'm sure the member for Regina South would give this to him. He asked me a question last Friday about province of Saskatchewan bonds and how they compared to 1979 to Ontario. I have the information, and if I can get a page I'll send it over, and he can pass it on when it's appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Rousseau.

**MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Chairman, we left off Friday at 12:45 p.m. when the minister wouldn't let me back in. He was a little frightened of the member for Arm River. I have been gone for a week. I have been out doing a bit of tractor work, and I was trying to remember what you said, but since it was such an absolutely nothing speech I couldn't remember it so I had to go back through Hansard to see what you said. As a Minister of Finance of the province of Saskatchewan, I'm ashamed of you, absolutely ashamed. I asked you some questions about Saskatchewan. What are you going to do about the serious situation here? And you got up and took it right down to Ottawa, and never mentioned the province of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Repeat it, Gary, see if he can answer them tonight.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Answer them, of course he can't answer them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will, don't worry. I'm not talking to you.

I just had to go back to Hansard to see what you did say, and I went through the whole

speech and you never even mentioned Saskatchewan at all. What really got me was when you said the whole election the Conservatives were fighting was on interest rates, and you brought the government down for interest rates. Interest rates were hardly ever mentioned by you people, and you say right here: now, I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, that we brought them down because of their high interest rates. It was the 18-cent gas, and you know it was. That's what your counterparts in Ottawa did, brought them down on 18-cent gas. All you wanted to do was get up there and be a big fellow and try to throw us off the subject.

You weren't interested in answering my questions, but boy you are going to answer them tonight or we'll stay here for another week. You people over there seem to think it's a joke that we have farmers and small businessmen and people going broke every day. I never said interest rates were your problem. We didn't blame you for high interest rates, but don't blame us either. Because we had a change in government, but did we see anything? And if we had your government in there, what would have happened? You'll never get there to find out, either. It would have been an absolute disaster. They couldn't do any better, either. It would have been an absolute disaster. They couldn't do any better, either. It's easy for your federal leader to make promises; he knew he didn't have to live up to them because he wasn't going to get there. It was a cinch.

I was also really disappointed in the minister. Maybe you'll remember in my budget speech I said he was getting so big for his britches that the Premier had to put him in as finance minister. But I don't think that's a problem after the way you answered questions here last week; he's not worried about you. You're going to go out in that leaky boat and you'll go down without a rudder, I can tell you that. I challenge you to come over to the Humboldt area and we'll get in the first 100 people we see; we'll ask them where they want this money spent. When I mentioned last Friday the auction I went to, that's exactly who I was talking to, people from your constituency, people who voted for you, who said no more of those carryings on. I know you are in trouble, because I see from the new allocation maps you had to take a little bit of my bad area to help you out. Thank you. You were worried about the member for Arm River. You know he won't be beaten next time; but you took some of my worst area and put it in with your area. Boy, that sure shows what . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order! I think we have always allowed fairly broad ranging debate on item 1, but ranging to the bad areas in the Arm River constituency I think maybe is taking it a little too far. I would ask you to confine your remarks to item 1.

I wonder if we could cut down on the visiting from both sides of the House. It makes it a little difficult.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — O.K., I'll just ask some questions then. Do you think there is a chance we're in a recession right now?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — In Canada we are not at the present time in a period of negative growth, so therefore I think it is fair to say we're not in a period of recession.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I haven't entered into this debate yet, but I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions on finance, and since we are still on item 1 this might be an appropriate time. Mr. Minister, do you ever, in the course of your work as the Minister of Finance for the province of Saskatchewan, or do any of your staff, make a comparative analysis with any other province in Canada or any other area in North America as to total government expenditures, total taxation, demographic layouts and

so on? Do you ever do that kind of analysis to see whether or not the Government of Saskatchewan is either keeping up or not keeping up with the kinds of policies being established by other governments?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, indeed we do from time to time, as is indicated in the budget speech on page 49. We there indicate one of those kinds of comparisons which we make.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, I noticed on page 49, you compared only with other Canadian areas. Do you ever make any kind of comparisons with American areas with similar demographic conditions as exist in Saskatchewan?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We can't remember any in the recent past which we have done.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well then the minister might be interested in a small comparison of which I know something, perhaps. And perhaps he might jot down a few statistics which might interest him.

I think it might be interesting for you people on the opposite benches to hear these figures. It's only a matter of interest I'm sure, but you might be interested to hear them.

In the state of Arizona, the budget projected for this current year by all municipal educational and state governments, is \$1.75 billion. There are 2.5 million people in the state of Arizona. They have approximately the same kinds of geographic conditions as exist in the province of Saskatchewan, and in fact, there are more areas of mountainous-type roads, more areas of difficult roads to build than there are in the province of Saskatchewan. There exists, for the information of the Minister of Finance, who I am sure would want to pay attention to this in case he could find out something from this, a similar population pattern to that in the province of Saskatchewan. There exists, for the information of the Minister of Finance who I am sure would want to pay attention to this in case he could find out something from this, a similar population pattern to that in the province of Saskatchewan. Approximately one-quarter of the people of the state of Arizona are native Indians. Approximately one-quarter of the state is set aside for native Indian reserves, which is approximately the same kind of geographic conditions and population conditions we have in Saskatchewan, approximately the same. Yet for 2.5 million people the total budget for all municipal, educational and state governments is \$1.75 billion.

It also might interest the Minister of Finance to know that the percentage of service citizens in the state of Arizona exceeds the percentage of senior citizens in the province of Saskatchewan. These are the users (if you like) of medical care facilities. These are the utilizers of the state facilities and of the provincial facilities. These are the utilizers of the nursing homes that are needed and necessary, provided both in the state of Arizona and the province of Saskatchewan.

Yet, here in the province of Saskatchewan, we have a provincial budget of over \$2 billion, excluding the cost of municipal government and excluding the cost of education. But as the former minister of finance and now minister extraordinaire has mentioned, excluding health care.

It might interest members opposite to know that a very significant portion of the Arizona budget goes toward health care. That would shock, I'm sure, the member for Biggar and the Minister of Finance . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but not as much as the province of Saskatchewan, I'll admit. Not as much, but a very significant portion — in the order of 10 per cent of their budget goes toward health care in the state of Arizona. That is health care on behalf — I admit in the province of Saskatchewan it approaches

20 per cent. I agree with that, which means that \$200 million of the Government of Saskatchewan's money allocated from the \$2 billion is in excess of that provided in Arizona and I'll agree with that. So cut the Government of Saskatchewan's budget to \$1.8 billion.

Now we're talking about 2.5 million people with the same geographic kinds of problems, excessive heat there, excessive cold there. They have the same kinds of problems with reference to senior citizens, the same kinds of problems with reference to native Americans or native Canadians. For 2.5 million people they can do it for \$1.75 billion and include municipal costs and educational costs.

Yet in the province of Saskatchewan, for less than a million people we have to expend over \$2 billion plus the cost of municipal government for which by the way, the figure is not available from any department in government because we've checked . . . (inaudible) . . . No, it isn't Paul. The figure is not available without phoning every municipal government in Saskatchewan. That is a research job the likes of which no opposition could possibly perform. Or try to find out the cost of education relative to the local school boards and the figure is not available. Wherever you phone it is not available because I've looked.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to debate with the Minister of Finance the reasons why in the state of Arizona this is true and why in Saskatchewan it is not true. Just to give the minister a few ideas, the legislators of whatever political party, be they Democrat or Republican (in the case of the state of Arizona there is one independent), whatever political stripe, enter into the legislative process with one idea in mind. The idea is to maximize the benefits for their citizens while minimizing the costs. I could give you example after example in this particular year of extreme economic conditions of the legislators in the state of Arizona coming to grips with excessive government expenditure. I could tell you that they have, and are limiting the kinds of increases in property taxes which our citizens are facing here; that they are setting a limit that government may take on people's homes. They are setting limits on what government departments can spend and they are not setting them in accordance with next year or the year after, they are setting them with last year. They are saying to the people of Arizona, we are going to stop government expenditure; we are going to come to grips with inflation and we are going to prevent this ever-increasing burden on our population.

Now the minister will say, sure but the American inflation at the moment is worse than the Canadian, and he's right, it is. But at least the legislators there are facing up to reality and they are saying that the cause of government inflation is primarily governments. The cause of that horrible tax on humans called inflation is government expenditure and they say, we're going to stop it; we're going to limit it. We're going to limit it not only by law but we're going to limit it by constitution. That's why, Mr. Minister, in the state of Arizona with 2.5 million people, split up in approximately the same balance as exists in the province of Saskatchewan, the fact that they can get away with a far lower expenditure by all levels of government and still provide the same kinds of services, except medicare. I'll give you \$200 million on the medicare issue. Even then they can expend far, far less money and obtain the same kinds of results and, in fact, even better results than we achieve here.

Mr. Minister, I have said in this Assembly before and I am going to say it again, there is no possible way . . . I can see it now in the attitude of the minister, in the way he is sitting there and the way he's performing. He's not interested, he doesn't care about the

April 24, 1980

issues raised by the member for Arm River. He's not interested in the issues raised by the member for Regina South. This legislature is not a committee for finance. It's a government exercise in presenting the people their rationale for expending too much money and for no controls. Why aren't we debating here in the province of Saskatchewan the kinds of important limits on government which are necessary in a free society?

Election day is not enough, for the benefit of the new member for — I can't remember where. Election day is not enough. You see that's the purpose for your sitting here. It's the whole purpose of each of us sitting here and it's boring. No one will doubt that this whole Chamber is boring during these estimates but your purpose in sitting here is on behalf of your constituents, to question why it costs so much money in Saskatchewan when it doesn't cost so much in other jurisdictions. Why aren't you doing something about it, Mr. Member? Why aren't any members on the other side doing anything about it?

We have a ruling in this Chamber that any member may question the minister. We would love to see during estimates on this side of House, (and I have difficulty in speaking for members to my right now) but I know they have expressed to me before the opinion that they would love to see the member for Saskatoon Centre rise in his place and question expenditures by the Government of Saskatchewan. Why? Because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, it's not good enough in camera. Oh, it's not good enough in secret. Oh, the principles of democracy depend upon public debate.

What is the minister saying in this Assembly? My goodness, let's do everything in secret. We'll accomplish everything back there in caucus. We'll accomplish everything and these members will make the questions that they have but we'll never ever bring them to the light of day. We'll never let that man's constituents know he did question the Minister of Finance. Never! That's democracy in the minister's opinion. I don't happen to think so.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the reason why the expenditures are so high in the province of Saskatchewan is because our system does not allow open and individual debate on the expenditures of government. The reason why expenditures are so abnormally high in Saskatchewan compared to Arizona is because individual members in Arizona do have a say. They can rise up in their place and move motions that they can hope to be passed. They can rise up in their place and vote in accordance with the conscience of their constituents. They can rise up in their place and make meaningful contributions to the legislature.

But here, what do we see? The minister and his hirelings answering questions. The members from the NDP sitting quietly in their chairs and the minister so busy ignoring the comments and valid ones of the member of Arm River, ignoring the comments and knows when it comes to the crunch, it's automatic. That's what's wrong with our system, Mr. Chairman. It shouldn't be automatic. This place is supposed to be for the open debate in front of the press and in front of the media where we can, as individual members, bring forward suggestions that people listen to. That's why we spend more than we should. You could still have socialism and spend less.

I notice the minister extraordinaire smiles. I know the minister realizes what I say is true. He himself from time to time has brought some semblance of intelligence to this

Chamber. It's unfortunate I have to admit that but he has. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, very few of the members opposite are allowed to use their intelligence to question the expenditures and the decisions of the Department of Finance.

They only sit in their chairs and say, that's the way it's going to be — over \$2 billion plus what we have to raise from municipal governments, plus what we have to raise for education for fewer than one million people — while here's a jurisdiction we can examine that spends \$1.75 billion, including the whole works, for 2.5 million people and gets just as much service except for medicare. As a matter of fact . . .

The member shakes his head. I happen to have some experience. I don't know what his experience is. As a matter of fact, in a great many areas, the government of the state of Arizona provides better, more complete, more reasonable, more humane service to its people than the Government of Saskatchewan. They don't do it in medicare and they should. They should! They don't do it in medicare but you know, Mr. Member for Saskatoon Centre, the definition of socialism, which I'm sure you recognize better than any. It's the kind of socialism, unfortunately, the member for Saskatoon Centre believes in. And that is, what's yours is mine and what's mine is mine. I don't accept that definition of socialism. To me, true socialism means what's yours is mine and what's mine is yours. And we share and share alike. And I'll tell you something, Mr. Chairman, if true socialism existed in this world, if true . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . if the member for Saskatoon Centre is suggesting he would like to share with me both assets and obligations, I would be more than happy to share with him my share of a lawsuit brought by this very group of people over here and I would be happy to share with him all my assets in exchange for that. How would that strike the member? You see, he's backing off already, Mr. Chairman. He doesn't want to debate that now. Now he knows it's not so great to be such a smart ass in his chair. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, that was an unparliamentary word and I do withdraw that word immediately. I withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Finance should recognize the problem. I think he should make examples of the various states in the United States, and compare what's happening in Saskatchewan. He might find that perhaps this system, this legislature, could open up. If the legislature opened up, I wouldn't get any supporters at all.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to get into a prolonged debate on the merits of Arizona or any other part of the United States. I am a Canadian. I think some of the services and some of the attitudes and some of the points of view which we as Canadians have toward life, and toward providing services to our citizens in this country, are the kinds of attitudes and services our people want to have; that's why they have them.

Mr. Chairman, we have services in Saskatchewan which I'm sure they don't have in Arizona or some places south of the border. The reason we have those services, Mr. Chairman, is because the people of Saskatchewan have said they want those services. The member talks about medicare and waves that as one example because he knew I would use it as an example — and I will use it as an example.

I'm prepared to stand up in this House or anywhere else and compare our medicare system to anywhere else, not only in the United States, but in North America. And I'm prepared to say, Mr. Chairman, it is a superb medicare system. No doubt about that in my mind.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — The member agrees, and I'm not surprised he would because he has seen both. But, Mr. Chairman, it's not just the question of the medicare system. It's also the question of the hospitalization system. The members must keep in mind that in most places south of the border the hospitalization system is privately owned. It's not just a question of expenditure more or less money. If you are a person, or if you are a government with some semblance of social conscience, surely you have to consider questions like accessibility to those services? No, they don't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and I would be glad to hear it. But I doubt very much whether people who have to put down a \$300 or \$600 deposit before they can get into a hospital bed have accessibility — Mr. Cowley will be able to tell you. He's had experience with whether or not they have the kind of accessibility we have in the province of Saskatchewan.

There was mention made, Mr. Chairman, of a comparison between the tax systems of Canada and the United States. I have one, by the way. We dug it up. It was done by the Department of Finance of Canada. Just for the edification of the members and for their information, I want to quote to you from this analysis which says:

that the paper leads to the general conclusion that the Canadian tax system compares favorably with that in the United States. In aggregate, while tax revenues of all levels of government were 1.8 percentage points of gross domestic product higher in Canada than the United States in 1977, Canadians had the benefit of publicly provided health care services and demographic transfer payments in the form of family allowances and old age security pensions.

And you can add more to that list, Mr. Chairman. It is not so simple to compare Arizona to Saskatchewan. You have to keep in mind that the system of government between state and federal government in the United States is substantially different, from the point of view of their responsibilities, from that which is in Canada and the provinces of Canada. The American federal government carries much more of the responsibility financially than do the state governments, as compared with Canada and the provincial governments in this country.

Now, it's fine to say, Mr. Chairman, we are expending too much money. But I want to point out to this House that for the last five years our rate of growth of expenditures for each of those years has been declining, and I think that's a pretty fair indication of the kind . . . The member for Regina South frowns but it's a fact. Let me make that clear. The rate of growth of expenditures of the government has been declining. I ask members to compare this budget to the last four budgets, and I think it will become clear the rate of growth has indeed been declining. As I was going to say (and I'm going to then sit down), it's fine to say we are expending too much money, because those are nice sounding words. But you cannot just say that without, at the same time saying, where will you cut back? Tell us that. Which programs would you do away with? And when you have told us that, I think you will really have contributed to the debate (sorry, I should be speaking through the Chairman) in which the member indicated this House should be making contributions.

**MR. COLLVER:** — First of all, I am going to answer the minister's last question. The minister's last question was, where would I cut back? Well, I'm going to start with one very heavy expenditure of the Government of Saskatchewan, and that is the \$600 million borrowed to buy potash mines. That's just one example of an expenditure of the province of Saskatchewan of some \$60 million in interest payments (and I am giving



the member opposite the benefit of the doubt here because I am only allowing 10 per cent interest). An expenditure of \$60 million would not have to be made. Now, that's number one for start. Number two — you check your item of budget, Mr. Minister of Finance. The day the people of Saskatchewan don't realize the expenditure of interest on borrowings of \$2.5 billion or \$3 billion now (which I gather is approximately the right level of borrowing in Saskatchewan) that they don't have to pay for those borrowings (when people say to themselves, we don't have to pay for that), that's the day when socialism will reign supreme because then you won't ever have to argue your points at all. You're getting money for zip; and you might just as well be Social Creditors then, because that's what they want. They want money for nothing, and that's what you're getting, isn't it, ex-minister of finance?

Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make to the Minister of Finance is that there are jurisdictions in North America which are curtailing expenditures of government. There isn't a single economist in North America who doesn't agree that rampant inflation is the result of excessive government spending — not one. Mr. Chairman, absolutely everything in the realm of economics is debatable. Every economist in North America differs on the means of production and the ways that they shall go about things and the means of accomplishing certain areas. There isn't any set group and I was told this as a matter of fact when I went to college. I think I actually said this in this Assembly at one time but perhaps it's worth repeating.

The very first lecture I ever had in economics is the one I remember the best. That was where the professor stood before the classroom and said, I am about to prove to you that two plus two equals the pope. And we sat there dumbfounded. Sixty students. So what does this mean? The man went through an exercise of two plus two plus four plus eight and he went through this exercise for 40 minutes. At the conclusion of that exercise he in fact did prove that two plus two equals the pope. He said, any member of this class who finds the error in my calculations will get an automatic first. This is a true story.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And you found it, eh?

**MR. COLLVER:** — No one found it because surprisingly enough, for the benefit of that eminently intelligent Minister of Health, no one in that class, some of whom arrived there with a number of scholarships (I don't know whether the Minister of Health received one), was smart enough to pick up where the man had made his error.

The point he was trying to make was that economics is such a vast subject and such a broad subject matter. The point he was trying to make was that if you make the tiniest of errors the logic that will lead to will lead you to a wrong conclusion. He said economics is an art.

I'm saying to you that's true. Economics is an art and to a very great extent most economists can't agree. But on one thing they are in agreement. Heavy government expenditure at all levels of government creates inflation. That's what they are in agreement on.

Now there are jurisdictions in the United States of America which are seriously attempting, in this free society, to answer this problem. We are not doing that, Mr. Chairman. We are not seriously trying to curtail the level of expenditure of government. And therefore we are dooming the senior citizens and dooming the children to continued rampant inflation. You can hide your head in the sands; you can dig your head into books; you can put your head wherever you like (in a place where the sun

never shines in the case of the member for Saskatoon Centre). But, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that if you hide your head like that you'll never come to an answer. The answer is that government expenditure must be curtailed. And it is being curtailed in the state of Arizona. So all I ask is that the Minister of Finance examine how they are going about it in these various jurisdictions, establish his own priorities and perhaps he'll come to the conclusion I have that government can be run for less than it is in the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the member has spent a considerable amount of time looking at the estimates but I pointed out before I sat down that our growth in expenditures for the last five years has been declining. Now we've made that happen, Mr. Chairman, while at the same time making sure the services we provide to Saskatchewan people have been maintained at a very high level. And I ask the member opposite, since he was talking about needing to drastically cut back on government expenditures, to give me an example or give me some examples — one example isn't good enough — of where he would in this budget or any budget in the province of Saskatchewan, make the kind of cutbacks . . . The member for Estevan screams across the floor, about \$600 million. I want to ask the member for Nipawin again, Mr. Chairman, which program sit is he would be cutting back. Now he says \$600 million borrowed to buy potash mines. Well, that's nonsense, Mr. Chairman. He is very clearly confusing, as he is confused, revenues and expenditures, investments and expenditures.

The money in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, is an investment, and it's a good investment. I know the member for Nipawin would love nothing more than to have the province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan lose that investment. Maybe he would like that investment to return to the foreign companies that used to own those potash mines, whether they're located in Arizona, in New York, or Dallas, or wherever they may be located. That is not our view. Not only do we get a return from the potash industry, from the point of view of revenues, taxes, and other forms of revenues, we now assure we have some capability to direct the development of that potash resource in this province so it provides the maximum benefit to Saskatchewan people.

Not only do we get the royalties and the taxes from the potash industry, Mr. Chairman, but we also in 1979 saw the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan earn \$78 million in clear net profit which we would not have seen in the province because it would have gone to those foreign owners the member for Nipawin so greatly supports in this House when he makes the remarks that he does.

I challenge him to tell me and tell this House where in this budget and these estimates, he would make those drastic cuts, Mr. Chairman, so the budget we are presenting here today would meet the amount he has in mind.

Don't talk about money borrowed to go into investment, because that is well-placed. Talk about money being spent, Mr. Chairman, on the consolidated fund for programs and services for the people of Saskatchewan. Then you might be getting someplace about really indicating what the policy is on those programs and expenditures that you're talking about.

Let me indicate something else about the budget, Mr. Chairman. Let me indicate grants to local authorities and other third parties increased this year by 10.5 per cent. They take up 46.2 per cent of the expenditures provided in this budget.

The grant to program services in government increased by only 8.8 per cent. So we very consciously made sure the third party grants we must provide to municipalities, to school boards and others are adequate. We've done it by being very frugal and managing very well the ordinary government operations, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I hadn't planned on entering this debate. I'm certainly not entering it to reinforce the views of the member for Nipawin but more or less to correct some of the statements made by the minister.

It rankles and annoys me every time I hear the socialist government sit on the other side of the House and expound about the virtues and the money they spend on that one service everybody in this province cares about and wants. That's our medicare and health service. It's about time the minister took a look and understood exactly what the Government of Saskatchewan is spending on health services as compared to other areas.

I'm going to give you the comparisons, Mr. Minister. I've made comparisons with only three other provinces. I haven't checked with the others yet. I will at a later date. But in just the three provinces I checked with in western Canada (British Columbia, Manitoba, and Alberta) — and this may come as a shock to you — Saskatchewan ranks fourth in the per capital health care cost provided to the citizens of this province. Now I think it's about time you stopped saying you are the only people in this country providing medicare services to the people of the province.

Let me just give you the figures so you can write them down and you'll have them, or you can check with Hansard tomorrow: British Columbia per capita expenditures on health in the 1980-81 budget \$555.73; Alberta \$548.17; Manitoba \$639.89. And where is Saskatchewan? At the bottom of the list — \$543.23. So let's not have any more of that nonsense that you are the only government which can provide health services to the people of this province or in this country.

You indicated another thing I would like to discuss at this point and that is the expenditures. You keep referring to a decline in the rate of expenditures of this government. It took you 70 years to reach a \$1 billion budget (government expenditures) and in five short years after that you doubled it. Now that is declining the rate of expenditure? I don't know what school you went to. I don't know how you can calculate a decline when it takes 70 years to spend \$1 billion in a year and in five short years another \$1 billion. The Premier, the day I replied to the budget and the day you delivered that budget (and not too many people heard him), said, 'That's nothing. Before we're finished we'll spend a heck of a lot more.' I think he said somewhere around \$8 billion. Now if that isn't being ridiculous!

You refer to the investment in potash. I don't know why you brought up the investment in potash. That has nothing to do with the expenditures of the government or of this budget. You referred to the five hundred and some million dollars invested in potash as an expenditure. I don't know why you would refer to that as part of the budget. It has absolutely nothing to do with it.

Then you went on to say you're happy you invested that money in potash and that the profits are going to the people of Saskatchewan and not to the people in the United States or those multinational corporations. But what about the exchange on that

American money you borrowed from the Americans? What about the interest you're paying to the Americans, which is a large portion of the revenues of that potash . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Don't . . . get away from me. What are you talking about — none? And you talk about exchange. You're dealing with the multinationals in the United States far more than any other government in this country ever has.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Chairman, at least when the member for Nipawin got up to make his remarks he was. In his way, being thoughtful about some comparisons we might make with Arizona. I disagree with him, but at least he was getting into some depth in the kind of propositions he was making here.

I was interested in listening, on the other hand, to the member for Regina South, who represents the Tory caucus over there, and who when he got up did not deal with any specifics at all. He talks about per capita expenditures for health care. Well let me ask him, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the services for health care, not only about the per capita expenditures. They may not mean very much except they may mean the system we run here in Saskatchewan is one heck of a lot more efficient than the system they run in Alberta or the system they run in British Columbia. I'm prepared to talk with the member opposite in this debate on the kinds of deterrent fees and health premiums Alberta people pay which people in Saskatchewan don't pay. Why doesn't he mention that? Why when the member for Kelsey-Tisdale while he was speaking, mentioned the question of what is happening with the Alberta nurses did the member for Regina South totally ignore the issue? I'll tell you why . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it doesn't matter whether you want to speak, but the member for Regina South hears very well usually. I'll tell you why, because the members opposite are embarrassed. They are embarrassed about the kinds of things that are happening in Alberta in the health care field and particularly with the nurses' situation, where they have, Mr. Chairman, their version of Bill 2. Now members of this House will know what Bill 1 was and Bill 2 they have in Alberta doesn't even work. Ross Thatcher's apparently did, but theirs does not even work.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister asked me in the previous question, how I would cut the budget of the province of Saskatchewan to enable the minister to come appropriately closer to the kind of budget that exists in the state of Arizona as opposed to the province of Saskatchewan. I would like to present just a few, because it would take far too long, far more time than we have tonight to go through all of the items. But I'm just going to do it in general terms, Mr. Chairman, from the budgetary cash outflows, on page 9 of the minister's budget.

Let's start with the expenditures on behalf of the Attorney General. I mentioned already tonight that there is \$2 million which doesn't need to be expended on behalf of the Attorney General in the province of Saskatchewan; there could be savings and extreme savings in that area.

On behalf of consumer affairs \$454 million budgeted for that department, a very large, substantial portion of which is dedicated to inspectors for that department who do absolutely nothing to protect consumers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Let's go on to co-operation and co-operative development, \$2,406,000 expended on that department. Yet, Mr. Chairman, not one penny expended on the part of the government of the province of Saskatchewan for corporate matters in the province. Amazingly enough for the benefit of the minister responsible for finance, co-operatives exist in Arizona. It will kill him, it will absolutely slay him and yet the government of

Arizona spends not a dime for a department of co-operation; \$2.4 million could be saved in this budget because co-operatives exist in that state and they flourish in that state. They are happy in that state without government spending \$2.4 million on behalf of that particular department.

Now, let's move down to education. On the total education budget of some \$295 million, approximately 10 per cent of that amount is expended in administration — administration of what? The vast majority of the expenditure of the department in the province of Saskatchewan is the transfer of funds to locally elected boards. Why does the Government of Saskatchewan need to spend close to \$30 million on administration for those programs? Local boards can make those decisions, and in fact, make them very well in the state of Arizona. For the benefit of the minister, that's education.

The Department of the Environment, Mr. Minister, \$8.601 million. Now, I wonder how much good they have done. PCBs in the city of Regina can't be cleaned up. What kind of regulation does the Department of the Environment exert over the nuclear business in Saskatchewan? Nothing, let's face it, nothing. That's done by the federal government. Yet \$8,601,000 expended will be by the Department of the Environment. That could be cut, Mr. Chairman, and it could be cut substantially, and obtain exactly the same level of service we have today.

Now here's one that's of interest I think to every member of this legislature: Executive Council, \$3,397,000 for 19 cabinet ministers or is it 20? I'm sorry. I can't tell you whether it's 19 or 20. I believe it's 20; there are 20 ministers of the Crown expending some \$3,397,000 for 950,000 people. It might interest the Attorney General to know that in the state of Arizona with 2.5 million people, the total executive branch of government for 2.5 million doesn't spend anything like \$3,397,000. They are able to do it with far less. They have administrative assistants.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How do you know that?

**MR. COLLVER:** — How do I know that? I have been there, boy, I have been there. You haven't.

Now, Mr. Chairman, \$92,850,000 allocated to this government in capital costs. How much of that is expended on behalf of the land bank? Because in my opinion, not a dime has to be spent on behalf of the land bank. That's a considerable saving. It seems to me that the land bank allocation is some \$20 million. I'm sure I could look it up; some \$20 million in the province of Saskatchewan. Not a dime has to be spent on behalf of the land bank . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if I sit down now, Mr. Member for Regina South, they are going to really give me heck. So I thought since there are only seven minutes left.

He wanted to know, Mr. Chairman, he wanted to know. The minister wanted to know how I would cut this budget? We don't have to spend money on land bank. The land exists. What benefit does it give to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the huge expenditures of the government for land bank? Nothing, not a penny. What benefit do the people of Saskatchewan get from the huge interest expenditures? Nothing. What benefit do they get from the expenditures of \$2 million in court houses for the Attorney General? Nothing, nothing. What benefit do they get from these great huge administrative costs? And, Mr. Chairman, I am just coming to the department of welfare. That will be coming up shortly in the terms of the administrative costs of delivering a dollar's worth of welfare to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I

think that the minister could recognize that doesn't have to be so high and isn't as high in other jurisdictions. He's pointing out to me a yellow paper. I don't think that's a comparison with the state of Arizona.

Let me tell the minister, for example, one of the problems they have in Arizona we don't have in the province of Saskatchewan. They have a great any illegal aliens coming across their borders for whom they have to provide welfare because they don't speak the language, for the information of the member for Saskatoon Centre. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that they have far more problems down there than we have and yet the people's problems are being met. Sure they could add medicare to their services, and I think that would be a good addition to their services. I would support such a move. But in the vast majority of areas they are cutting expenditures. I've said it before and I'm not going to repeat it.

The Minister of Finance asked me for further evidence of where I would cut. Mr. Minister, I've come up with about \$150 million. The numbers move pretty quickly. About \$150 million so far that could be cut just in administrative cuts, interest cuts, expenditures on land bank, expenditures for court houses for the Attorney General, while at the same time he is scrapping other court houses elsewhere with no trade-off of any kind.

Mr. Chairman, the point is, we could go through this budget and produce another \$150 million or maybe \$200 million. Perhaps it would be better if we did. Mineral resources, \$9 million. Can you believe that?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How much money does it raise?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mineral Resources says: how much money does it raise? My goodness gracious, Mr. Chairman, the same kinds of revenues are raised in the state of Arizona, but they don't spend \$9 million to collect it. They have eight million inspectors out inspecting the books of legitimate organizations in the province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Talk to the federal government says the minister responsible. I'm not talking about federal employees. I'm talking about provincial employees. Provincial inspectors after inspectors after inspectors. \$9 million? Would you like me to go into that department? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is going to come out, Mr. Chairman. Mineral resources will come up and I am absolutely positive we will find all kinds of expenditures that could be cut from the Department of Mineral Resources.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is some \$82.5 million for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I didn't happen to be in the Assembly when the members to my right raised some of the issues about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, I can assure you I have read some of the issues that have been raised: the abysmal lack of controls, the abysmal waste of dollars, the abysmal crookedness that exists in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and in fact, the people involved outside the Department of Northern Saskatchewan with the department. I think this was shown time after time in those debates. Millions of dollars wasted — \$82 million, Mr. Minister, surely it is not necessary for a government to support that kind of operation surely it is not necessary for you as the Minister of Finance to support that kind of operation.

I notice the member for Saskatoon, Saskatoon wherever it is. I can't remember the

name of that constituency just right now. We didn't win that one so good. The one at the back, the two at the back, they weren't paying attention, and I asked them specifically to pay attention because they might want to question the Minister of Finance on some of these expenditures.

I think the people of Saskatchewan have an interest in the expenditure of \$82 million on the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I believe that, even for the Attorney General, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale. They are interested in \$82 million.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — So are we.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, so are we. How many years has it been since the Department of Northern Saskatchewan estimates came before this legislative session? Every year (certainly since I've been in this legislature) the same kinds of things are brought to the attention, such as shoe boxes filled with cash. Every year the same kinds of things brought to the attention of the members opposite. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, it's abysmal, absolutely abysmal. They . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If that were only true, Mr. Chairman, if that were only true!

The point is millions of dollars could have been cut out of the budget of northern Saskatchewan. The identical service could be provided if the members of this legislature took their jobs seriously. If the members for Saskatoon, the members of Regina, the members from all parts of Saskatchewan took their jobs seriously and came into these estimates with a view to cutting expenditures, they could come in here and say we can provide the same service at less cost, let us get at this budget. This is just a budget. Let us get at it properly.

If every member on the opposite side and every member on this side was to take his job seriously, we could in fact achieve the results of the state of Arizona, Mr. Minister. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, that's not possible under this system. Under this system you people make your decisions behind doors; it really doesn't matter what you say. Under the American system that's not true. Under the American system budgets are delineated line by line in the legislature in the open, in front the press, so constituents know where each and every member stands on whether excessive amounts are being spent by government. And that's why they're coming to grips with it, Mr. Chairman. Our system doesn't allow that to happen. The fact is we could meet every month and under the circumstances of this legislative Chamber, under the circumstances of this budget examination, not one change will occur.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this legislature since 1975. In that time, and I have said this every single year before this legislature, not one single dime has been changed from the budget that was presented by the government. Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for Saskatoon Eastview is not an idiot. The member for Saskatoon Eastview was elected by the people of Saskatoon Eastview to represent their views. Yet, not one word have we heard from him about the impact of this budget on his constituents and the increase in the expenditure of government and the impact of that on inflation.

Nor have we heard one suggestion from any single member opposite on how that budget could be pared. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General asks me, how about those guys? Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt in any way to present anyone else's views except my own. I am criticizing the preparers of the budget. I am criticizing the system that allows a budget of over \$2 billion for less than a million people to be presented to this legislature without any hope of ever changing anything, without any

April 24, 1980

hope of changing one dime, even though we may say we could prove beyond any reasonable doubt. That's the failing of this system. We could prove beyond a reasonable doubt the expenditures are too high. We could prove the government shouldn't borrow in the United States for potash mines. We could prove beyond a reasonable doubt in anybody's mind, even the mind of the member for Saskatoon Eastview, that it wasn't reasonable to expend this kind of money, and not one dime would be changed.

Mr. Chairman, that's the fault of this system. That is the fault of this so-called budget examination. It's all very well to ask the Government of Saskatchewan how they're spending the money, but what we get elected to do, on behalf of our constituents, is to tell government they're spending too much. That's our job.

We represent the people, the people are taxed, and it's our job to see they're taxed to a minimum. If this is a charade, say it's a charade. But don't, for heaven's sake, as the minister tried to do, make light of the comparison between the state of Arizona and the province of Saskatchewan. Because I can tell you there are lessons to be learned from that system — important lessons, where individual members take their jobs seriously. It matters not whether they meet every month or every second month or every second year, but when they meet they take their jobs seriously and they represent their individual constituents seriously. They present the view that government expenditures can and must be cut and that the maximum benefit for every tax dollar . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know why it stopped either.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:09 p.m.