

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

May 14, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**MR. F.J. THOMPSON (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the Assembly, I would like to introduce a group of 21 students from the Dene High School who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers, Milton McKay, Tom Turgeon, and Maureen LaBrash, and also their chaperone, Albert Piche. Since leaving La Loche they have travelled to Saskatoon and visited the university, then travelled to Regina, spending the afternoon in the legislature. Later on today they will be attending the Shrine Circus at the exhibition grounds. They are also staying at the home of Tom Turgeon in Fort Qu'Appelle while they are down in southern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask all members in here to welcome them to the Assembly, and we sincerely hope that your stay here will be both educational and enjoyable; we all wish you a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Projected Economic Activity in Saskatchewan

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier. On April 12, the Toronto Star quoted Premier Blakeney:

Ontario must realize that some manufacturing is now moving west. Not much of it will come to Saskatchewan, I can see that, but it will go to Alberta.

Mr. Premier, is this an indication of your confidence in the projected economic activity in Saskatchewan?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, it is a statement of my belief that at least at this time more industry is likely to locate in Edmonton and Calgary than in Regina and Saskatoon, if for nothing else than much of it is petroleum related. We all concede that Alberta has much greater petroleum resources and much greater petroleum development than Saskatchewan.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not an admission by you that the climate for industrial development in Saskatchewan at this time is just not that terrific?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It is an admission by me that the climate for manufacturing is not as strong in Saskatchewan as it is in Alberta at this time. Alberta has a population which is twice ours; it has a good deal more vigorous economy at this moment arising from very substantial oil revenues which are being spent and which are generating economic activity which is unrivalled in Canada. I believe that our record in Saskatchewan is probably only second to Alberta in economic activity. I do readily concede that it is not as strong as Alberta, as indeed every other province would have to concede.

### Special Tax on Crude Oil

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Mr. Minister, the first round of the latest oil pricing negotiations has now been completed with Mr. Lalonde's visit to Alberta yesterday. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this. In your negotiations with Mr. Lalonde in Saskatchewan (I believe last Friday), did he implement a special tax on crude oil used in Canada against the companies, which would eventually be passed on to the consumer, and use the money from that to supplement the imported oil in western Canada?

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — The discussions carried on between myself and Mr. Lalonde last Friday were again, exploratory in general. We did not talk about specifics when he met with Mr. Leitch, Minister of Energy in Alberta. I've talked to Mr. Leitch and that seems to be consistent. He did convey that they were trying to find some more appropriate means for dealing with increased offshore oil prices but he was not explicit as the member suggested that he might have been.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The TV coverage last night would indicate that Alberta and Ottawa are still very, very far apart with regard to an oil pricing agreement. In your general discussions with Mr. Lalonde, did Mr. Lalonde indicate to you that the Government of Canada has, to all intents and purposes, given up on the idea of oil self-sufficiency for Canada by the 1980s? If so, what was our reaction to that?

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister did not convey to me that they had given up on attaining Canadian self-sufficiency by the early 1990s. There are different interpretations of self-sufficiency. Some say self-security. But I think the general objective is the same. I conveyed to him that even though there may be different proposals coming from the federal government, we would not want to consider settling for anything less than we were offered by the former federal government. There may be different means of arriving at that. Indeed we were expecting substantively more in being able to encourage and accelerate exploration and development in the province of Saskatchewan, particularly in the heavy oil area.

**MR. ANDREW:** — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The statement by the Prime Minister, I believe, the other day in parliament was to the effect that the policy of the Trudeau government and the policy of the NDP has come much closer. He also spoke of the blended price indicating that light and heavy crude would remain at the present low level and increasing the price to develop offshore oil and perhaps tar sand and heavy oil. Can the minister advise this assembly with regard to that blended price, whether you indicated to Mr. Lalonde any encouragement that the province of Saskatchewan would be prepared to look at the blended price idea, a lower price for the light and heavy crude as a saw-off for development either in terms of higher price or federal financial help to develop heavy oil in Saskatchewan?

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I won't attempt to answer the member's initial remarks in introducing the question in respect to the Prime Minister suggesting that the NDP and the Liberals are coming closer together. I will let the Prime Minister do that on his own accord. But in respect of a blended price, we did talk generally about what a blended price may be. Again, the minister suggested that he had no specific formula to offer at that time. But it was their intent if they were to pursue a blended price formula that there would be special pricing for non-conventional oil production such as tar sands, such

as the recovery of heavy oil and that there would be a special cataloguing or categorizing of prices in order to encourage that non-conventional oil production. Certainly we are interested in such a proposal but that should not by any means, be interpreted at this time to mean that we are in favor of a blended price. We are expecting officials at the provincial and federal government level to get together in the course of the next couple of weeks to take a look at what the actual figures mean when you put a couple of proposals into workability as far as enhanced recovery of heavy oil is concerned. We will await the kinds of results those tests on the formulas being proposed will bring to us before we start to consider seriously a blended price proposal.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Minister, you indicated as I understood your statement, that you have communicated with Mr. Leitch, I assume after his conversation with Mr. Lalonde. I would assume your conversation with Mr. Leitch would also deal with the question of Bill No. 50 presently before the Alberta legislature. My question to you is are you supportive of the spirit (if not exactly that type of legislation) of that type of legislation? Do you envisage the province of Alberta and the province of Saskatchewan using the production restraints as a tool in bargaining with the other provinces and particularly with the Government of Canada?

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member I believe has somewhat misinterpreted what the province of Alberta wishes to use the powers of Bill 50 to achieve. Certainly they have conveyed to me, as they have conveyed to the federal government and I believe have attempted to convey to the general public, that the powers of Bill 50 are not to deal with, in a negotiating manner, the federal government's proposals (which may be unacceptable to the province of Alberta). Rather, they are to have better control over the production of oil in Alberta for Alberta interests and not to curtail or shut off the flow of oil to the rest of Canada or outside of the province of Alberta.

Certainly, the way the member was addressing his question, he was leaving the impression that Alberta was introducing this legislation in order to put into place a power play the federal government would have to contend with. That may ultimately be what this particular legislation is used for, but certainly they are not conveying to me or for that matter to anyone I know of that that is their intent.

The circumstances of Alberta and Saskatchewan are significantly different in that the lands producing oil in Alberta are primarily, certainly the largest percentage, Crown-owned and they can have such legislation to control production. The member knows that in Saskatchewan the situation is very, very much different and there is a very different and very much larger percentage of freehold land where that legislation would not apply.

### **Cuban Refugees**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the Premier. The Premier will be aware that the situation in Florida with reference to the Cuban refugees is developing mammoth proportions. Some 40,000 Cuban refugees have arrived now and they are anticipating more at a rate of 5,000 or 6,000 per day. Has the Premier made any representation at all to the Department of Immigration or to his counterpart in Ottawa about providing a home for some of those refugees in the province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The answer to the question is no, Mr. Speaker. I think there has been

no indication until now that all of them would not find a home in the United States. I noted some recent news reports suggesting some may wish to find homes in other lands, but I think these are as yet unconfirmed and we have made no representations.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be aware that the President of the United States has announced he hopes to be able to disperse at least one-third of the refugees from Cuba — the legitimate refugees and not the criminals and insane that Castro is attempting to include in those boat-loads of refugees — throughout the United States. Would the Premier please say why he has made no representation with regard to these very, very, badly-off people in so far as Saskatchewan is concerned, when he did make representations at the time of the Allende revolution to invite Chilean refugees to Saskatchewan? Is there some difference in your mind between the Chilean refugees and the Cuban refugees?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to say that I was not aware of the announcement by the President of the United States. Any representation which we made with respect to the Chilean refugees was some considerable time after the events and after we had had an opportunity to assess the situation. I think that time has not yet elapsed with respect to the exodus from Cuba and accordingly, I am not able to assure the hon. member what action we may take as circumstances develop.

### Transcripts of Radio Programs

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in view of the fact that I have been given one set of the transcripts from information services of radio shows taped by that department, I would like to thank you for that. Will the Premier now make available to the opposition, all transcript of media broadcasts that are recorded and transcribed by information services, which of course is paid for by the taxpayers of this province?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not reviewed the. I do not know whether they are all extant. No doubt numbers of them have been destroyed from time to time. I think they are only saved for about a month. If the hon. member would like to put a notice of motion for return on the order paper we would certainly debate it and consider it.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I was asking for a list of the ones that are up to date. I have a supplementary. In view of the fact most governments commission public opinion polls to frame government policy or to assess ongoing government programs, would the Premier indicate if his government has commissioned any polls in the past 18 months?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — We have certainly commissioned polls from time to time. Without checking the record and subject to correction, I would think we have done so in the last 18 months.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Supplementary. In view of the fact that the government-commissioned public polls are paid for by the taxpayers of this province, and in view of the fact that the Government of Ontario has recently revealed to the opposition all polls they have commissioned in the calendar year 1979, will the Premier make available to the opposition the results of all public opinion polls that you have commissioned at the taxpayers' expense in the past 10 months?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe an order to that effect has already been

passed by this House. So you can be assured that we on this side of the House agree with the request of the hon. member. I may say that it has been passed without the teeth pulling debate which occurred in the legislature of Ontario. So we propose pursuant to the order of this House to supply the information in due course.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — One supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of the fact that the Legislative Library makes available to all members, list of the books and information that are available to that library, does it not seem reasonable to you that a list of the tapes that are available — that haven't been destroyed — from information services and as well the list of the polls and results of those polls, should be made available to all members, certainly including the opposition of the House?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Library makes available matters which are filed in the Legislative Library pursuant to either statute or long-term practice. There is clearly no long-term practice with regard to this material. There is any amount of governmental material in departments which is not reposed in the Legislative Library, very large amounts of it. We certainly wouldn't wish to burden this Legislative Library with all of the material which is available to the public, but available through other channels.

I think we have already found a way to make available to the hon. members the poll results. With respect to the recording of tape broadcasts, if hon. members wish to put a motion on the order paper we can debate it in the ordinary way. For example we do not have lodged, in the Legislative Library, clippings which various departments clip and file in their departmental files, and as I am sure hon. members opposite do with their public funds.

I am sure it would be perfectly logical for me to ask, wouldn't it seem reasonable if the Legislative Library provided a list of the clippings which have been clipped and filed by hon. members opposite, with their budget of public funds? Accordingly, I think hon. members can follow the procedures which are well known.

### Nursing Qualifications

**MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — A question to the Minister of Continuing Education. Last week the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, at a meeting in Saskatoon, passed a resolution asking that nurses move toward a professional organization with a bachelor of science degree as a minimum qualification. Does your department support the move, and if so, in what time period do you expect it to be feasibly achieved?

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, our department does not have a position on that matter. The matter is just beginning to be reviewed at this time and if and when a decision is made I'll be informing the House on that decision. But we do not have any position on that particular recommendation at this time.

**MR. SWAN:** — I would like to ask a supplementary to the Minister of Health. I would like to know if the Minister of Health feels that he could staff his hospitals in a reasonable length of time, say in 10 years from now, with strictly degree people? Or are you indeed going to face considerable difficulty in staffing if this program goes forward?

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all let me indicate to the

member that the government is addressing itself to that particular problem at the present time vis-a-vis whether or not we should go with degree nurses or whether we should extend the number of individuals who can attend Kelsey Institute and Wascana Institute for diploma nursing courses. There is certainly no unanimity as to whether or not our hospitals ought to be staffed with degree nurses or with diploma nursing individuals. There are advantages to both. There is no doubt about that. One, for example, is a two-year course and the other is a four-year course. As the member well knows, in the 1960s we had a three-year course that was reduced at that time by the former government to a two-year course, and I think accepted by many people in this province. We are, as I indicated, reviewing the situation particularly as it pertains to a shortage of nurses. And I want to indicate to the member that doesn't just pertain to us, that pertains right across Canada. The government I can assure you has addressed itself to the problem and will be announcing very shortly our particular decisions in that regard.

### **Woodland Memorial Gardens**

**MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Are you prepared to state that at no time as a member of the Securities Commission of Saskatchewan or an official of the Government of Saskatchewan, you were a party to the approval of a prospectus for authorizing the sale or the operation of commercial cemeteries operated for gain in the province of Saskatchewan, namely Woodlawn Memorial Gardens, North Battleford? And at the same time, Mr. Premier, would you make it clear to this Assembly, were you at any time ever a member of the Securities Commission of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that's an improper question. I think there is no conceivable basis for any member asking me what I did before I was elected to this office. But just by way of answering it anyway, I obviously was chairman of the securities commission from 1955 to 1958. I was not chairman of the securities commission or otherwise associated with it during those years which the hon. member for Arm River keeps alleging I was associated with it in 1953 and 1954. There is simply no basis for that. As to what prospectuses I may have approved during that period, I would not have any way of recalling them. It would be some hundreds, perhaps thousands, and I clearly don't recall which ones.

### **Use of Screenings for Livestock Feed**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, we are all aware in this province that the livestock industry is already in very serious straits as far as hay and pasture are concerned, and it's common knowledge that in some areas even if rain comes shortly the hay crop is going to be very minimal. Mr. Minister, in light of this situation, does this re-evaluate the thinking of your department and the philosophy of your government when with every train load of grain we send to the ports we are sending along many hundreds of bushels in screenings, which are going to be lost in the form of dockage? In other words my question, Mr. Minister, is the dockage that is removed from the grain of every farmer's truckload to the elevator (which he is docked for, which he then pays the freight on to the coast and which is then given away) were that grain kept in Saskatchewan, would you concede it would certainly alleviate many of the short feed supplied we are going to experience this year even if rain does come?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon.

member who raises the issue of the feed shortage in Saskatchewan at the present time (and in fact right across western Canada, including British Columbia), I am not aware that the issue is grains or is on the grain side. It is indicated to me, in my contacts with farmers and with farm organizations and with farm people, that the issue being faced which we should address immediately is that of the availability of pasture and possibly of hay and roughage going into the fall season. Work is going on with respect to that at the present time in an attempt to solve the immediate concern.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, would you concede the time has now arrived to clean grain on the Prairies and take those screenings out and have them available for livestock feed? Would the minister concede that had this been done on an ongoing basis over the years, these screenings which could be used in many cases to replace the roughage would alleviate feed shortages in years such as this? We never now in this province when we have a year like this; we may have one now, we may not. Would the minister not concede that it is a time we looked at the process? Instead of giving away a very valuable feed source, should it not be retained here on the Prairies for use by our livestock processors?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll attempt to convey to the hon. member the policy of the government with respect to the existing situation. I report to the hon. member that the deputy minister of agriculture has been with deputy ministers from the other three western provinces in Ottawa. They worked out an agreement which we will be considering upon his return (and I understand he is returning today), to attempt to alleviate the existing situation should it become serious. There is a time frame on this of two to three weeks.

On the request for a position of this government with respect to grain movement, our position clearly is that in light of the grain transportation system and the markets available to grain producers and the Canadian Wheat Board, our objective as a government is to work out a system which moves the grain from the country elevator to the ports as quickly as possible, thus the hopper car purchase. We don't see it being a viable position to have stop-off charges, as the hon. member is suggesting, being applied at inland terminals in order to get the grain moving. We think the grain should move from the country elevator system (which we strongly support and I hope he strongly supports) to the ports as quickly as possible. That's the policy of this government, this the hopper car purchase we are moving forward with.

### **Grants to Information Centres in Saskatchewan**

**MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, my question is the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Approximately a week ago, Mr. Minister I asked you about grants to the information centres throughout Saskatchewan in the small towns and cities. You said you would bring the information back. Do you have the information as to whether those grants are available to them now or not?

**HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, they are and there is a letter forthcoming. I don't know if it has come through my office or not but it is on its way to your office, with regard to the grants.

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not have a ministerial statement. I wonder if I might have leave of the House to make some introductions?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We could do it now or before orders of the day. We could do it after introduction of bills. If the member feels he must make it now, by all means proceed. I think we'll go through the introduction of bills and before order of the day we can deal with further introductions.

### **Point of Order re: Question Period**

**MR. COLLVER:** — On a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I've already called on the Minister of Finance. Is the point of order with regard to the question period?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Perhaps I'll take the Minister of Finance first.

### **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall not take a great deal of time. As I indicated, I wanted to take this opportunity to introduce to this House some guests whom we have with us. They are part of an Open House Canada exchange program. Saskatchewan Cadets from Saskatoon and Colonsay were in Montreal, I believe in March. This is a return visit to Saskatchewan by Air Cades from the Montreal area. They are seated in the west gallery and some are seated in the Speaker's gallery as well. They are here, as I indicated, under the Open House exchange. It is most fortunate for us that they are here in this year because it is Celebrate Saskatchewan. I want to point out that they are accompanied by parents and chaperones of Squadrons 107 and 701, by Mr. Jack Scarfe of Saskatoon, who is on a sponsoring committee; by Marion Neufeld, who is the Open House Canada, Saskatoon co-ordinator; by Captain Pierre Ciambella, Montreal Squadron 701, commanding officer and Open House Canada co-ordinator; Captain Wilf Holdam, supply officer of 701 in Montreal, and Captain Jules Provost, training officer of Squadron 701.

I would like to ask members to join with me in extending our welcome to them wishing them an enjoyable stay not only in Regina but in Saskatchewan, and also a very safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Monsieur L'Orateur, pour ajouter aux mots du Ministre de Finance, et aux noms des membres de l'opposition, c'est un plaisir pour moi de souhaiter bienvenue a ces jeunes, a ce group de Montreal. J'espere que vous alliez jouir de votre sejour ici. En meme temps je voudrais vous souhaiter un retour a Montreal sain et sauf.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton):** — Moi aussi je voudrais offrir une chaleureuse bienvenue a tous les cadets de Montreal. Je voudrais offrir cette bienvenue de notre part, et de la part du Premier Ministre Blakeney, et de tous les deutes ici. Nous esperons que votre



sejour ici sera tres agreable et tres interessant. J'etais souvent a Montreal, parce que mon frere demeure a Point Claire. Je trouve que votre ville est tres, tres interessante. Cette une ville qui est vraiment belle dans une province qui est vraiment belle. Nous esperons vous revoir bientot. Encore, bienvenue a Saskatchewan.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### Point of Order on Question Period

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to raise a point of order, pertaining to today's question period. I also want to raise a point of order with reference to introduction of guests, without leave, out of order, by three different members. I am sure we all want to welcome these students to the legislative Chamber, but I think it should be done in order.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more urgent than the refugee plight of the people in Florida . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The member is debating the issue.

**MR. COLLVER:** — No, he is not.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I disagree with the member. I think the record will show the member is debating the issue now. If the member is rising on a point of order, he has to state what the point of order is. In other words, some rule of the question period must have been abridged, therefore, I want to hear that.

**MR. COLLVER:** — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that it is tradition in question period on this side of the House to give a question and two supplementaries to a member. The only time you sit one down is because you say it is not an urgent matter. I cannot imagine you saying that is not an urgent matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The question of urgency is a subjective one as the member will understand and as I have always said in the past. The member may think the question is urgent, but I also have to think the question is urgent. If I don't think the question is urgent then I will pass on to someone else. In the event the member still thinks it's urgent, he may come back later to try to get a question on the same subject. I have to make a determination of urgency as well. My point was that I felt it wasn't urgent, after you had a question and a supplementary.

## MOTIONS

### United Canada

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, prior to orders of the day and with leave of the Assembly, I would like to introduce a motion, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson). The motion reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

That this Assembly reaffirm on behalf of the people of the province of Saskatchewan their confidence and dedication to a strong and united Canada, and in doing so condemn the forces of fear and divisions which would dismantle this nation of ours. In dedicating our faith in a strong and united Canada, this Assembly conveys to the people of the province of

Quebec the most sincere wish of this Assembly that all Quebecois will vote no on May 20, so that together Saskatchewan and Quebec can build a stronger and united Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member has asked leave to introduce a motion. Leave is not granted.

### **House Adjournment**

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — I move, seconded by the Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)):

That when this Assembly adjourns on Friday, May 15, 1980, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 20, 1980.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The Attorney General has moved a motion, seconded by the member for Regina North-East, which requires leave of the Assembly. Leave is not granted.

### **SECOND READINGS**

**HON. MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment)** moved second reading of Bill No. 107 — **An Act respecting the Assessment of the Impact on the Environment of New Developments.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of The Environment Assessment Act that's now before us. It really is the product of many years of practical experience on the part of the government.

What we now propose in law are rules and procedures that have been tested and found workable through the environmental assessment policy introduced by the predecessor and colleague, the Hon. Neil Byers. From the beginning of our term in office, the Blakeney government has been committed to the concept of environmental protection. Since many of the important new developments that have been taking place in this province have involved Crown corporation activity, we have through their co-operation over the years been able to work out a realistic and pragmatic procedure acceptable to conscientious managers as well as government employees.

Up until now, Mr. Speaker, with Crown corporations playing such an important role and with a good corporate attitude displayed by private proponents we have been able to count on co-operation without complete and adequate legislation. It would be naive for me or any members of the House to believe that at some time, somebody somewhere will not take advantage of this lack of law and simply refuse to co-operate on the environmental policy. Therefore, the time has come to now translate these tried and tested procedures into what might be called enforceable legislation.

In simple terms, the proposed legislation says that if any proposed new development is likely to significantly alter the surrounding environment and the related social and economic structure, then the proponents of that new development must review those environmental and social effects in advance. They must consider the implications of the development and be prepared to implement measures needed to protect the environmental and social structure from harmful changes that could be the result of the development.

A report of the assessment and necessary mitigation measures is then sent to

Saskatchewan environment, at which point the project proposals will be reviewed by a panel of technicians and concerned members of the public and, if deemed necessary, subsequent public hearings will be undertaken to test public opinion. When Saskatchewan environment is assured that specified precautions will provide adequate environmental and social protection, the development can begin. This will admittedly cause some delay in development projects. However, it should not result in unnecessary delay and in unnecessary extra costs. We know from experience that delays can be kept to a minimum and that costs, although at times seemingly unnecessary and unreasonably high, are within the public's interest for environmental protection objectives. As for the costs to consider and to mitigate environmental impacts — We want to clearly establish that industries or investments, which are so financially marginal as to impose upon the environment for their profit margins, must be considered non-viable at the outset. It is unacceptable to plan the profit margins by transferring the social costs or the environmental degradation of a developmental project onto the shoulders of other taxpayers and future generations. These costs must be borne by the shareholders and the developers of the industries, and projects which are involved at the time of the involvement.

I also want to emphasize that the act does not permit any escape hatch which would allow government agencies and Crown corporations to enjoy a double standard. They too, must follow the same rules as any private enterprise undertaking.

Public participation is an important part of the environmental assessment process and anyone may inspect an environmental impact statement. Within 30 days of the first publication of the notice of the statement or if desirable within an additional 30 days, anyone can make a written submission, supporting or rejecting the development and the impact statement. If there is considered to be sufficient public interest and response, a board of inquiry can be appointed to provide public involvement in decisions on major or highly sensitive projects such as those we have already experienced — the Churchill River inquiry and the Bayda inquiry, and the one which is presently going on, the Key Lake inquiry.

The public inquiry board appointed under this act may conduct an inquiry, having all the powers of the commissioners under The Public Inquiries Act. This allows them to engage the services of professionals by other advisers, experts, various assistance, or employees necessary to aid them in the inquiry.

The act provides for approval of the project, or approval with specific conditions for mitigation of certain impact, a provision for withholding approval of the projects. An approved project can proceed only in accordance with the terms and the conditions of the final written approval. And finally, any significant changes in the project proposal after approval has been given will be reviewed in the same manner as the original proposals.

Environmental protection does not stop when approval is given to begin a new development. The act provides the continued monitoring. It permits the appointment of officers who can administer the act and the regulations, and who will have the authority to carry out inspections and obtain information required for the administration of the act and the regulations.

In emergencies it may be in the public interest to exempt measures from the environmental assessment process temporarily, or permanently. A comment made in the press after the introduction of the bill indicated that this may be a weakness of the

bill and that it may provide a loophole for various kinds of permissions to be granted. Mr. Speaker, the emergency power is also provided for in the act. I can think of one or more example such as were contemplated when that provision was put in the act — the flood mitigation at Lumsden a couple of years ago when the flood was in effect. The Department of Highways, plus other construction companies, moved in to alleviate that situation. Under the provisions of this act, if there weren't an opportunity for an emergency release, then they would have been required to proceed with the environmental assessment. Therefore, a waiver or an exemption would have to be necessary, or as I have already indicated, an environmental review and impact assessment would be required. So there are cases where it is thought advisable that waiver or exemption should be permitted.

The role of the minister's office in guiding the administration of the act and regulation assures electoral responsibility. The minister may designate research projects on the environment, or environmental impact assessment. He may also initiate studies on the quality of the environment, or the planning of the environmental impact assessment. He may further call for the gathering, the publishing, the disseminating of information on the environment, environmental impact assessments or the prepared statements and he may appoint committees to perform any of the advisory functions thought to be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, the minister may enter into agreements with other governments or with persons on the environment or environmental impact assessments. He can make grants available to persons for research or for preparation and presentation of briefs pertaining to impact assessments or statements, as has been the case in both the Bayda inquiry and the Churchill Board of Inquiry, as well as currently the Key Lake Board of Inquiry. Grants for this purpose will be paid out of money appropriated by the legislature.

The act requires that any information provided to the department is based on truthful statements and correct data. It requires that the validity of notice or service of documents must be clearly established. The act proposes penalties high enough to effectively discourage violation of this act on its regulations. We are suggesting a fine not exceeding \$5000 plus a further fine not exceeding \$1,000 for each day or part of a day during which the offence occurs or continues.

Furthermore, the act provides that no development can proceed without acceptance of specified provisions, if any, to make sure these provisions are met. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this penalty clause will adequately deal with not only the smaller proponent or project proposal, but would also deal with corporate proposals involved in a much larger degree.

The act further provides that in cases where the conditions set by the Minister of the Environment allowing a project to proceed conflict with the conditions of another agency of the government, the requirements of this act shall prevail. If any other act of the legislature allows a project to proceed which is contrary to the provisions of this act, the Minister of the Environment may apply for a court order enjoining any person from proceeding with the development contrary to this act. This is one of the difficulties we faced in the approvals given in the case of the Key Lake approvals for dewatering of some of the lakes in that area. We believe the inclusion of this portion of the act will provide a remedy to that situation.

There is a two-year restriction for prosecuting an offence under the act. The normal six-month period is obviously insufficient when construction periods of larger projects proceed over more than one year or one or more years. As is usual, the act provides that regulations can be made respecting the variety of objectives to aid the act in being flexible and operative at all times. It gives that opportunity for flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, finally this act gives Saskatchewan environment the laws which I believe it needs to protect our Saskatchewan environment during the new developments, during the period of new expansions of existing developments and during the operation of these developments. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, compared to any other jurisdiction, Saskatchewan will have the most open, the most comprehensive and progressive environmental impact assessment process in Canada.

I invite all members and the public to review any provincial, any American or Canadian legislation and compare it with the Saskatchewan approach to this environmental protection act. Mr. Speaker, this act demonstrates the Blakeney government's positive approach and commitment to the realistic environmental protection measures which are included in here in terms of legislation as well as the objectives of the government in seeing that those are carried out. Therefore, I am honored to move second reading of The Environmental Assessment Act and take pleasure in doing so, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make just a few brief remarks in support of this bill. I think it's one of the most important bills to come before this House during this session. It is especially important, I think, to ensure that our environmental policies are placed in law at a time when the pressures of rapid development in the province are growing increasingly every year.

I just want to draw to the attention of members of the House and the public a few sections the minister did not have an opportunity to comment on in his speech that I think are important and which basically represent new policy initiatives for our government beyond simply placing existing policies into legislation. I think one of the sections that is particularly important in this bill is section 7, which basically assures freedom of information, with respect to all matters of information related to pollutants, so related to public health and safety. I think this is a very important provision, and guarantees public access to all matters the public may be concerned with as they related to this act with respect to public health and safety.

I'd like to point out that socio-economic impacts are included in the definition of environment, and therefore are matters to be considered under this legislation. The legislation is not simply restricted to considering the impact on this environment in the narrow sense of the project, but rather to also consider the impact that a development may have on social and economic conditions in the community.

I think another of the sections that is particularly important is section 10. This represents an important change in policy. Up until the present time the public generally was not aware of an environmental impact assessment or not aware necessarily of a proposed development, until the environmental impact assessment had been completed and until that assessment was presented to the minister. Section 10 guarantees that the public will be informed of a proposed development the moment the assessment begins and the minister is aware of that assessment being conducted. This section basically means that in many cases, the public will be aware of a proposed

project and be able to consider its implications as much as perhaps two years ahead of what has been the case in the past. I think that that is an important new measure.

I am also pleased to see that the only exemption provided in this bill is an exemption from having to conduct an environmental impact assessment on the basis of an emergency situation. I think there are many other jurisdictions in which much broader exemption powers are provided, and it's important that here in Saskatchewan we're limiting exemption to emergency situations.

There are a few things I would have liked to have seen in the bill that are not here, but I think it's a very important new beginning. I'd like to, in the future, see us give consideration to the principle of having the environmental impact assessment conducted by a more independent body, rather than being conducted by the proponent. I still have lots of reservations about the proponent conducting the assessment, because I think it places the proponent in a position where whoever is coming forward with a project has been responsible for collecting the information by which the public may assess whether the project is acceptable or not. In many cases I think that it's to the advantage of a proponent to assure that the data collected is to the advantage of the proponent. Often I'm still afraid that certain important facts may be excluded and may particularly not come to light if a public hearing is not held to consider the assessment. I would like to see a period of greater than 30 days as being the time frame in which the public would have an opportunity to assess a project. However, the minister does have the power under the bill to extend the 30 days period to 80 days and I think that is an important provision.

Finally, I would like to see more criteria laid down in this legislation, criteria by which to determine when a public hearing would be called and when a public hearing is not needed. At this point a public hearing is simply called at the discretion of the minister. I would like to see some assurance under the bill that public hearings would be held whenever a major development is being considered. But I have confidence that as long as members on this side of the House remain the government, public hearings will be held on projects that are of major concern. However, I think we have to write legislation with the long term in view, and I want to say that I would like to see more stipulation requiring public hearings to be held for certain kinds of developments, especially larger developments which would have a major impact.

I think this bill is an important first step. I want to congratulate the Minister of the Environment for bringing forward this legislation. I think it will be welcomed by all people in Saskatchewan and I hope that it gains the support of all members of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I have studied Bill No. 107 very carefully and have gone through it clause by clause. I will just touch now, Mr. Minister, on a few items that I will be asking you extensive questions on in committee of the whole, to give you an idea of a few things I am concerned about. Section 2, subsection 1 bother me a bit here about the general and broad range — just how much power the government will have there. I have some questions I will be asking on that during committee of the whole.

If we turn to section 4, I just don't know how far we go here on what you call an emergency and I will be asking questions on that. I am just skimming through this, Mr.

Minister, so you have an idea what I will be asking in committee of the whole. I wonder if uranium will be exempted here; there are some things I will want clarified on that. In section 7, I will be asking you if uranium is exempted or involved.

I want to say on section 12, that I congratulate you. This is really excellent where you have asked for public input. I think that is really good. I will be asking several more questions in committee of the whole. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I congratulate the minister for this bill — so far. If PCBs and drinking water in this province could be handled as nicely as this bill then I would really congratulate you!

When we get to committee of the whole, it will depend on the questions I ask whether we will be having amendments or whether I will support the bill. It will depend on the minister's answers in committee of the whole and there may be some amendments we will be putting in. That is all I have to say at this time. Thank you.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment)** moved second reading of Bill No. 106 — An Act to establish Ecological Reserves.

He said: Mr. Speaker, again I am pleased to move second reading of The Ecological Reserves Act. This act will allow for the preservation of designated unique and representative areas of the province of Saskatchewan. It will allow the environmental department to more effectively fulfil its mandate for the protection of our environment, and for the designation of certain lands which I believe all Saskatchewan people would like to see set aside and maintained for future generations.

Saskatchewan environment since its creation in 1972 has recognized the keen interest that citizens of this province have for their environment, and in learning about the variety of ecosystems that exist in Saskatchewan. The department has responded by establishing an environmental education program and by producing educational materials for the schools, for youth groups and for special interest groups. The main objective is to encourage and foster an environmental conscience in Saskatchewan throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are as aware of, as interested in, and as concerned about their environment as the citizens of any area in Canada. They appreciate the diverse ecosystems, the waterways, the wildlife, the landscape of Saskatchewan, and they understand how susceptible the province's environment is to the impact of man. Although Saskatchewan is still sparsely populated compared to some regions of Canada, the province today is experiencing a faster pace of growth in resource development and in industrial development than at any other time in its history.

The pressures on the natural and relatively untouched areas of our province increase each year. Careful planning is required to ensure that fragile representative and unique areas of our natural environment are preserved for future generations of our province. Our government is dedicated to the selection and the preservation of limited areas of Crown land, some of which are fragile, some of which are unique in nature and others which are distinctively representative of the province's biogeographic zones. During the past few years we have explored several different ways of establishing an ecological reserve system. We now have before us The Ecological Reserves Act.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it has not been an easy task or assignment to bring into focus. Although it seems to be a rather simple act in principles, nevertheless in the whole matter of land use it is a very complicated issue and it has taken a considerable deal of time and public input to get to this point. The purpose of the act is to allow the Government of Saskatchewan to preserve tracts of land that are representative of unique Saskatchewan landscape. The initial intent of the act is to set aside a limited number of small (and I want to emphasize small) and unique areas of Crown land. For this fiscal year my department has been provided funds to evaluate and set priorities for potential ecological reserves. We will proceed with the establishment of some reserves next year and in following years as the areas are assessed and considered eligible for that type of designation. These tracts of land will be significant for scientific and educational purposes to measure the effects of man's impact on the environment.

Saskatchewan has legislation under The Provincial Parks Act to designate areas of the province as protected areas. These protected areas are frequently multiple-use area. However, the Ecological Reserves Act will allow for the preservation of a particular area, preserved for the sake of all living and non-living things in it. This criterion therefore suggests that they will be relatively small in size, and I make reference to the Great Sand Hills area (about which a question was raised in this House the other day), and to the Athabasca Sand Dunes. It would not be wise for the province to set aside large areas of that, but to set aside small ecological reserves to that they may be protected from any sort of impact in order that that may be the base line measure used to indicate the impact of man upon some of the larger areas. So I want to emphasize the point that we intend the establishment of ecological reserves to be basically small to being with, very small in size.

Mr. Speaker, let me outline the procedure and the criteria for establishing ecological reserves in order that members may gain a better understanding of their importance.

In the past, 100 important natural areas have been identified in Saskatchewan by the International Biological Program. The IBP was formed in the mid-1960s in the United States of America and western Europe by a group of biological scientists and naturalists concerned about the destruction of our natural environment. We will be open to suggestions from the public, special interest groups and organizations which may want to bring other areas of special significance to our attention. In 1980 and 1981, we will identify and prioritize only 12 high-priority areas of immediate evaluation. We will investigate these areas to determine the plants, the animals, the land forms present and other unique features and suggest sizes and the boundaries of the candidate areas. We will prioritize the areas with respect to the urgency for preservation.

Criteria for evaluation will include such considerations as the presence of rare or endangered species, the presence of unique or rare habitats, the presence of unique or rare land forms, and representative parts of ecological zones.

Mr. Speaker, members may be interested in a few examples of types of areas to be considered under this program. The province has several areas, as I have already mentioned, of unique sand dunes. We also have some natural grasslands, wilderness areas and river environments. The MacFarlane River, for those of you who may not be acquainted with that very picturesque river which flows into Lake Athabasca through the Athabasca sands, is a very unique and very picturesque area, the river and the land form. Certainly some parts of that river should be protected under the provisions of this act.



Samples of these land types must be set aside in order to ensure that preservation for the future will guarantee their natural environment.

Future benefits from an ecological reserves act cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Undisturbed ecosystems will, however, yield a wealth of knowledge through their function as living laboratories. As industrial pressures on our environment increase, these reserves will increase in value as will their rarity. Citizens of our province have reaped benefits from the land for many years. On this 75th anniversary of our province and on the threshold of great economic gains as a result of the natural resources of this province, I believe it is only fitting that we should take time to recognize our heritage and preserve portions of it for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure in moving second reading of The Ecological Reserve Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of very brief remarks on the bill. First I want to congratulate the minister on the bill. I think it meets almost all of the requests which environmental groups and natural history groups have been making to the government over the years. In particular, the bill has included in it, section 4, subsection 2 the provision that no designation of land, as an ecological reserve, may be revoked except by the Assembly. In other words, an ecological reserve once it's established cannot simply be taken out of existence by an order in council, or by a cabinet decision. It must come before the Assembly. I know that is one of the requests on which representation has been made to us for some time. I think it's an excellent bill, and I congratulate the minister for it.

**MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, basically we on this side of the House, in the Progressive Conservative opposition, agree with the general concept of this bill. My colleague, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, had brought this up before and I think it's very fitting especially in the year of Celebrate Saskatchewan 1980, that we do have a bill like this brought in, especially to protect certain areas of the province. The minister makes note of the Great Sand Hills area. I think that's a prime example of an area of land, part of which needs to be protected. I know the area very well. Whether it be four-wheel drive vehicles, motor toboggans, motorcycles — this can be ruined, and once it's ruined it's gone.

The area the minister speaks of, I would like to know (when we get into committee of the whole we'll find out) the size of area that he's talking about. To date the minister states that there are only 12 areas he's looking at. Hopefully, we can look at a few more than the 12 areas. I have to agree with the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland who spoke before. I do believe that under section 4(2) — no designation of land as an ecological reserve may be revoked except by the Assembly — is definitely a change in the government opposite. Usually they like to do everything by orders in council. It's nice to see something can still be done in the Legislative Assembly.

There is one other thing that does bother me in there (not too much, but I'm a little bit concerned about it) and I think maybe the minister should bring in an amendment. Under section 5, where it says the minister may hold public hearings, I think it should read the minister will hold public hearings — not just may — so that people throughout all of Saskatchewan can have input into this ecological reserves act, whether they be

farmers or businessmen or wildlife groups, whoever it may be. They should have input into this, not just at the minister's discretion but that he will hold these hearings to make sure all of the people in Saskatchewan are happy with this.

I think also it's very important with the ecological reserves act, Mr. Speaker, that we protect not just the areas of land in Saskatchewan but the endangered species. I can bring to mind a couple of them that are very important, one of them being the sharp-tailed grouse and its stamping grounds. The stamping grounds are either being put into pasture land, or being broken up and once these pasture lands are broken up or the stamping grounds are gone (as I call them) for the Saskatchewan prairie chicken, so are the birds going to be gone. It does create quite a problem and we could lose a species that has been around Saskatchewan for many, many years.

Also it brings to mind the sandhill crane populations in Saskatchewan. I know on my own farm I have an area where the sandhill cranes come and maybe there is an area that should be set aside just for them. And this would fit into this special bill.

I see nothing drastically wrong with this bill, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side of the House, can surely agree with the concept of it. After all, we did bring it to the government's attention, and we're very pleased that the government opposite is listening to their Progressive Conservative opposition in bringing in this bill. We would appreciate if we could work together on many other fields, on some of these other bills. We could speed this Assembly along a lot faster. And if we didn't have some of these bill number 13's it would really progress quickly. I'll be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

---

**Bill No. 108 — An Act to amend the Construction Industry Labour Relations Act.**

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill we are considering today proposes an amendment to The Construction Industry Labour Relations act. I thin hon. members will recall this legislation was passed just a year ago, in May 1979. It was designed for the purpose of creating a framework conducive to more stable, rational, and orderly collective bargaining in an industry with a history of employer-employee conflict characterized by strikes and lockouts.

At the time a choice had to be made between implementing a system of collective bargaining on a multiple trade basis, as is instituted or in place in Quebec and British Columbia, or bargaining on a trade-by trade basis as is the general pattern in Ontario, the Maritimes and Alberta.

Multiple trade bargaining, as some members may know, consists of an organization representing all unionized employers in the industry and one council representing all trade unions in the industry getting together and negotiating a collective agreement.

Trade-by trade bargaining is a different concept. Trade-by-trade bargaining involves an employers' organization representing unionized employers in a trade division of the industry, and a trade union representing employees in that trade, getting together to bargain a collective agreement applicable to unionized employers and employees in that particular trade division.

After a great deal of discussion and thought, it was decided that a system of trade-by trade bargaining was far and away best suited to the province's construction industry.

Trade-by trade bargaining, Mr. Speaker, I believe is consistent with the structure of the construction industry in this province, particularly with respect to the structure of the unions representing construction employees. It was also amenable to the history and tradition of collective bargaining in the industry whereas multiple trade bargaining was not. In addition trade bargaining was more agreeable to the trade unions representing construction workers, as well as to employers and employers' representatives.

To implement the system on a strong and stable basis, section 9 and 10 of the legislation gave the Minister of Labour the authority to designate appropriate trade divisions and representative employer organizations. Provision was made to take effect in 1981 for employers to change their bargaining agent if the majority of unionized employers voted for such a change. Their application was made to the labor relations board. However, employers will not be able to elect not to have a bargaining agent as was the case in the past.

This then brings me to the matter of the amendment, Mr. Speaker. The amendment to section 14 of the act is designed to ensure the preservation of the concept of trade-by-trade bargaining in situations where an employer's organization is designated to represent more than one trade division, or where different employers' organizations are designated to represent different trade divisions.

By your leave, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to explain this amendment. It's particularly relevant to the province's construction industry.

The Saskatchewan Construction Labour Relations Council, incorporated under The Societies Act in 1971, took over most of the collective bargaining in the construction industry in 1972. The council acted as the major employer representative in the construction industry prior to the present legislation coming into force. It's logical, therefore, that this agency would then continue to play a major role in the collective bargaining process under The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act. This, indeed, Mr. Speaker, is very much the case.

Out of 23 trade divisions, the Saskatchewan Construction Labour Relations Council has been designed the representative of the employers organization in 17 out of the 23 instances. So in accordance with the commitments offered in the past, and to protect and to promote the principle of trade by trade bargaining given this set of circumstances, a condition was attached to the minister's designating orders stipulating that all decisions concerning collective bargaining issues in each of the trade divisions will be made only by the unionized employers in their respective trade divisions. A condition, I think it has to be said, that is somewhat cumbersome to enforce as a part of a ministerial order.

As such, Mr. Speaker, it's proposed that the condition attached to the minister's designating orders be incorporated in section 14 of the act to preserve and to promote the concept of trade by trade bargaining. The initial round of bargaining under the terms of The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act is currently in progress as members will know. We, of the government, Mr. Speaker, are of the view the proposed amendment will ensure beyond any doubt that the concept of trade by trade bargaining will be guaranteed in the process of collective bargaining in the construction industry in our province. That is the only purpose it hopes to achieve and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Minister, the amendment on the surface looks very simple, It's very snort and to the point. It seems to indicate from your speech that maybe this will solve the problem they seems to be running into at the table. I'm a little concerned as I was about the original bill on the actual workings of The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act or the bill we passed last year which put them all negotiating together. The principle has not had sufficient time to work.

My only concern is that we're bringing in an amendment right now and they haven't even had their first real contract for everybody who is involved at the table.

I am wonder if it's really the time to make a change or are you suggesting this is a problem you didn't foresee when you moved the original bill and therefore that's the reason you're bringing this in, to clean it up and make it a little more easy to handle in areas you didn't realize when you passed the original. Rather than hang it up, I would ask if the minister could reply to those two questions today.

Then, in committee of the whole, if there's any lengthy debate, we can handle it there. I'm just concerned that you have both sides approval of this amendment because you're dealing with them regularly. I have heard from some of them and they're just not sure they've had sufficient time to make sure the whole system is working. And that's my concern over the bill we passed last year.

Mr. Speaker, rather than putting a position at this time I will wait until we get to committee of the whole. Rather than hanging it up, I would let the minister make his

closing remarks. Maybe he can relieve my fears by answering those couple of questions.

**MR. SNYDER:** — A very few brief comments in closing debate on the bill before asking the House to give it second reading. The hon. member asks whether the act has had an appropriate opportunity to work its way through the system. And obviously I suppose the proof of the pudding is finally in the eating. I can't tell the hon. member whether the bill is going to work to the ultimate advantage of both parties except we know there has been a general degree of acceptance throughout the trade union movement in the building trades and with the organized contractors in Saskatchewan. My fear and my concern as expressed by a large number of the construction trades was that, as a result of the designation process and with the construction industry labor relations council being named in 17 out of 23 of the trade divisions as the bargaining agent for those organized employers, there might very well emerge what would appear to be (if not in actual fact) a system of multitrade bargaining.

Essentially what was happening was that the building trades were saying in order to prevent the multitrade bargaining concept emerging with the labor relations council being named in all except a very few of the trade divisions, there should be spelled out in a very precise way a condition which would say without question that only the organized employers in that trade division would have the authority to make decisions with respect to the collective bargaining process in their own sphere of influence. Accordingly, there would be no veto, there would be no interference by the other employers in other trade divisions. That was what the trades feared.

I have a letter from Mr. Trace (?) of the construction industry labor relations council indicating general support for the amendment as it is drafted. I think in general terms the trades involved will give their general support to the concept because it was they in the first instance who expressed the concern over a system of multitrade bargaining possibly appearing to emerge when there were such a large number of instances (as I said 17 out of 23) where the labor relations council was named as the bargaining agent for the respective group.

This was the purpose of the amendments, a very simple and straightforward one I think, to further emphasize the intent and the spirit of the act. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Before the member takes his seat, would he allow a question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Would the member allow a question?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, what you're really saying is this because they have the 17 out of the 23, you are trying to make it line up with the real spirit of the original act. Am I correct?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Yes. That's what I've been attempting to say. When I moved second reading in the first instance, when the bill was passed a year ago. I indicated that we believed beyond question of doubt, given the craft nature of the bargaining process and of the unions involved in the construction industry, that trade by trade bargaining was the most suitable method of approaching bargaining in the construction industry in our province and accordingly, that was the main thrust of the bill one year ago. This, I think, just goes somewhat further in attempting to guarantee beyond all doubt that trade by trade bargaining will continue to be viewed as the appropriate method of

bargaining in the construction industry.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — SOCIAL SERVICES — VOTE 36

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Are you ready to go, Mr. Minister? Would you like to introduce your officials?

**MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services):** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce the staff that is here this afternoon. To my immediate right is the deputy minister of social services, Mr. Harold Jones. To my immediate left is the associate deputy minister, Mr. Ron Hikel. Immediately behind me is Mr. Don Cameron, executive director of income security. To his immediate right is Richard Fontanie who is executive director in charge of family services, core services and the senior citizens' division of the department. Those are the immediate officials to be introduced.

Mr. Chairman, I would like just as a background to make a brief statement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Before you make any brief statements, I think the procedure is that we have to read off this item 1 first, O.K.?

#### Item 1

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I said, I would like to set the background for the consideration of the spending estimate of the department by outlining just a few figures and the direction in which we are heading with the department.

Over the course of fiscal 1980-81, an estimate 110,000 persons or about one Saskatchewan resident in nine will directly receive services from the department. That statistic points to the main defining characteristic of the department. It's primary activity is to direct daily provision of a wide range of social services.

The second and increasingly important function is the provision of funding and program support, for services delivered by other agencies. These include agencies such as the senior citizens' activity centres, group and foster homes, employment support projects, day care centres, social development projects, professional multi-service agencies and sheltered workshops.

In the fiscal year 1980-81, we will be supporting about 800 local social service agencies located throughout the province. In 1980-81 we expect about 75,000 people will receive services from these community agencies. Of course, some of the people receive services from both the department and from these agencies. But something like 150,000 Saskatchewan individuals this year will benefit from the expenditures of the funds in this budget. Mr. Chairman, that is about 15 per cent of the total population of Saskatchewan which directly is affected or indirectly affected by the Department of Social Services. The majority of these people are young and elderly or those who care for the young and elderly and the physically and mentally disabled. There is a prevailing notion that our age has seen a decline in the willingness of some Canadians to care in times of crisis for their relatives and neighbors. And certainly we must be careful to avoid doing anything that would encourage a shift away from the full acceptance of individual responsibilities. But from my perspective, any loss of willingness to care for others has been more than offset by a shift away from the use of

institutional services toward an increased reliance of community services provided by local residents. This increasing reliance on community delivery services can be seen in such areas as mental retardation and physical disabilities, senior citizens and, indeed, in corrections.

As community services expand, more and more of these in need are in fact being cared for by families and those who live near by.

So in Saskatchewan we're working towards a synthesis, a coming together, of increased government support and a growing family willingness to protect and nurture its own members. Far from diminishing the family, the result is to strengthen it and to help it cope with the special needs of its members. There was a time when one was either in one's family to be helped by whatever resource the family had on its own, or totally in the care of a state-run or state-sponsored institution. Now, however, we are moving toward a new fusion of the traditional responsibilities of families with specialized support resources brought into the home by government.

Thus the budget before you requests in excess of \$23 million in grants for local service delivery programs. This is an increase of about 18.4 per cent. Another \$154,898,000 is marked for payment to be made on behalf of individuals so they can themselves purchase means of life and required services. This combined with the \$23 million in grants to third parties, means that somewhere around \$178 million out of the total budget, or about 76 per cent of the total request in the estimates, is to go to individuals in need, their families, and to local non-government agencies acting on their behalf.

This leaves about 24 per cent to be spent by the department on direct provision or administrative support of services. Of the remaining 24 per cent, a full 14 per cent out of that goes towards the operating costs of institutions such as Valley View Centre at Moose Jaw. The remaining 10 per cent is for program development, support costs, and administrative overhead, including regional services. It is this portion of the budget in which the smallest percentage of increase was incurred over the last year.

I believe wherever possible needy individuals should be cared for by themselves in conjunction with their families and those who live near them. And this is essentially the approach we are attempting to take in the Department of Social Services.

**MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — I'd like to start out today by asking you a question with relation to the social service districts that you established. And the reason I raise the question is because there's a lot of confusion in the country about where we go to receive assistance through social services. I've been somewhat concerned about the type of district you have established and the distance people must drive or telephone to get service.

Let me give you some examples of my concern. At the community of Demaine and Beechy where I live, they must phone to Kindersley to get assistance if they need assistance. That is a distance of about 150 miles in exactly the opposite direction to what they would normally travel for any trade services. Rosetown is about 80 miles from the same district. They would be 55 miles from Kindersley, but they don't get service from Kindersley; they get theirs from Saskatoon which is 70 miles away. And the district just a few miles north of the town of Rosetown falls into the North Battleford district. It's a very, very confusing pattern of service. I would like to have you explain the

rationale for the type of districts you are setting up to provide social service to the communities.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I think the basic regions were there and basically haven't been changed since I have taken over. I want to point out that we have the various regions as you indicated. When you set up any form of boundaries, whether it be for home care or to provide social services, you set up a given area to services.

I think inevitably we run into problems of whether or not a given area should be in a different district. All I can say in respect to the rationale for setting them up was that they were set up as administrative districts as much as possible. If you take Moose Jaw for instance it deals with a given number of areas where the rural offices are held and it is somewhat aligned with the trading district. I know what you are saying though. There will be some areas which one would wonder about. Take for instance the Moose Jaw area. One would wonder whether Davidson to the north would in fact fit into the Moose Jaw area.

I want to say to the member we have taken a look at it. I would like to join with you in saying we would want to provide as much service as possible on the local level. It's a question of what degree of decentralization can in fact take place. All I want to say is that we have taken a look at it. We haven't come to any decision, but if there are particular areas where adjustments into another area would make better sense, certainly we are amenable to look into it.

**MR. SWAN:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it seems to me that the boundaries were drawn rather haphazardly and there was really no background information used when you drew these boundaries. You have a health district which services people for health and lots of the same services overlap and yet the health region and the social service region has no relation.

I believe this is something you could be looking at. And I'm wondering if your department is prepared to take a look at the overall districts set up in social service as they relate to the health districts and see if you can do some co-ordinating to make these districts a little more operational.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, well certainly. I welcome your suggestion here. It has been a concern to government to try to co-ordinate the various boundaries so that if they are operating for one type of program like health, they could be operated on a continuous basis with another program because of the general identification. People do get used to the services being provided in the same area. I certainly welcome your suggestion and of course we will be reviewing that.

**MR. SWAN:** — All right. If you'll take a look at that one, then we'll move into another area.

I noticed when you were giving your opening comments you were listing the number of people receiving services. Can you give me any indication how many people are there who have had service for five years or ten years (and when I am speaking of service I don't mean old age pensioners; I am talking about people who are on social welfare assistance because they are not employed); how many people have been on an ongoing receiving program where they may have gone five years to ten years, or a fairly long term?



**MR. KOSKIE:** — I was just checking with the officials with respect to this. They say there would be a problem on the accuracy of information we can provide because of changes which take place — changes in names, changes in health numbers and a few other factors. They probably can come up with a reasonable estimate. We don't have that actual figure with us here today. It wouldn't be precise; it would be a ball park figure.

**MR. SWAN:** — I'm not really asking you to give me 25,006 or something like that. Is it 25,000 or is it 30,000 or 50,000? Give me a ball park figure.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised that the largest proportion we would find continuing are those in the senior citizen area and we don't have an estimate of the others. Essentially what we have is a group which is a short-term unemployed. We have another group which may be displaced from employment, such as single parents, but they tend to get back into the labor force. We just don't have that breakdown for you.

**MR. SWAN:** — Can you get me the breakdown? How long will it take to get it?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just so we are clear on the questions you asked. Are you asking for precisely those who are receiving social assistance, not in respect to other programs? They will narrow it down for us. In order to determine that answer.

It has been drawn to our attention here that of persons in the various categories, we find that the number unemployable (of course which would again include the senior citizens) is 22,045, but we will see what we can come up with on that for you.

**MR. SWAN:** — You've thrown out a figure of 22,045. I don't know whether it's accurate and you don't know if it is. I would like you to have someone bring in the information as accurately as possible, because that's a figure I want. I would like it during the course of the estimates, not afterwards. I think someone can likely do some work and bring it back in fairly shortly.

The reason I'm asking you for this is because I've been concerned when I look at your employment and support program to see there is a significant cutback in the amount of money put into it. Sure, you say some of it is transferred into industry and commerce, but I can't quite say that that's going to solve your problem. I think it's a program that is needed, if anything should be expanded, to take the people off the welfare rolls. We're seeing people going into the second and third generations as welfare recipients, basically because they need the opportunity to get employment. They need to be restructured so they have the work ethic built into their lives. They sit at home in a situation where no one works; it does not encourage a young person to work, and I believe you are not doing a service for these people by continuing to just pay out social assistance when you could be doing something to put them back in the work force.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, this is a direction the department initiated with the employment support program. I think if you co-ordinate the expenditures (that is, what was transferred for industry and commerce and what was retained) there was indeed not a cutback but an increase in the overall funding as I recall it.

Certainly that is an objective and I realize that many of the individuals, as you have indicated, need to get the work habit and get off the continuation, in many cases, of generations of welfare. I think many of the programs in that instance have to be relatively simple in their nature. The one area we have been addressing in order to

encourage the work incentive is to negotiate with the federal government in order that amendments may be made to the Canada Assistance Plan. Under the Canada Assistance Plan there are some limitations as to what an individual can earn before he loses the benefit of working. That is one direction we are going.

A second direction we are going, and we are just in the process of doing so, is in the employment support program. We are looking at redefining that somewhat and one of the areas we want to address is, for the sake of a name, employable, units at the basis regional divisions. What will happen is that the employment support program, the employable unit, will in fact do an analysis of those people who are on welfare and who with additional assistance could be put on the employment roll. One of the areas I have asked my department to look at very carefully is, in fact, a very high and significant number of single parents. If that problem, it seems to me, isn't addressed fairly abruptly to assist that person to get into the working market it could go on. If the single parents has children or a child, he/she may be off the work force for an extended period of time. So we are looking at those modifications in respect to the employment support.

**MR. SWAN:** — I raise a question with you with regard to the employment support program. I believe one particular committee you had was having some degree of success, although they did become a little bit radical later in their statements, was the one at Love, Saskatchewan. I understand you're not even going to provide them funding this year just because they did make a couple of rash statements. They were putting people back to work and I think doing a pretty fair job of it. What is your policy with regard to that particular operation?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I don't agree with your conclusion as to why they did not receive funding. ESP is not a continuing ongoing funding as you know. We have far more applications than we are able, under the present allotment of funds, to totally meet. Accordingly, what we have to do and we have done, because basically there's probably going to be fewer funded this year, because we are also developing the other facet of it as the employable units within the various regions . . . So to say that, for that reason, is accurate.

**MR. SWAN:** — Did you in fact cut off the support to the Love ESP committee?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised they were advised they won't be receiving funds this year but that is not unique by my understanding to that community alone.

**MR. SWAN:** — All right, Mr. Minister. Last year you provided a small grant to them. I believe the figure was \$18,000. They were able to provide employment for 33 people. Some of them have continued in a steady work pattern form that day on. I believe you're really indeed pulling the money away from that particular committee for only one reason and that is they made a statement at a meeting you didn't agree with. I would like to have you reconsider that decision and provide some funding to these people so they can continue get people back on the work force.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I would think we could continue to debate whether or not that is the reason. You are alleging that it is; I am alleging that it is not. The fact of the matter is, if you look at the amount of funds within the ESP, it's insufficient to meet all the demands of all of the communities. Some of it has been used in respect to community service organizations which have taken on a special project and so we have in some instances provided additional funds. All I want to say is the ESP is in fact being re-examined to try to zero in on the particular hard core, if you want to use that word, type of case load

including the area of the regions so that we have employable units at each region in order to better assess the employability of each person who comes in and applies for social assistance. We have set up in some of the cities a community-based organization in which we can refer. They then have communication with the business community and various employment and educational organizations, in order to assist these people back to employment.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, you told me awhile ago that the employment support program, in fact, was increased if you added what was in industry and commerce and what is in your department. We just added up the figures. At least from the addition that we can do it looks to me like you've cut the program. Could you clarify the point which you made before?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — As you know there is a split of the funds. As I recall, it was the employment support program funding, then there was in addition to that an economic fund of about \$700,000, if my memory serves me right. Then there was also Special ARDA (Agricultural Rehabilitation Development Agreement) somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2.4 million. What went to industry and commerce was one-half of the economic fund which we had because the thrust for native economic development is with industry and commerce now. So Special ARDA went over to industry and commerce. As I recall one-half of the economic fund, which was the previous year about \$700,000 — it seems to me that we retained about \$350,000 of that in the economic fund, over and above that is \$1.5 million for the base fund.

The emphasis, as you know, has been put on to the area of native packages. What funds show up in the ARDA funds, or are transferred to the economic fund, does not necessarily indicate that this is the limitation of funds, because other moneys were made available through industry and commerce for the development of an economic base for the native people.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, you told me that the funding was increased. But when we look at it, it's not increased; it's down. Now, I'd like you to add it up and come back with a definitive statement of whether it is up or down. I'm concerned that you've cut the employment support program. You're not really doing what you say you are doing. Rather, you're giving lip service to it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I've checked with my officials and they have advised me that that is an accurate statement. The amount of money per se has not changed from the previous year. The fact is that in the package which goes into industry and commerce the emphasis is toward the native package, more money is being put into that. Certainly in dealing with that area it also assists the department in the same type of area of development.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Minister, with the employment support program, what mechanisms do you have in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the program? Do you do follow-ups on people who have partaken in this program to see whether or not they are continuing to be employed or have sought employment elsewhere? Exactly what mechanism or what standards do you use to evaluate the effectiveness of that program?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised that is, in fact correct. There is a follow-up. There is a determination as to the effectiveness which will vary of course by the degree of hard-core-ness of the applicant with whom we're dealing. But there is a determination as to

how many, who have actually gone through the ESP, eventually go in and receive work in the labor force. The percentage I think is relatively good as a result of the program, but that is followed up. We are trying to assess how effective it is.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — In 1979-80 what was your percentage of people taking advantage of this program who were employed? Is it increasing?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised that analysis of the effect of the program, they check it back in respect to determine whether the individual reappears within six months thereafter on assistance. On the basis of that, if they haven't reappeared on the case load. It is running somewhere around 80 per cent. I am advised.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in another area which is probably related to the area the previous members were questioning. Does your department have a liaison with the Department of the Attorney General with preference to the crime statistics in Saskatchewan?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised the Department of Social Services is represented on the criminal justice committee which is a committee of representatives of various department, law enforcement agencies. Through that mechanism there is some exchange of the basic information.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Therefore, Mr. Minister, you are saying to me your department is fully aware of the statistics on crime as they relate to various areas in Saskatchewan such as the city of Regina which has the highest crime rate in Canada. Your department, I am sure is aware of that. Am I correct on that?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'm told we have a general awareness, we don't have a sharing of the exact information. That's the best information advised by the deputy.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, what the minister has just said is that his department which doles out social assistance across the province and is responsible for that is not aware of the crime rates in the various centres in the province of Saskatchewan. That's what he said. He said they are aware of it but they don't have any statistical data, they don't have any information. Is your department aware of the studies conducted in the United States of America that correlate the doling out of social assistance with crime?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, I don't want to leave the impression the department is without information in respect to the general area of crime. ?but to say we have a detailed analysis of it, I am advised, is not so. We do have a contact through the criminal justice committee and that does give us some significant information. Similarly in respect to corrections we have some additional information.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister has not answered the other part of the question, but that's perfectly satisfactory. I don't think he can answer it. The minister will be aware that certain studies in the United States of America over the last number of years seem to indicate that the more welfare is doled out the higher the crime rate will be. Since Saskatchewan has one of the highest, if not the highest, rates of doling out of welfare moneys, and since Regina has the highest crime rate, would the minister not now be prepared to accept what the member for Rosetown suggested that the only kind of program which is going to work is one like ESP. It is going to put these hard core welfare cases to work, which would in turn cause society to have far lower crime rates

and therefore cost society far less money.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I want to just indicate to the hon. member that in respect to the numbers on assistance in Saskatchewan, they have in fact been decreasing at a considerable rate. In May of '72 there were 56,000 or more persons benefiting from payment. That has been decreased from 62 per 1,000 in '72, and in '74 it was somewhere around 54 per 1,000. That had been reduced in '78 to 44 per 1,000. We have made further gains on that from the 44 per 1,000. Generally speaking the number of people on social assistance has been, through some of the positive efforts of the department, going down. I can agree with the hon. member that to some extent ESP has made a contribution to that. But that's not to say other initiatives are not needed. What I'm going to say is that, as I've indicated, the number on social assistance has gone down. I don't think that necessarily correlates with the crime rate in Saskatchewan. I would have thought it was a different curve. In other words, the crime rate at the present time is on the increase and the social assistance rate is on the decrease.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, it's a good thing then the minister doesn't have the statistics from the Department of the Attorney General because in fact the crime rate has been declining somewhat. It's still the highest. What I'm trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is quite simply this, that because of the co-relation between the payment of social assistance and crime and because of the tremendous cost to the taxpayer of criminal activity the minister should not pay less attention to programs that work.

He admits himself the ESP works. It functions; it works and it has contributed to this gain. I happen to believe as well, the minister is misleading this Assembly when he suggests the reason that the number of participants in social assistance declined since 1972 is because of the program put forward by the Department of Social Services.

I would suggest to the minister that the prime reason why the number receiving social assistance has declined is because the economy of Saskatchewan has been relatively buoyant in the last number of years. In addition to that, the Department of Social Services does not take into account the social assistance provided to treat Indians in Saskatchewan, and never did. That's quite right.

It may possibly be that if you examine the total amount of social assistance paid in Saskatchewan, both through the treaty Indian program and the Department of Social Services, the actual number of recipients of social aid of one kind or another is actually going up. That's a possibility. We don't have those statistics. I don't think the minister himself has those statistics and therefore they're not available.

So what I am trying to say is that it has been shown in their jurisdictions that the payment of social aid is directly related to crime. And there have been instances in some American cities where when social assistance was removed and work-related programs were introduced, the crime rate dropped dramatically.

What I am trying to say to the minister is this: here's a program that works and has worked for others. We can reduce crime in Saskatchewan by encouraging the program. Now you say you're de-emphasizing the program and you're going to start something else you think might work.

This seems to me to be very, very short-sighted on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan and is causing the people of Saskatchewan to have less and less confidence in social aid. And if you don't believe that, just go talk to your constituents.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I would like to indicate to the hon. member that I'm not sure which causes which — whether high rates of crime cause more to be on social assistance or whether a large number of people on social assistance cause high rates of crime. I want to indicate that in the area of social assistance, I think there are groups within the case load which need identification and need a particular type of approach for a given area. And certainly that's not to say ESP will not work. No one is saying that.

But I do say with respect to single parents that I think there is an area which can be identified. Perhaps another approach can be taken which would assist them by giving them an extra incentive if they take training and by giving them day care centres where their children can be looked after.

I think there are areas where we can take some of the recipients like single parents and give them training in operating day care facilities. We may be able to take some in the social assistance program and make them available in home care programs throughout Saskatchewan.

I hope I don't leave the impression I'm detracting from that but I'm looking at the broader base with the emphasis on what you're raising.

**MR. COLLVER:** — One final question for the minister. If the minister says he is aware of the studies completed on the correlation between the payment of social aid of all kinds and the crime statistics in our community would you not say two things should be done.

The first thing, for certain, you and your officials should obtain from the Department of the Attorney General the statistics on crime in the various centres in Saskatchewan in order to more directly relate them to the payment of social assistance and more directly relate the criminal activities in these various areas of the province to the payment of social aid. That's first of all. Surely it is not an unreasonable request that your departmental officials make themselves aware of the criminal activities in the province of Saskatchewan and the crime statistics in Saskatchewan.

The second thing which you should do is to make a commitment to this Assembly today (whether you call it anything else) that the emphasis by your department will be in the forthcoming years on trying to get the people receiving social aid back to work. The best way to do that, surely is with local groups and local people. To try to implement it from the top down, as has been your practice in the past, quite simply doesn't work. It was only with these local committees (because ESP was a local committee program) that these people were able to get back to work.

I think two things: one you make a commitment to the House to receive those statistics on a regular basis so you can relate these payments, and two, you commit to this Assembly that whatever you call the program, you are going to work with local committees to try to welfare recipients back to work.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want, first of all, to address the second suggestion which you indicated, the commitment for programs. Perhaps I didn't clarify this situations, but that is in fact what we are doing in establishing, for instance, the regional economic development committee in Saskatoon, which is going to be a local community group. We are doing that in Regina and a number of the other cities. Non-government agencies will focus on that very thing, getting them back to work.

What we are doing just with another part of ESP is to have an employable unit which will within that region, assess the capability of an individual for employment. The worker will receive the individual for assistance. Some information will be obtained there (the age and son on). If they are young enough to be able to go on employment; then they will be sent to this employable unit (if I may call it that). They will take a look at the potential and be referred to the non-government organization in the community. Then the non-government agency goes to work in order to facilitate that person becoming employable.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Before you answer the other part of my question, could you tell me if you believe (the way you are talking about employable units, I think, is what the people on welfare object to the most, being referred to as some kind of a unit or number or whatever), those committees which you are making in the cities may be too large a unit to relate on a people-to-people basis?

I think what the member for Rosetown-Elrose was trying to point out to you was that it was because of local involvement in Love that the program worked. They were able to get people back to work and because it was a small enough unit, a small enough committee, people could relate to it and relate to it on a person-to-person basis. If you are just going to create it, dump them in the city and say, O.K., there's 150,000 people here and we have a committee of 12 people, go see them — they are going to feel the same way as they do about going to the department of welfare.

What I am saying is perhaps that's a nice first step, but don't you think it would be better to have in the cities, neighborhood committees, neighborhood units if you like? I hate the word unit as well. But don't you think it would be better to have neighborhood groups of people who are trying to help their neighbors get back to work. This might take it down to a level those people would understand, not feel they are part of a big machine, not feel they are part of the overall welfare scheme, that they are dealing with their neighbors, with the people they feel they can relate to?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, I think what we have been doing is working with a lot of the municipal bodies in the smaller centres and communities.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Saskatoon and Regina are too big.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — No, but in the real smaller ones. That has been relatively effective, that is right.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Do you remember the Conservative policy of 1978 with regard to welfare?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, right. Certainly I share your expressed direction. What we want to do is certainly address that aspect you have raised. It will be in fact an emphasis I intend to pursue which I have in fact addressed with my officials. They are in concurrence with that. I appreciate some of your suggestions in respect to the neighborhood type of concept in a city because if you get the non-government agency which is very large . . . That has its merits.

In respect to the other point you raised, that will be taken certainly under advisement. I think there is a lot of merit in being able to look at different areas of the province, knowing the potential of crime and the crime rate in a given area, and being able to

better assess the need for programs in that area.

**MR. SWAN:** — I would like to come back to the statistics you gave us a little earlier on the percentage of results you are having through the employment services program. Could you give us some figures on that? If possible, send it across in writing so we have it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised in respect to the previous studies, we could make that available. We don't have it with us here today. We could get it here probably tomorrow.

**MR. SWAN:** — I didn't say anything about previous studies. You gave me figures earlier. You gave me figures that said you had 80 per cent success results in the employment support program. Those are the kinds of figures I want. How many in 1977, 1978, 1979 and so on, do you not have those?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I am advised, yes, we can get that to you. We don't have it here.

**MR. SWAN:** — I would like to talk a little bit about the special-care homes. I raised a question with you a little while ago in question period. You got a little bit excited when I raised the question of a news release out of Saskatoon. It said special-care home residents were to get a 22.5 per cent increase. Then I pull the minister's news release and he's still saying the same thing. But you denied in here that you said it. I think the kind of statement you are making has been misleading. I have had people from special-care homes calling me and saying when can we expect to get the 22.5 per cent? If you are going to make statements like that, you are going to have to follow up with some money. I would like to know what have you done to notify the people when they can expect this nice change in their funding?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I explained it perfectly and the statement in the press release did not in fact say that. I wish I had the press release . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The press release did not. I take no responsibility for the press. Take a press release of mine and read it. It doesn't say 22 per cent for individual allowances. Read that article. I'll tell you, you cannot be confused.

It is perfectly clear, as I indicated. You say special-care homes are contacting you and indicating they are confused. It is my understanding they were advised in the early part of April with respect to the actual amount of subsidies and what they were going to be.

**MR. SWAN:** — I would just like to read into the record what the minister wrote. This is right out of your press release:

Social Services Minister Murray Koskie has announced that allowances for residents of special-care homes will amount to \$35,273,670 in 1980-81 fiscal year, an increase of 22.5 per cent over last year.

That's what the people received out in the country. That's when they started to phone to say, look we only got 7 per cent. When do we get the rest of it, the other 14 per cent? Now don't tell me you didn't mislead the people. They read that in their papers and they expect to get that kind of . . .

**MR. KOSKIE:** — You seem to think that the first part of that statement . . . Even if you can't understand it, read the rest. How could you possibly indicate that it wasn't clear.



Why don't you be fair? It is very clear if you go through the statement to where it says \$3 million is going to be used in the restructuring program. It says about \$1 million is used for the special subsidies for heavy level 3's. It goes on to say that \$3 million plus was used to increase the subsidies in level 2 and level 3. That's precisely what it says.

If you turn to Vote 29 you will see an estimated expenditure for 1980-81 of \$35 million. The previous amount was \$26,791,500. If you compare those two figures, it's 22.5 per cent. In Vote 29, allowances to certain residents in special-care homes is what I referred to.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Minister, when you specifically say that allowances for residents of special-care homes will increase by 22.5 per cent, it's very, very clear to the people in those homes that allowance means their allowance. When you talk about a 22 per cent increase, you could start out by saying there is to be a 22.5 per cent increase overall in funding for nursing homes. You don't have to say allowances for special-care residents. Don't say that isn't a misleading statement.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — No doubt that the 22.5 per cent relates to the \$35 million from the \$28 million as I indicated. If you go down the press release you will indicate the allocation of that additional expenditures.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Go back to your platform in '78 — substantially decrease nursing home costs for the elderly. You go back and ask them how you substantially decreased it. Duping them, that's what you're doing.

**MR. SWAN:** — You go on to say that there's \$300 a month for the heavy level 3's. That sounds good, but that goes directly to the special-care home. It doesn't go directly to the resident. For that reason, really the resident is not gaining the benefit. When you talk about heavy level 3's, they're basically the level 4's who you haven't any place for. So, for that reason, you're not really coming out with the whole truth in that statement either. I think that type of action by the minister is not fair to the general public and the special-care home residents in particular.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — What I would like to get is a little bit of your truth serum. You seem to be the only one with a truth serum. I want to make it perfectly clear, as I have told the hon. member, that a part of the moneys is in fact to be used in the restructuring of the special-care allowances. That is eminently clear to the hon. member so to discuss it further. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Talking in respect to the member for Maple Creek, all I can say to her is we are doing a review as has been indicated by my colleague, the Minister of Health. We are working in co-operation with the two departments. We are looking at the funding to the subsidies. We are looking at the standardization of assessment and placement units. We're looking at all aspects relating to the need for special-care beds. So it's a fairly comprehensive review at which we are looking.

We want to be able to discuss this with the Saskatchewan Association of Special-Care Homes. We had a meeting tentatively arranged, but some of the members weren't able to be there so we will be meeting at a later date. But certainly we want to have the input of the interested parties; indeed, some of the workers, perhaps some of the recipients, senior citizen organizations, the senior citizen council for the province headed up by Mr. Harry Mullens. So, in this way, we hope to evolve what will be a relatively effective program commensurate with what you were saying as to our commitment, which we never break. We never break any commitment to the people of Saskatchewan; you

know that. Accordingly, that is our hope — to fulfil our commitment.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Is this a special committee you have or is this an in-department committee?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — It's at a preliminary stage but considerable work has been done by the two departments. There are a number of areas which have to be addressed vis-a-vis the two departments in respect to the future reorganization or structuring of the program.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Have you provided them with specific terms of reference and how long do you anticipate this study is going to take?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — We are looking at some general broad guidelines co-ordinated between health and social services to say that we have given them a framework, that we have in a general way addressed in broad terms the areas of concern (one being the level of subsidization to the individuals in the homes). We are looking at some other areas relative to the amount of assets, whether it be asset-tested or income-tested. Those areas are being looked at in the general purview.

What we're essentially doing in health and social services is attempting to rationalize the delivery services to our senior citizens in the best possible way, co-ordinating home care and special-care and the low-cost housing.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Minister, this problem isn't one that has just surfaced dramatically. The cost to special-care homes has been escalating for the past 10 years. You and I know they don't find any relief from inflation, the same as you and I. It's actually costing a lot of residents on level 3 in the neighborhood of \$700 a month to stay in these homes.

Now, you say you're going to start a study. Well, that's fine. But we on this side have been urging you for three or four years to look at this problem. Tell me, can you not provide some type of interim relief to the elderly who are paying their own way in the homes today? You say you have a study. It is going to end up like the Wascana study. They anticipate that's going to run for two years and then it will take another two years to digest all the information the minister might get. It'll happen in social services the very same way.

You're going to sit on that report. It's going to take a long time to report to you. You're going to sit on it for a couple of years. In the meantime those people in the special-care homes need help today, not a year down the road or two years or whatever. Surely you can find some money some place, whether you take it out of the heritage fund or what. I don't care where you get it but it seems to me this government can often find money for more frivolous things. Maybe you as a minister should put a little bit of pressure on your colleagues because it's a really pressing problem.

I can send you over letters I get from children of parents who are in these homes. They can't afford it. You can go and talk to matrons of these homes. They'll say to you that the ones who are the least well off are the ones who are paying their own way. Most of them have just a small amount of money, too much to qualify for social assistance, yet it is very traumatizing to them all of a sudden to have to go on social assistance.

The ones who are being supported by social services through your plan get allowances for clothes and comfort and things like that. It's the ones who are paying their own way

who are scared to death to spend 35 cents on a birthday card for a grandchild because she or he is going to run out of money. Surely in the interim period, while you're studying the problem, you can find funds some place to help them.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just want to indicate to the hon. member, as I have indicated to the member for Rosetown, that what we have done initially is to increase as we did in April, and within the budget as you can indicate . . . as is set out in that very clear press release your read before. You will find exactly the evidence of further assistance, at least further funds. Within the structure of the budgetary process we have given the initial assistance, recognizing the costs have gone up. We are hoping within the given year to be able to add additional benefits to the individuals within the special-care homes. That is contingent upon the speed with which our consultation process takes place. Certainly we share, at least I share, your concern in this area, and will be working as quickly as possible for the implementation.

If we are going to restructure it, we want to be able to finance it. Accordingly the plan within the estimates was to do exactly that.

I don't know where you find your statistics, but you say those who are paying their own way often have just a small amount in order not to qualify for social assistance. That is difficult, I think to come by unless they have made that known to you throughout the province (all those who are in there). We don't have that particular statistic as to the level of income of the individuals who are paying on their own. To say there is a large number just above, who have a small income, is not necessarily, I think accurate from what I gather from the department.

The thing I think you should remember is no one under the present system will be denied the comfort and placement in a home for lack of funds. What will happen if their income is insufficient is we will pick it up through social assistance. Now, you may say that is repugnant to seniors. I suppose it's repugnant to a widow who has lost her husband and has four children. What we do is guarantee at least, through this method, that no one will be denied, because of the lack of funds, the right to have the care.

I want to assure the hon. member that we will be addressing and we are addressing this problem just as rapidly as we can.

**MR. SWAN:** — You say, just as rapidly as you can, which leaves the door rather wide open. It may take a year; it may take two; it could take any length of time. I would like you to tell us, if in this study, you are considering the board and room type of charge, being charged in the other three western provinces, that would allow these older people to have care by living within their old age assistance and income supplement. That happens in British Columbia, in Alberta and Manitoba and the government is picking up the balance of the costs. If it's available to residents in those provinces, it should be available to residents in this province. Then all people could live in the old folks' homes without dipping into their meagre savings. No one is going to lose that dignity of being, so to speak, independent.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I would say to you in respect to that there are various options available. The type of concept you have indicated will be one of the considerations within the study. I can't give you a commitment that that in fact is going to be where we are headed but certainly it will be a consideration during the course of the review. There are other possible modifications in respect to the subsidy system which you can give to the individual in the home and accordingly we will review that option.

**MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie):** — Mr. Minister, I would just like to move along in level 2 and level 3 care. I have a letter here and I think you have received one too. It's addressed to The Hon. Murray Koskie, Minister of Social Services, province of Saskatchewan.

Dear Sir:

My board of directors (I'll just back up; this is from the Wilkie and district Centennial Nursing Home) wish to express their disappointment at the small increase in subsidy to private paying level 2 and level 3 residents. Rentals at this home have increased more than \$100 per month in the two categories mentioned. And with the minimal increase in subsidy, our private paying residents will soon have another indignity thrust upon them — loss of ability to pay their own way.

I am taking the liberty to send a copy of this letter to the MLA for this constituency. Mr. James Garner, member of the Progressive Conservative Party. Yours truly, Mrs. Walby, Administrator.

Now, first of all, I have two or three questions on this, Mr. Minister. Have you replied to that? And what is the actual amount of subsidy being increased this year?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — The amount of the subsidy was \$464. It has been increased to \$497 per month for those receiving level 3 care. Level 2 was previously \$156 and that was increased to \$167. Did you ask any more?

**MR. GARNER:** — No, I didn't ask any more. O.K. So then just roughly we have about an \$11 increase in level 2 and \$25 or something in level 3. Mr. Minister, is that correct?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, if your figures are correct.

**MR. GARNER:** — I've given you a ball park figure. We hear the Premier of Saskatchewan talking about this great Saskatchewan of ours, so much wealth from all of these resources, yet what kind of an answer is this for the senior citizens of Saskatchewan?

This nursing home was built as a centennial project. These are the people who opened up this country, Mr. Minister. In boom times is this the government's direction — to get everyone in the province over 65 years of age living in level 2 or level 3 homes? Is it their direction to get them all on social aid and have them become members of the state?

What about their pride? You take their pride away. They're the people who opened up this country, Mr. Minister. I say to you and to the Premier opposite, shame; if you want to break them, put them on social aid. That's your goal. That little pittance increase — \$10 or \$11, and \$20 or \$30 on the other one — when their costs are going to go up

\$100; in one case it's about 10 per cent and in the other it's about 30 per cent. They have to foot the other 70 per cent on their own, and with inflation they don't have it left. The only thing they still have some of them, is their pride. And this government is trying to rob them of their pride. Would you like to answer that?

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I would like to say, in a general way, that we in Saskatchewan are very proud of the extensive programs we have for our senior citizens. I can, if the hon. member wishes, go through a fairly comprehensive list of outstanding programs which I think have increased the dignity of the way in which senior citizens have lived; the expansion of public housing; in 1978 the 25 per cent increase in SIP; in 1978 a further increase. We have set up various programs to assist them to live in their own community with the senior citizens' rebate. In an analysis of the total expenditure of this government on its senior citizens, the percentage of our expenditure is equivalent to or greater than the total percentage of the senior citizens in the province.

I want to say as clearly as I can that you have to remember that by increasing the subsidy as we have, I don't think you can turn and say, well, gee that's terrible. In case they can't pay for it they have to go on welfare. Because the money coming to pay their keep in an institution is revenue from the consolidated fund. When it is in the form of social assistance, I suppose some people in society look at it with some kind of a stigma, the essential thing to remember is that no one (until we have the program restructured) will be denied the right to receive the care he needs.

That is, within the budgetary review, the priority we have given to this individual item. We are as I indicated, wanting to restructure it. We don't want to go on too much of a piecemeal basis. We have given some interim assistance and within the budget as indicated there are additional funds for subsequent benefits to the senior citizens.

**MR. GARNER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I can understand when you say they are not going to be denied care. That's fine. What I am saying is going to happen to these individuals is their pride is going to be taken away. No one likes to have to go to apply for social services. No one does! An elderly couple, or an elderly individual, who worked hard all their lives and put so much saving away for their golden years, so that they don't have to go on social assistance . . . It isn't us. It's your government that says the boom times are here in Saskatchewan. The potash mines are turning out millions of dollars. Where are those dollars for the senior citizens so they can retain their pride? That's my question to you, Mr. Minister. It's not about whether they are going to have a place to go. It's how can they pay for the place they are staying in? It's your government that is saying boom times, new deal for the people. This isn't a new deal for the senior citizens that I have to go back to Wilkie and say no, there's no more coming, when you run out of money to go social aid. You tell them, Mr. Minister. I don't want to. I don't want to take their pride away. You tell them.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, obviously it is very clear that to members opposite anyone who receives social assistance, there is a stigma attached to it. That's clearly what is coming across; anyone who receives social assistance, there is some kind of stigma attached. And that's what you are saying. I want to say that we in this party do not attach a stigma to someone who needs and receives social assistance. Accordingly I say and I repeat that we are prepared to guarantee that no individual will be denied full coverage and care in a special-care home.

**MR. SWAN:** — I would like to continue with the same question which Mr. Garner was raising. You point your finger across here and say there's a stigma on anybody

receiving social assistance, that's not the case. But when the senior citizens have to reduce their own net value down to \$1,500 before they are eligible for assistance from you (at least total assistance), you do take away a lot of pride from the elderly. You know most of them have built up a small nest egg at the time they retired and their idea is that when they do they would like to have a little bit to leave to either children or grandchildren; you take that away completely.

On the other hand, if there happens to be a couple, a husband and a wife, you demand that they pay until they are down to a very limited amount of money (I believe it's \$2,500) and if they are going to avoid going down to that level, then you advise them that they must legally separate. You can't tell me that's not going to take away the dignity of people and don't tell me that you are not advising it. I can give you names of at least two people in Rosetown who were asked last year to go through that process. One of the couples had been married for 60 years, and your department recommended a separation. Don't tell me that doesn't hurt the pride of the people; it hurt it very much. The other one advised to separate was either a case of the husband and wife separating so that the wife could continue to receive care without the husband having to support her or it was the case of the farm going down the drain and the son, who is only 20 years old and wanting to farm, losing the right to farm. So your department is indeed taking away the dignity of people. I would like to see a change in that and a method of financing which will discontinue the practice of having people reduced right down to their last dollar before you will provide assistance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I don't think what the hon. member has expressed differs greatly from the direction in which we are looking. I want to say that in respect to the senior citizens that is precisely what I have indicated to you. But if you are going to change a system, certainly you have to put in a process for changing it. We have discussed this in the House previously and I think that the hon. member, I at least hope, will be more than satisfied with the outcome of the restructuring.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 p.m.