

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 16, 1981

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record a petition that was delivered to me yesterday from the village of Carievale, with 193 signatures on it. It is addressed to the NDP government:

How do you justify the 12.6 per cent increase of power rates on small business? We are writing to register complaints of concerned citizens in rural Saskatchewan. As a very worried group of small business owners, we feel we have to take a stand against the 12.6 per cent increase placed upon us.

Instead of encouraging the development of small independent businesses, as the government is supposedly encouraging, acts like this are contributing to the demise of rural Saskatchewan. Out of necessity, this increase is reflected to the consumers and we have their full support in presenting this paper to you.

A comparison can be made between the eastern attitude toward the insignificant West, and the Saskatchewan government's attitude toward small insignificant businesses in rural Saskatchewan. Are we in business to take the brunt of these major increases in the power industry? Why are we being penalized to create another \$20.1 million added to revenue when there is already a \$40 million profit being shown by Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The government is the owner, and because the democratic government is supposed to be the government of the people for the people, then we are all owners of Sask Power and where do we reap in the \$40 million profit?

Instead, we receive the dubious benefit of constant increases and, in particular, the unjustifiable increase slapped on small businesses. We feel that the government is behind all the major co-operative businesses and against the small businesses, and this power is our coffin. We are struggling to keep our doors open; the government is fighting to close them.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Could I interrupt the member for a moment? . . . (inaudible interjections)
. . .

I think we should probably review the proper order for members presenting petitions. Section 11 or the rules covers that. Section 11(1) says:

A petition to the Assembly may be presented by a Member at any time during the sitting of the Assembly by filing the same with the Clerk.

April 16, 1981

Subsection (7) says:

On the day following the presentation of a petition the Clerk shall report the same if it is irregular or contains a matter in breach of the privileges of the Assembly. If no such report be made the petition shall then be deemed to be permitted to be read and received.

Subsection (8) says:

No debate shall be permitted on the reception of a petition, but it may be read by the Clerk, if required; or if it complain of some personal grievance requiring an immediate remedy, the matter contained therein may be brought into immediate discussion.

So I would ask the member to follow the procedure which is laid down in the rules with regard to presentation of petitions and merely to present the petition today to the Clerk in accordance with the rules.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, of course I accept your ruling. I'm sure you understand that it is a matter of concern which was raised by these people, and I bring it before the legislature with that view. In order to present the petition to the Clerk, I wonder if I could ask leave of the House to revert to presenting petitions under routine orders?

MR. SPEAKER: — That's the section we are under now. The member may proceed to present the petition to the Clerk . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order, order! What's the point of order?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — The Hon. Leader of the Opposition presented this by prefacing it with the remark that this petition was directed to the Government of Saskatchewan, not the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan. He prefaced his remarks on that basis, and I understand from words uttered by you only moments ago that this has to be presented to the legislature, not to the Government of Saskatchewan, not to the power corporation, but to the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. BERNTSON: — I would just like to point out to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that when I had lunch with the people who delivered this petition to me yesterday, they made it very clear to me that they didn't understand fully the rules and regulations that govern this House.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Whether people who present petitions to members to present in the House understand the rules of the Assembly has absolutely nothing to do with what is going on here today. It's whether the members here understand the rules with regard to presenting petitions that's important.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Obviously, the Minister of Labor doesn't.

MR. SPEAKER: — I wanted to comment on the Minister of Labor, and I'm glad the member for Qu'Appelle drew it to my attention that the Minister of Labor had been on his feet on this point of order. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Labor raised the point of order with regard to this petition, and I will say that one of the reasons I interrupted the presentation of the petition was the very reason the member raised: the petition was

directed, in the beginning of the petition, to the government and not to the Legislative Assembly. Therefore, I want time to follow the usual procedure for the presentation of petitions. I think that although the point of order was unnecessary at this time, it was in order.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I recognize the Leader of the Opposition. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition has some directions if he would get on his feet.

MR. LANE: — I wish to speak to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! There is no opportunity to speak to a point of order. I want to know if the Leader of the Opposition has completed the presentation of his petition to the Clerk?

MR. BERNTSON: — Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. LANE: — A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I think there should be some clarification as to the precision with which the English language is used by the people of Saskatchewan, and the fact that they may not be as precise . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. ALLEN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of myself and the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone, the Premier (who unfortunately is in Ottawa today and won't be able to meet with the students), it's my pleasure to introduce 25 students from Wascana School in the Regina Rosemont constituency. They are accompanied by Jim Dumalski and Mrs. Pugh. I'm sure that all members of the Assembly will want to join with me in welcoming these students to the legislature, and we hope that their stay here is informative and interesting. I look forward to meeting with them in a little while.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you to the Saskatchewan a most welcome guest to our province, Sir John Ford, who is seated in the Speaker's gallery. Sir John is the retiring British high commissioner to Canada. He is on his final official tour of Canada and his farewell visit to Saskatchewan. He is accompanied by Mr. Stephen Day, the British consul general in Edmonton. Sir John has most ably served the interests of his homeland and his assigned land as high commissioner. He has a distinguished diplomatic record, having represented his country in Budapest, San Francisco, Rome, Jakarta and in Ottawa. The ties between Britain and Saskatchewan are strong, and the diplomatic links are an important aspect of these ties. As high commissioner, Sir John has visited our province many times. He

April 16, 1981

has greatly impressed us with his strong personal knowledge of our province and its people.

I would also like to inform the Assembly that last evening the province hosted a banquet for the high commissioner and presented him with a water-color painting depicting a Saskatchewan scene, as a token of our province's appreciation of Sir John's services. Would you please now join me in a warm Saskatchewan welcome to Sir John Ford and to Mr. Stephen Day.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join with the Minister of Finance in expressing best wishes from this side of the House. I think it's a matter of record and is perceived by all Canadians, that, while you were in Canada, you performed your task very well. That is certainly appreciated by all Canadians. I do sincerely hope that question period today is lively enough that it will cause you to fondly remember Saskatchewan from time to time. We look forward to your visits back to Canada and Saskatchewan at some future date. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. LANE: — I'd like to join with the member for Regina Rosemont in welcoming the students from the Wascana School.

I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to introduce to the Assembly some guests from Ranch Ehrlo. This is the second (if I can use the phrase) contingent this year. We always welcome the guests from Ranch Ehrlo. I'm very pleased to see the interest taken. They are 10 in number, including Mr. Ross Wilkinson who is accompanying them. Their ages are 15 and 16. I will have the pleasure of meeting with them after question period. I hope they find question period interesting and informative.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today, on behalf of the member for Thunder Creek who is unable to be here, to introduce to you and to the other members of the Assembly a group of students seated in the East gallery. They are grade 5 students, 13 in number. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Debbie Quinlan, who, incidentally, is a daughter of Marj Jermyn, who is a well-known and respected individual by members of this side of the House. They are also accompanied by parents Della Anderson, Roy Hunt and Eva Deneve. It's going to be my pleasure to meet with them in the rotunda for pictures, and later on for some refreshments in the members' dining room. So I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Saskatchewan, and I wish them a good day.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SGI Reinsurance Losses

MR. LANE: — I wonder if the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government

Insurance) would have had a chance to reconsider the losses incurred on reinsurance. Were all the losses resulting from a reinsurance contract treaty, or arrangement, with a U.S. consortium known as Home/AFIA?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I would have to check. I would not know whether all of the losses were with that consortium.

MR. LANE: — Would any of them be with that consortium?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I have been informed, Mr. Speaker, that some of them are, yes.

MR. LANE: — On your investigation that you indicated the other day in this Assembly your officials undertook — the management undertook — are you able to give us an estimate as to the percentage of those claims or total volume of losses that were in fact with Home/AFIA?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, Mr. Speaker, I am not at the present time able to give a percentage.

MR. LANE: — Would you be prepared to?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I will check with the officials and see if it can be given.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for SGI. Mr. Minister, we have repeatedly asked you what gave rise to the losses incurred by SGI as a result of your reinsurance contract. Now, I am going to ask you again. In the quarterly report received by you from RMC (Reinsurance Management Company), did RMC indicate the reasons for the losses that they reported to you? I'll start back with the period of August 1979.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I did not receive a quarterly report with respect to the reinsurance. It was given to the management of SGI, and they reported the problems that were arising with respect to the contract to the board.

MR. LANE: — New question to the minister responsible for SGI. Would the minister please tell this Assembly what your understanding of the concept of ministerial responsibility is, and are you now prepared to answer for the actions of SGI, or not?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I have no comment on that one.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Maybe I'll just clear one point of order here. A written or oral question must not ask solution to a legal proposition such as the interpretation of a statute, or of a minister's own powers. I think as long as the question is not dealing with what the interpretation of the minister's powers are, it would be in order. And I just issue that at this point.

MR. LANE: — I'm going to ask you again. Concept of ministerial responsibility — are you prepared to answer to this Assembly for the actions of SGI and its management?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I have been doing so, and will also be available to the members in the Crown corporations committee.

April 16, 1981

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you indicated that the management had received the report from RMC. Presumably these reports were presented to you and to the board, and you have read them. Again, I would like to ask you this question and clear it. Was there any indication in that report of the nature of the losses incurred, starting with that report of August 1979?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I've informed the Assembly before that RMC had reported to the management of SGI, and SGI management had reported to the board that they had problems with the contract. I did not see any quarterly reports in terms of a breakdown with respect to the losses of reinsurance, and neither did any other member of the board.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you indicated that the reports were received by SGI. I would ask you this: will you table in this Assembly the reports received by SGI from RMC for every quarter since August 1979 to date?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Minister, no, I will not. I told the Assembly the other day that I was tabling the joint statement related to the court action. That has been tabled and that is all that is going to be tabled.

MR. LANE: — Did the minister ask the management of SGI, given the significant losses, for those quarterly reports and subsequently where those losses arose?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, I did not and I do not intend to do so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LANE: — Does the minister not believe that he has an obligation to the people of Saskatchewan to inquire into the reasons for the losses, given the significant amount of the losses, which will be paid by the people of this province?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, obviously the losses occurred because of unfavorable risks. When risks are written by insurance companies and by reinsurers, they have no way of knowing whether those will turn out to be favorable or unfavorable risks. Therefore, that's the only comment I wish to make with respect to it.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, two questions arose. First of all, you gave a blank cheque to RMC (Reinsurance Management Company) to write, so you really abrogated your right to inquire. Subsequently you have admitted in this Assembly, on April 13, 1981, that SGI investigated those losses, that it asked for additional information from RMC, and that it decided "to conduct their own investigations with respect to the losses" (those are your own exact words). Now the question to you, again, is: why did you not ask SGI management for the results of those investigations and those quarterly reports when you had significant losses?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the board was made aware that the losses were unfavorable. We received that report from the management of SGI, and that's all we require to know with respect to that particular contract. We set board policy; we do not manage the organization. That should be obvious to the members opposite.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I would ask you this. When the losses which were incurred in the particular report to which I am going to refer — the August report of 1979 from RMC — was there any indication of losses as a result of insuring classes of insurance that were not covered under chapter 3 of The Saskatchewan Government

Insurance Act, the act which existed in 1975?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the agreement authorized RMC to write all classes of reinsurance. There were no restricted classes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The question I asked you, Mr. Minister, was: were the resulting losses, those losses incurred as a result of whatever particular class of insurance was insured at the time, covered in this act, or were they outside of the clauses or restrictions of this act?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I would not know the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. I will have to get it for the member.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I want to ask you this question, Mr. Minister. It seems as though asking you questions about SGI is like pulling teeth — today, or anytime for that matter. I ask you this question which I put to you directly: did SGI, through their reinsurance program, carry insurance on computer leases anywhere in the world?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know the answer to that question. I would have to check to get it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, wasn't it reported in the quarterly report of 1975 that those losses were as a result of insurance of computer leases, a report which you received in 1979 and subsequently every quarter since that date?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I have not received any quarterly report giving me any information with regard to computer lease losses.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You indicated a while ago that the reports were received by SGI management and they then were turned over to you and the board. Obviously you have seen them; obviously you know what was in them. I ask you again . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member for Regina South is debating with the minister whether he has seen them or not. The member is saying, "And, I ask you again." I repeat, the rules are quite clear that a member must not repeat in substance a question already asked, to which an answer has been refused.

MR. LANE: — Did you ask for the specifics of the losses and the reasons for the losses?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, I did not and I do not intend to do so.

MR. LANE: — Then how do you know it's a bad contract?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Because I have confidence in the management of SGI.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I'll ask you this question: did the SGI management report to you and to the board the reasons for those losses in 1979 and ever since . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will just take this opportunity to intervene and tell the member for Regina South that the member for Qu'Appelle has just asked about the specifics of the losses with regard to the question we are discussing. I find that the member is contravening a rule which I have brought to his attention continually over the last two or three days, that an oral or written question must not multiply with slight

April 16, 1981

variation a similar question on the same point. Now, the member should be aware of that rule, and we're getting the same questions over and over again. If the members have new questions, I'll be glad to accept them.

MR. LANE: — If you were told by the management of SGI that it was a bad contract, why did you not ask them why?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I'm aware of the fact it was because there were heavy losses in terms of reinsurance.

MR. LANE: — You feel, Mr. Minister, that you had no obligation to pursue it further. Is that correct?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the board I have a responsibility in relation to the policy of SGI, and I do not have responsibility with regard to the management and the direction of management in SGI.

MR. LANE: — Do you not have a responsibility to answer to the people of Saskatchewan for the operations of SGI?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Yes, obviously I do.

MR. LANE: — Then why are you not doing so?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I am.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I'll take a new question.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, are you telling us that even though you knew it was a bad contract that SGI was losing money, (you as minister responsible) did not ask any questions to find out what the losses were, why they were occurring and in what areas? Did you not, as chief executive officer, ask any questions? Is that what you're telling us?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying we had the information with respect to the reinsurance contract. The members say it was a bad contract, and as it turned out it has been a bad contract. If that question had been asked in 1978, everybody would say it was a good contract. We had made \$2.5 million by that time on that contract. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask for the detail and I do not intend to ask for the detail.

MR. LANE: — I ask the minister if insurance leases were, in fact, insured — computer leases — that, in fact, the losses to Lloyds of London will be in the range of \$200 million to \$600 million? What is your obligation under those computer lease insurance losses?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I suspect the information, given by the member for Qu'Appelle is as accurate as the information we got previously. They told us that the settlement out of court was for \$4 million. It was for 140,000 pounds. A pound would have to be worth 26 Canadian dollars to work out to \$4 million. The fact of the matter is the member is making pure speculative assumptions.

For example, SGI is an insurer in the province of Saskatchewan, and when it takes on risks it is not going to obviously suffer losses on all those risks. We have 140,000

houses in this province insured at over \$7 billion; we're not going to lose all that, obviously. But you take risk in insurance. That's what it is all about.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I ask you if you have read a report by a law court correspondent from the high court of England, stating that SGI incurred losses in the quarterly report (and I'm referring to 1979) from RMC of \$6 million? Do you concur with that figure?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — First of all, I haven't seen the report that says that and, secondly, I do not concur with the figure, because how would I know?

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I have a confidential report from the World Insurance Report put out by *Financial Times* of London. It's a very limited circulation report to those involved in the insurance industry. The date is February 27 (and I gather by the minister looking through, that he has been fully aware of this), and it indicates that the quarterly report showed \$6 million losses. Would the minister now be prepared to table the quarterly statements sent by RMC to SGI?

I further add, as a supplementary to that, Mr. Minister, the fact of your admissions (and we got them again yesterday) that there were subsequent losses for the next quarter and throughout 1980. Would you table that information?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — There's lots of misinformation going about this Assembly at the moment. I read a report where they say that there were \$4 million losses in the first quarter of 1979. The losses totalled \$4,058,000 to the end of December 1980. The contract was cut off in November, in terms of accepting new risks — the end of 1980, not the second quarter of 1979.

I also point out again to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that that contract had clearly made \$1.4 million up to the end of 1978, that there were investment earnings as well, which we can't break out completely, but probably run in the range of \$1 million, before the losses occurred. It was a good contract to the end of '78 and was making a good deal of money. It turned sour; it turned bad on us, and we got out of it. We terminated it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The answer is there, if the member would listen.

MR. LANE: — You keep telling us that it turned bad, but you won't give us the reasons. If you have a bad contract and you've lost millions of dollars, are you telling this Assembly that you, as minister, had no responsibility whatsoever to check into the source of those losses and to report to this Assembly with the quarterly reports and the full statement as to the losses?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, SGI, since it began operations, has made \$14,499,737 clear net earnings, and that includes those losses. In addition I should point out that the \$4 million loss includes the settlement, which was around \$364,000.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I take it then that you refute the \$6 million report from the high court of England. I would ask that as a question, first of all. Do you refute the \$6 million loss in that quarterly report?

Secondly, would you answer me as to why last year you changed your act to cover now all classes of insurance, whereas before you specified the classes of insurance that you were authorized to reinsure under?

April 16, 1981

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — If I got the member's question correctly with regard to the initial loss . . . What was that first one?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — \$6 million.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I assume that he is referring to the \$4 million loss, which we have admitted. We've reserved for an additional possible \$1.5 million loss which may never materialize. No one knows whether it will or not. That's the nature of the insurance in the reinsurance industries. All of the reserves have been set up in relation to those contracts in the accounts, and they are properly audited.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, since these reports have come out of the high court of London and have been reported in several insurance newspapers and magazines throughout the world, and since we are aware of the \$200 million to \$600 million in losses throughout the world, and since we are aware of the \$200 million to \$600 million in losses through the computer leasing program (and you are part of it), and because the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know what is really going on, will you table those quarterly reports, or is there a reason . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I'm not particularly concerned about how the member phrases his question as long as it is in order. He can ask for anything he wants — to have it tabled — and I'm not particularly concerned what the answer is. But the rules are quite clear that a written or oral question must not multiply with slight variation a similar question on the same point. I have jotted down here — table quarterly reports. This has been asked for at least twice prior by the member for Regina South. So, I declare your question out of order.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Will the minister advise this Assembly why he will not reveal what the amounts and losses are, and the contents of the reports?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I have already reported on the losses, Mr. Speaker. It's not my difficulty if the member can't understand it.

MR. LANE: — Why would the minister of SGI change a 20-some year act which specifically listed the classes of insurance which SGI could issue or cover; then last year, interestingly enough after the losses of RMC, he brought in a new act which withdraws all those limitations and allows SGI (at that time) to issue any type of insurance or reinsurance contract without limitation? What caused the minister to withdraw and take away a 20-year or 25-year limitation clause?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I have no comment on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LANE: — We have no further questions at this time.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 70 — An Act to amend The Education Act

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Education Act.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Tobacco Tax Act.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

Point of Privilege

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day, I have a statement. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle, yesterday, raised a point of privilege to the effect that a reply to an oral question was misleading. I want to take this opportunity to stress to all members, as I have done on numerous previous occasions, that the protection of the privileges of the members of the Assembly is paramount. To raise a point of privilege is a very serious matter and should not be taken lightly. Actual point of privilege arise very rarely and pertain to instances where the rights and privileges of members have possibly been infringed.

This, of course, is not the first time that I have been asked to rule on whether an answer to an oral question was sufficient. As I have ruled before, the point is a dispute over fact which should lead to debate. It is the role of the members to debate issues. It is not the role of the Chair to decide whether an oral question is based on fact or if the answer to the question was misleading. These are matters for the House to consider. If the member feels that the answer to a question is vague or not sufficient, the opportunity exists for the member to ask a supplementary question or new question on subsequent days. However, members should not involve the Chair in disputes over facts.

I advise all members that continued and repetitious raising of points of privilege where none exist demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the rules of parliamentary procedure or, on the other hand, an abuse of the spirit of proper parliamentary procedure. I, therefore, request that the greatest care and deliberation be exercised before raising a point of privilege.

I have reviewed the point raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and find that no prima facie case for privilege exists. I refer all hon. members to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, page 12, section 19(1) and page 114, section 322, and to the ruling of this Chair on April 2, 1981.

MOTION

Member's Withdrawal from Committee

MR. ANDREW: — With leave of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the member for Wilkie, the following motion:

That the name of Mr. Andrew be removed from the list comprising the committee on public accounts and printing.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

SOCIAL SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 36

Item 1 (continued)

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think yesterday the Minister of Social Services took notice of a question. I'd like his answer.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Vice-Chairman, I took notice of a question from the member for Regina South yesterday when we left off. It was about whether or not we had offered retroactive pay to some of the workers in the correctional camps. We have offered retroactively a camp differential increase, because it's our opinion in the department that probably since 1979 the camp differential has not been enough, and we are, therefore, offering back-pay in those terms. He is saying that it's 10 per cent of what's owing them. I don't know where he gets that number. What we are saying is that we are ready and willing to increase the camp differential pay — not only increase it in the future but retroactive a certain period of time.

Before I take my seat there were a couple of things that were asked for yesterday by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and by Herb Swan, and I'll send those across.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The retroactive amount that you offered them amounted to about 10 per cent of what they feel is owing to them. Is that not correct?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Ten per cent of what they feel is owing to them, I suppose, is correct. It's our opinion that overtime, certainly before July 1980, cannot apply for the reason that at that time they were considered to be field employees. The question of whether or not overtime is appropriate after July 1980 is the question which the dispute evolves around, and which we anticipate will be sorted out, not here, but at the negotiating table in the very near future.

MR. HARDY: — Well, Mr. Minister, one question to you. When did you decide that these were field workers or employees?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The workers were by definition, and by agreement, field employees until the agreement of July 1980.

MR. HARDY: — You say they were field employees until July 1980. Who decided they were field workers prior to that?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, it's the opinion that they were field employees, by definition of the agreement with SGEA, until July 1980. The documentation stated that after that time they were regulated employees, which is where the argument occurs. Whether or not overtime is due after July 1980 is the question that we're dealing with but not before that because at that time they were considered to be field employees.

MR. HARDY: — Well, could you tell me under what agreement (could you table that agreement) they were field employees prior to July 1980?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, I can table the documents relative to this issue and also a written response to that.

MR. HARDY: — Am I to understand that you have a written agreement with the SGEA employees that they were field workers?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — We have a document which interprets, until July 1980, an agreement with the employees. It is interpreted that they are in fact field employees. Those documents we will table.

MR. HARDY: — You tell me that you interpret them. Was it actually agreed to by these employees in a signed agreement?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — It is not an agreement signed by the employees. The fact is the acceptance of the camp differential shows the agreement with the department. There is also the indication that we feel they were in fact field employees until July of 1980. After that time is when the question occurs of whether or not they are entitled to overtime. It is that point which is being negotiated. A settlement is being looked for at the present time.

MR. HARDY: — Are you telling me that up to July 1980 that your department considered them to be field employees; after July 1980, you considered them correction workers 1 or 2? If they fall into the category of correction worker 1, they are entitled to the overtime under the SGEA agreement. Am I not correct?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, as of June 1980 we do have a letter of agreement between the public service and the SGEA saying that we would carry on in the same vein until an agreement was reached. That agreement which we are talking about is coming about through the negotiation process going on at the present time. I think it is fair to say that the historical precedent which was set before June 1980 has been agreed to by the two parties, in the interim, until a new agreement is reached.

MR. HARDY: — If the letter of agreement which I believe you are referring to is saying "a reasonable length of time," am I to assume that from July 1980 to the middle of April

April 16, 1981

1981 is, in your mind, a reasonable length of time? Or do you feel it has extended much beyond a reasonable length of time?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think we can question what a reasonable length of time is. What we have to decide now, and what we are doing right now is getting the negotiating process going, and we are finally attempting to reach a conclusion. I think that to argue the point, with your saying it is not a reasonable length of time and my saying it is, is pointless. I think what we are really debating here and what we are attempting to do is to come to some logical conclusion in the matter at hand.

MR. HARDY: — I would like to go back to the statement I made a few minutes ago — if a person were a correction worker 1 (as you defined it) as of July 1980, are you not in fact saying that they are entitled to overtime effective from July 1980 under The Labor Standards Act?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think that is the very crux of the matter which is being negotiated — the definition of whether or not overtime will apply. I think for you and I to attempt to decide that here is fruitless, because as you well know, employees in Saskatchewan, whether they work for a department or an industry, have certain rights to negotiate. We believe very strongly in that process and we think that the conclusion will not be reached here, but will be reached through negotiations around the bargaining table.

MR. HARDY: — I suppose we can talk about this for ages, but when did you start negotiations on these problems? I think you have been aware of them since as far back as 1977 or 1978, when I think you received a letter from the White Gull camp requesting that they be paid overtime. I wonder when your department started to look into this, and when it started negotiating to have the problem settled?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed that between July 1980 and January 1981, many attempts were made to negotiate, and I don't think it is proper for me to say whether the department is to blame or whether the other side is to blame for the fact that the negotiations didn't take place.

The first official meeting took place in January 1981 on this matter and, as of today, we are at the point where negotiations, hopefully, are taking place and we will be reaching a conclusion on the matter.

MR. HARDY: — All right. I would just like you to clarify where negotiations stand at the present time, and if you are endeavoring to get these employees back to work. I understand that there are five camps where they are off the job now (maybe even six) — that's approximately 30 employees. I understand that there are up to 29 inmates in one camp with only one manager to look after them.

I wonder where your negotiations stand now, and what you are prepared to do to get these people back to the table and solve this thing?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The negotiations broke off on Monday night at about 10 p.m. The conciliator is at hand and is available to assist.

I would just like to comment as well that it's an interesting turnaround, the attitude being taken by the members opposite. I think the people of Saskatchewan will not be fooled by this. I think you only need look at Great Britain, where you have a Conservative

government, to see where the real sympathy would lie if a Conservative government were in the position of working with this process at the present time.

MR. HARDY: — Well, I didn't really anticipate that you would answer my question in that way. In my area I have supported labor extensively, so I think I fit well into supporting it now. I feel that I'm justified in asking these questions on behalf of them, seeing that no members on the other side wish to do so. A lot of those camps are in those members' constituencies. I would have assumed that they had looked into this prior to my coming into this Assembly.

I'd like to get back to one of the questions here. I understand that on a radio report this morning, a Mr. Boyd(?) said that these employees are making about \$29,000 a year now, and are asking for \$44,000 a year. I think the true statement would be that they're making about \$22,000 a year, and are probably asking for \$29,000 a year. Is that your department's stand? Do you feel these employees are making \$29,000 a year and they're asking for \$44,000 a year?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Could you repeat the last part?

MR. HARDY: — I'll just repeat that. Do you feel that these employees working in these correctional camps are actually making \$29,000 a year, and that they are asking for \$44,000 a year?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — At the present time, a correction worker in a camp is making approximately \$24,000. As for saying what we're offering at the present time and what is being asked for by the other side. I don't think that this is the proper place. The other point is that the Department of Social Services is not negotiating directly. The public service commission is doing the negotiating. I think it's unfair for the members opposite to ask for details of the negotiating process in this forum. As I mentioned, our government believes very firmly in the negotiations taking place at the bargaining table.

MR. HARDY: — I understand that the Minister of Labor said that your books were being audited in regard to the employees' overtime. It is my understanding that these employees do not submit the overtime sheets. All they submit is the days they worked. I just wonder what audit is really going on with these books to decide what overtime they worked.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I don't have the details on the audit which is taking place. I think that question would be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Labor. It's my understanding that the process which is going on involves an audit of the time sheets. That's as much as I know about it. I think, probably, that question would be better directed to the Minister of Labor.

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, you said "an audit of the time sheets." Do your time sheets show the actual hours which these employees worked?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The time sheets, I'm informed, state the number of days worked as well as the number of times the camp differential is paid.

MR. HARDY: — You said they show the number of days worked and also the times. Do they show the actual hours which these employees work in camp?

April 16, 1981

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — What the time sheets show is the number of days. I'm quite sure that they don't show the number of hours. We can check on that. What we pay is 10 hours a day plus a camp differential of \$20, at the present time.

MR. HARDY: — I'm given to understand that, if these employees start at 6 a.m. and stay until 10, 11 or midnight, after the 10 hours you give them \$20 for all the other hours worked while they are there. Is that right?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — They get paid for the 10 hours, as I mentioned earlier, plus a \$20 differential which covers the time they spend in camp. Part of it is spent sleeping, eating meals and that sort of thing. Before July 1980, it was done through a long-time understanding that this was the way the whole process worked. As I have mentioned, time and time again, the point of dispute at the present time is from July 1 until the present time whether or not overtime will apply. That's what will be negotiated when they go back to the bargaining table.

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, are these employees required to stay overnight, and required to stay in excess of 10 hours?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, that is what the differential is paid for. We have also stated that we feel that the differential has not been high enough, probably since 1979. We are also saying that it's not high enough at the present time and should be increased. The fact is that before July 1980 that was part of the agreement; we have a letter of agreement that would continue on until a new agreement is reached, and that's what we're negotiating at the present time.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, am I correct that you just said that it is a requirement that they stay on the site?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, that's correct.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if it is a requirement, then it is also a requirement for you to pay them and therefore you're committed to the overtime. you can't weasel out with \$28 or whatever. I tell you (and the Minister of Labor may dig it up for you if his department ever gets organized) the Turner case in Saskatoon went back 10 years. A guy was allowed to sleep — he wasn't even required to stay awake — but because he was sitting in a little room over on the side sleeping, and he was allowed to be disturbed to fix things, they had to pay him for 10 years of overtime for 4 hours a day. You're saying that your specific case is different? I'm saying that the Turner case is a prime example and that you owe those men the money. Let's pay it and stop playing games.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member for Rosthern is attempting to get involved in negotiations which are taking place. I really don't think it's his job or my job to decide whether or not overtime will apply. In the long-term best interest of negotiations, I think it will be decided at the bargaining table. I will also mention that, if it's decided that the money is owing, the department will pay it. But I think that to negotiate or to attempt to bargain, with you for one side and me for another — that is not the way the process takes place, and I'm not going to be drawn into it, because it is a very unfortunate way to attempt to come to a conclusion in a labor-management dispute.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, that's hogwash. If you owe them money — and there are labor standard cases to prove you owe them money — then what are you trying to

do? You're trying to bail yourself out by trying to go back to the table. The fact is that you owe them money if you required them to stay there. You said yourself that you required them to stay there; that means the money is owed. There are labor standard regulations which have proved that in the past; why aren't you paying? What you're trying to do is negotiate yourself out of a bill and trying to lower the bill. Why don't you admit that?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the past and before July of 1980, staying on duty for more than 10 hours of work was covered by camp differential, which everyone agreed with. Since that time we have a letter of agreement which says we will continue on until an agreement is reached. That agreement is what is being negotiated. There's no point in carrying on in this roundabout way as to whether it should or shouldn't be done. It is not going to be decided here. It will be decided at the negotiation table, and when it's decided we will act on it, either way.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, the law says that you have to pay it. You're not trying to negotiate yourself out of it; that's what you're saying.

Mr. Minister, the facts are that no member of no union can sign away rights for worse than what legislation gives them. So what you're saying is that they've signed for \$28 where legislation says they have to be paid for all the hours. Legislation says you cannot sign away their rights for less, only for better. Check it; it's there. You cannot sign away your rights for something less than what is in legislation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, Mr. Minister of Labor, if you want to get up on your two-by-four, get up and swing.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I'm somewhat reluctant to become involved, but when the hon. member says that somehow or another workers are not capable or not authorized to agree to a set of circumstances somewhat different than is provided for in The Labor Standards Act, then, obviously, he doesn't know what he is talking about. There are a great number of circumstances where either the union, on behalf of the employees in question, or the employees themselves, by a majority vote, have the opportunity to determine that they may work in excess of eight hours in any given day, which is the rule, which is the law under labor standards. They may agree, if they wish, to work now as much as 12 hours per day, to work a three-day week or to provide, for example, four 10-hour days making up their 40-hour week by that process. Thus, they give away or sacrifice some rights conferred upon them by The Labor Standards Act. He's nodding his head and I can hear it from here. But, you know, that's in direct contradiction to what you're saying when you're on your feet.

I only rise on that one single point to correct you, because employees do have the right, with agreement, to agree to circumstances and conditions to work if they like, under these circumstances I gather, something like eight days in, six days out, because of an agreed-to arrangement. Don't say that they don't have the right to make those arrangements, because you will know of all kinds of circumstances where this has been agreed to, where there have been fly-in and fly-out arrangements, where there have been arrangements where workers have agreed willingly to extend hours of work much beyond what is required by The Labor Standards Act. I haven't always agreed with those circumstances but, nevertheless, we sort of regard employees to be masters of their own destinies. If they wish to work hours in excess of that, then we agree to that. We sort of turned our back and closed our eyes to it a little bit.

So don't try to ride . . . The hon. member's feet get a long way apart in some of his arguments. I hear him now (with people in the gallery) mounting a giant defence for the

April 16, 1981

workers of this province and I find that (in a very major way) out of character with what I have heard from these people on a continuing basis.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister of Labor and Mr. Minister of Social Services, the Centax court case indicates that a person cannot give away what is in legislation, unless he is getting something which, in his opinion, is better. That is a court case: that is a document. That's where the Department of Labor tried to force something and the workers said: "No, we have signed it. We're getting a better deal than what legislation requires."

What you are now trying to say is that you are actually giving the worker a poorer thing than what legislation requires. Now you are going back to the table and saying: "Guys, we want to only pay a little bit of what we owe you, even though legislation says we owe you all that amount." That's what we're into. Are you different from anybody else in relation to labor standards? That's what you're trying to do. Because you're a government body you think you can get away with a different set of rules than others in this province have to live with.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — I want to tell the hon. member this right now. The government, as an employer, is going to be treated no differently than Ipsco (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) or Stelco or any other employer in the province of Saskatchewan. If paid, and we'll see to it that that is done. The determination will be made by the labor standards officers in determining where the costs rest. There may be some difficulty. I anticipate, in a judgment as to when employees were field workers and what point in time they were perhaps not field workers. That will not be a judgment, I expect, that can be made perhaps short of an arbitration process.

But, nevertheless, don't ever get the idea that the government is going to treat itself any differently in terms of the application of labor standards than other employers. Now, if you are saying that, then you are dealing with the truth loosely.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, do you have a signed averaging order or anything like that type of agreement by the Minister of Labor for those individuals?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Up until July 1, 1980, averaging orders were required and were in place. Since then, they are not.

MR. KATZMAN: — You don't have averaging orders now. Is that what you are saying?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — No, we do not at the present time.

MR. KATZMAN: — What did your averaging order prior to this time say? Was it 160 hours in a month, in four weeks? What kind was it?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — We do not have the averaging order file here at the present time. We can get it for you and get you the answer.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, what type was it? Was it a weekly averaging order? Was it a 80-hour averaging order? Was it 160? What kind of averaging order did you say you have?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think we will back up one step here. The averaging

orders which are involved in the department did not apply to the people in question, who were designated as field employees, even prior to July 1980.

AN HON. MEMBER: — One more time.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The averaging orders about which you are asking, which apply to many areas in the department, did not apply to the field employees (those people we are concerned about at the present time) even prior to July 1980.

MR. KATZMAN: — A minute ago you said they had averaging orders. Now you are saying that you didn't have averaging orders and you don't have averaging orders presently and presently they are not field employees.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — We don't have it at the present time, nor did we before when they were classified as field employees. It wasn't something which was required when a person was designated as field staff.

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, you said you don't have it now and you didn't have it before because they were classified as field employees. If they are not classified as field employees, why don't you have it now?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — As I mentioned at least four times, we are continuing to work under the old agreement, under a letter which was signed between the public service commission and SGEA, until a new agreement is arrived at which applies to all areas. I don't know how many times I am going to have to say that. The negotiations which are going on at the present time will bring a conclusion to this matter. It is not going to be settled here. We hope that in the very near future, negotiations will begin again (they broke off at 10 o'clock Monday night) and a conclusion will be arrived at.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary, just from that one point. Are you suggesting that your officials are available at any time to get back in the meeting, if requested?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes. I am informed that the government staff is available for negotiations. Of course, you will know that the Department of Social Services is not doing the negotiations. Government staff is available. The conciliator, Sig Walter, is available as well.

MR. HARDY: — I presume that will be over the weekend too, will it?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, they are available now and will be available over the weekend, I am informed.

MR. HARDY: — Who is directing these negotiations?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — PSC (public service commission) is conducting negotiations for the government.

MR. HARDY: — Are you helping them to establish these negotiations and whatever rate should come out of it?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, we give support during negotiations; we have people in the room during negotiations.

April 16, 1981

MR. HARDY: — You say you are assisting them. Do you not think that you should almost be directing the public service, because they are under your jurisdiction and your employees? How many of these employees are under suspension at the present time?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I am told that the department does not do bilateral negotiations. The public service commission does that job for us. As to how many employees are suspended or were suspended, there were four people suspended so far.

MR. HARDY: — Are they still suspended?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — There is only one who is suspended at the present time, because of holidays being involved. The other people are no longer suspended.

MR. HARDY: — Could you tell me why they are suspended?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I am informed they were suspended because they left their tour of duty before it was completed.

MR. HARDY: — You say they left the tour of duty before it was completed. Are you saying that they are required to stay in excess of 10 hours?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, as I have informed the member three times now, they are expected to stay beyond 10 hours because we are working on the principle that the existing agreement before July of 1980 is in existence until a new agreement is arrived at. There is a letter which exists between the public service commission and SGEA that states we will continue to work under the old rules until a new agreement is arrived at, through the present negotiations, which we anticipate will be completed in the near future.

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, you told me that they were required to stay in excess of 10 hours. Why were these employees not give that authorization in writing that they were required to stay in excess of 10 hours when they asked for it?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — They were required to complete their turn of duty in lieu of receiving the camp differential which, at the present time, is \$20. We have gone into a great deal of detail explaining how, since 1979, the camp differential possibly wasn't enough. Part of the negotiations at the present time include that we accept the fact that possibly the camp differential wasn't enough. It should be increased in a replacement for working and staying in camp beyond the 10 hours of duty.

MR. HARDY: — Would it be a fact, then, that if these employees stayed in excess of 10 hours, they would not be covered by compensation?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I am informed that if they stayed longer they would be covered by compensation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just one point. I understand that the employees are scheduled for so many hours a day of work. Is that correct? Then, they are on this \$20 (or whatever you want to call it) for the remainder of the day. How many hours are they required to be there working? How many hours are on the other period (whatever you call it)?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — They are paid for 10 hours a day for four days a week. The \$20 per day covers the rest of the time period.

MR. KATZMAN: — What is their schedule? I assume they are to get up at 6 a.m. and work 10 hours (some of them start at 8 a.m. and work 10 hours), and then they are required to be there the rest of the time. Is that the way it works?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I am informed that they supervise the inmates from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m.

MR. KATZMAN: — The schedule, every day, is 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., four days a week, and they stay on the nights in between. Am I correct?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, that is correct. Those are the scheduled hours of work. They are responsible, during the evening hours from 5 p.m. until the evening is over. That is what the camp differential has paid for. It covers those hours that they remain in camp.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, there is no way, in anybody's convoluted mind (even in the mind of the minister for Moose Jaw), that that can be considered a field employee. First, he is scheduled for 40 hours work. A field employee is not scheduled. He is on a total flex system. He is not scheduled. He normally can take time off when he wishes, and when it is busy he works more hours. That's a field employee. He's on a flex-type system. You just told us that this fellow works four days a week, 10 hours a day. Therefore, you have already scheduled his whole allotment. Then, you require him to stay there the additional time. He cannot be considered, in anybody's imagination, as a field employee, because he has his 40 hours a week scheduled.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, the member is saying that we are classifying them as field employees or we are attempting to. That's not accurate. As of July 1980 they are no longer classed as field employees. But at the same time he is attempting to say what the workers can negotiate on their own behalf and what they can't. What we are saying is that the negotiations won't go on here, and it's not up to him to be doing the negotiations for one side or the other. The logical place will be around a bargaining table, and that's where the conclusion will be reached. But as for the status of field employees, that was changed as of July 1980.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay. We are talking about two different times. Let's make it clear. As of July 1980 they are not field employees anymore; therefore, you owe them the overtime for all hours exceeding 10. They either have to be one way or the other. You can't have your cake, eat it too, and have somebody else pay for it at the same time.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — As the Minister of Labor already indicated, if the employees wished through their bargaining team to arrange something different, that's their option. I'm certain it isn't your place and I don't think it's my place to be telling them what is the best position for them to be in. If they agree to something different then they will agree to it, and I don't think it's up to us to tell them that's wrong or right. Nor is it your place to be telling them what they should be agreeing to or what they shouldn't be. The decision will be made at the bargaining table, without the advice from the member for Rosthern, and through the normal negotiation process.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, it is the duty of the members of the Legislative Assembly to make sure the laws of this province are followed. It is the members' duty,

both in government and opposition, to make sure that they are followed. No matter who it is that's breaking them, the government must do something about it and if the government isn't willing, then the opposition will get up and make you do your job. That's what we are talking about now.

Mr. Minister, you have said that as of July there are no more field employees; therefore, by the Centax court case, by the labor standards, they have to be paid. You can't take their money away. There's no argument, even from the Minister of Labor, when he spoke. If you want to talk about prior to July '80, it is another issue. That's when you are claiming they were field employees. I am saying to you, nobody can be considered a field employee when he is scheduled to work the full schedule, and must remain additional time because he does not get time off in lieu; a field employee may take a whole week off if he has nothing pressing. These fellows aren't allowed that. That is what a field employee is all about, except north of a certain line in Saskatchewan there is a little change in the rules. But anywhere south of that line, Mr. Minister, the rules say, that you can't be on flex, you can't be field. If you are a field worker you are on the flex system. The flex system says you try to make sure your hours work out to 37.5 over the period or the year, or whatever. But that's not what's happening with these guys.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, I think it's fair to say that the Minister of Labor has covered this area very well in saying that the legal rights of the workers will be decided, and they are checking into it. The negotiations will decide whether or not payment of overtime is due and we have agreed to that. What we are saying is that when that decision is made, the Department of Social Services will abide by it. Further than that, I don't think it is appropriate to comment or discuss the details of the negotiations which are going on, because I don't think that there is a great deal to be gained by going through that process.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, the Minister of Labor made comments which you and I both heard. The fact is that you are trying to have your cake, you are trying to eat it and get the guys out there in the correction institute to pay for it. You can be on flex and a field worker, but you cannot be scheduled the way you have scheduled these employees, and be a field worker. It is impossible. It is against all of the rights. It's against labor standards because you have scheduled them. You have admitted, Mr. Minister, that you scheduled them for 40 hours, and then you require them to stay extra. The Centax court case says you can't do that either.

Are you totally blind to the law Mr. Minister, or what are you trying to do here?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — As I have mentioned 10 times to the member opposite, it is not his place to make the decision which he is attempting to make here. We have a process in Saskatchewan (some of the best labor laws and regulations in the total domain of Canada), and when a decision is made by the appropriate body, we intend to abide by it. Further than that, we could go on for two hours talking about whether he is right or I am right. It's not our place to decide it. I won't be dragged into attempting to negotiate a bargaining deal between the two parties, because that's not our role. The Department of Labor will be making a decision on this and we will abide by it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, we are not talking about bargaining here. We are talking about rights. We are talking about the rights in The Labor Standards Act. We are talking about rights which a court decision has ruled on. Are you saying to this House that you are going to try (and as you have been trying from what you said earlier) to suggest that you will pay them a few dollars more for staying those extra hours, or the

nightly figure which you give them, rather than paying the overtime which they deserve and to which they are entitled by the laws of the province? You don't even want to follow your own laws. That's what you are saying to this House.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member for Rosthern, once again, says that the workers cannot decide whether or not they can enter into an agreement which is better. I would like to read in part section 72(1) of The Labor Standards Act, which says:

Nothing in this act, or in any order, or regulation made under this act, affects any provision in any act, agreement, or contract of service, or any custom, in so far as it ensures to any employee more favorable conditions, more favorable hours of work, or a more favorable rate of wages, than the condition, the hours of work, or the rate of wages provided for by this act or by such order or regulation.

It is fairly obvious that the decision isn't quite as simple as he lays out. If the employees, through negotiation, arrive at what they conceive to be (and I don't think it is his place to decide that) something which is better than what he is referring to, they can do it. That's why the negotiations are going on. It seems to be a bit difficult for him to understand The Labor Standards Act. If he would read this he would understand it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, that's what I have been saying to you for two hours (not quite, but an hour). They can't negotiate for less than the minimum, by legislation, and that's what you are trying to get them to do. Now get it waxed through that thick head. You can't go for less than the law allows. You can't pay a guy \$1 per hour wages, because the minimum wage is higher than that. That's what you are trying to do. Now follow the law yourself.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The question is what the employees are attempting to gain, or what they believe to be a better agreement. The member for Rosthern is making a decision as to what is better for them. I don't think that's our place, your place or mine, to decide what is in the best interest of the employees. Section 72 of The Labor Standards Act clearly indicates that the employees can make that decision, and I am sure that through the negotiation process they will avail themselves of that. If in fact it is decided that there is fault on either side, that will be what we abide by. But to attempt to negotiate the agreement, whether or not it is a better agreement, is not my place and I am certain it is not the place of the member for Rosthern.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, going back to a comment which you made a few minutes ago, you said they worked their 10 hours, then they went home; that's why you suspended them. Are you saying that they are forced to stay there, even though they've worked their 10 hours? Therefore you suspended them after they had worked their normal scheduled day and went home.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The tour of duty is considered at the present time, because of a letter which exists between the public service commission and the SGEA, to be four days. If they leave their tour of duty, under a letter which we have been going by since July 1, 1980, then they are considered to be leaving their position, for which they are accepting \$20 per day to fulfil, and that's where it's at.

MR. KATZMAN: — If they don't take the \$20, if they give you the \$20 back, then they don't have to stay there. Otherwise you're forcing slavery.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member asks whether or not they are forced to remain for their tour of duty. The way it works and the way it has worked prior to July 1980, and how we're working at the present time, in the interim, until a new agreement is reached, is that, in effect, the tour of duty is for the four days. They have an agreement and if they don't like the agreement, then they'll change it in the negotiation process. I think it's fair to say that in any agreement, where there is an agreement between the union and the public service commission, if they don't like it, then they have their ways of making their feelings known. I imagine that's what they are doing in the present round of negotiations.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, one question. They work their 10 hours; they are then paid an additional 20-some dollars to stay. If they refuse the \$20, then they don't have to stay. Mr. Minister, you're paying them \$20 to remain there the additional 14 hours but they can say, "We don't want that." Mr. Minister, what you're asking for is slavery. You are breaking every other law in the book.

MR. HARDY: — Just one more question, Mr. Minister. Does your department intend to shut these camps down and turn them into correctional centres? I understand that there was sort of an ultimatum given on May 4 that if it hadn't come to agreement prior to that, then you're going to turn them into correctional centres. I wonder if it isn't time now for your department to get back to the negotiating table and get this thing settled. I think we've hashed it over many times today. Let's get it settled; let's get the employees back to work. It's your responsibility as a minister responsible for these employees. Let's get them back to work; let's get to the negotiation table. I would like your answers.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, on that point we are very interested in getting back to the bargaining table. As I mentioned, the staff on the government side will be available over the weekend at all times, if negotiations were to get going. Even at the present moment, if we could possibly get back to the bargaining table, our position is that that's where we should be. To debate it longer in here, I don't think will gain a lot, because I don't think that we're the body which will make that decision in the long run.

So I think I agree with the member for Kelsey-Tisdale; the proper place to be negotiating this is around the bargaining table. Our people are available; the public service commission is available and we're ready to go back to the bargaining table.

MR. HARDY: — This is a follow-up question. I asked it, but maybe you didn't hear me. Is your department now prepared to remove the threat (or whatever it is) that it is going to turn these into correctional centres and in reality remove these people from their jobs or reduce their jobs? I just thought I would ask you again. Are you now prepared to remove this threat (if there has been a threat made) to get these people back to the negotiating table and get it settled?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — There is the option available of going to a 5-5-4 work week which would mean that the camp designation would no longer exist. That, of course, is an option. In long-term planning of the department it is something which we have been looking at, at all times. So I think it is fair to say that we aren't looking at closing down the camps. But it is an option of going to the 5-5-4 work week which has existed all along.

MR. McLEOD: — From your last answer, Mr. Minister, if you go to that option of 5-5-4 and designation as a correctional centre, would that not mean that inmates could be

sent there directly from the courts, rather than the process which they now go through, so that they are minor offenders and they are coming out through the other correctional centres? Would that not change the whole aspect of the types of inmates who are in these centres?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes. I am informed that the courts do not decide which one they go to. It is under our jurisdiction, our department, to decide which they would go to. So that will not change as a result if we were to go to the 5-5-4 work week.

MR. McLEOD: — So a designation as a correctional centre would not change in any way the type of inmate who would go there (the offenders which would be sentenced to this). In no way would that be changed. My concern is, of course, within those provincial parks and so on. I had a concern about it when it was first established in Meadow Lake in my own constituency. Certainly, it has turned out to be all right as it now stands. But if it is designated as a correctional centre, I would raise those concerns which I had initially about sentencing directly from the court.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes. I agree with the member for Meadow Lake that the camp situation has been a very important part of the correctional system. The young offenders who go there have an opportunity to be rehabilitated to a much larger extent than if they were sent to the regular correctional centre. He is right in assuming that my previous answer indicated that that wouldn't change if we went to a 5-5-4. The designation would still be made by the department as to whether or not they would go to the work camp, rather than to the correctional centre.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I would like to talk to you for a few minutes about the social assistance program. On one hand, we chastise you for being too lenient and on the other hand, we are going to chastise you a little for not being lenient enough. The concern I am raising with you today is a particular case which has come to my desk several times over the past year. I don't want to use names, but the case concerns an unwed mother who has an infant in the home which she must look after. She is not able, in the rural setting, to put the child in a day care centre. She must, for that reason, stay at home and look after it. She hasn't been able, at this time, to find baby-sitters. Every month she has difficulty getting her social assistance cheque. She went three months without getting a cheque. After I raised it with the office concerned, we were able to get her the three cheques for December, January, and February. Again yesterday, I got another call from the same lady — March has come and gone and no cheque. I don't think that we should have people out there having to come to their member every month in order to get their social assistance payments. There is something wrong. I'd like the minister to tell me what's going on in that department that causes this kind of thing to keep recurring. I can see it happening once, but I don't see a recurrence time after time, the way this has happened.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed that the usual process is fairly simple and straightforward. They usually get their cheques on a regular basis if they are eligible for them. I would like to tell the member that if he has a specific problem, he should send me the information and our department will look into it and see if we can't alleviate the problem. I don't know if he has brought it forward to the department, but we would certainly be willing to look into it and fix it up for him.

MR. SWAN: — This problem is just one case that I am raising, and I can certainly send you the details of this one. But it seems that in this one particular area of the province, there are many people facing the same concern. I believe it has then to do with a

particular worker who is not understanding the program. For that reason, I'll send you this case later and you can perhaps correct the problem out there in the country.

I'd like to also talk to you for a few minutes about the day care situation. I know this year you have put additional funds in your budget for day care, and you have been on radio and television and so on making a big blow about what you are going to do for the day care situation. If I really believed it I wouldn't raise it, but I'm having difficulty with it.

From 1971 until 1979 (the latest figures available), you have allocated funds to day care each year. But in each of those years you've spent 66 per cent of the allocation. If it is your intention again this year to make a big blow and to put a fair number of dollars into your budget and then only spend 66 per cent, what really are you going to do to improve day care? It's going to mean that there are a lot of people out there who are going to be without day care facilities. Today there are a number who have no place to put their children as far as a day care centre is concerned. There just aren't enough centres to handle them. At this time, 81 per cent of the children between the ages of 19 months and 5 years are not able to find a day care centre that they can use. I think that is a pretty serious figure when 81 per cent of them cannot be placed in day care centres in our province. Are you prepared now to increase the number of centres and to spend the actual money that you have allocated — not holding it back and just having the figure there as a good looking figure for the government?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — They are just looking up some answers for me. I would like to table some of the things that were requested yesterday by the member for Wilkie and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. I'm not sure which is which. I'll send it over and maybe you guys can sort it out. If you need more we have lots more.

The member raises the point, in essence, of whether or not our department is committed to getting a good quality day care system in Saskatchewan. I think it's fair to say that the 100 per cent increase which we allocated in the budget of March 5 toward day care in this province is a serious indication that we do intend to increase the number of spaces and to increase the quality of day care in the province.

In the past it is true, back in some previous years, not all the money for day care was spent because spaces weren't developed. On the other hand, I see this year that it's probable that we will spend all the money which has been allocated and we will probably need more. I think there, again, you see the thrust of the department in developing new day care spaces. We have announced that we intend to increase the number by 10 per cent this year — in new spaces — and that the spaces which were empty when we started the budgeting process will be filled quickly, and we will allow for an increase of 10 per cent more.

MR. SWAN: — Are you indeed going to put in place enough day care facilities that you spend the complete budget, or are you going to spend 66 per cent?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member says that we spent 66 per cent last year; we're looking up the number. I think it's more than that, although all the accounts aren't in yet. We do not anticipate that we will be spending our full budget this year, and that every cent available will go into the day care program this year.

MR. SWAN: — Since the program was announced at the time the budget was brought down, how many new day care facilities have been established? How many different spaces will be available for 1981 than were available last year?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — There are eight or nine new day care centres in the process of being formed. It's not a simple process. The space has to be checked out and we go through the formal arrangement and agreements which have to be arrived at. We also are anticipating that, of the spaces which were empty, most of them have been filled now, and for the new spaces which we are bringing on stream, we have allowed in our budget for an increase of 10 per cent in the total number of spaces throughout the province.

MR. SWAN: — I would like to go back to the special-care homes situation. You have put a freeze on the amount of money that you are going to allow them to charge. Are you prepared, at this point in time, to announce that you are going on a room and board rate for all people in special-care homes? Or are you going to wait and announce it on July 1?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The final agreement is not ready for an announcement yet. The room and board rate is being considered as part of the negotiations. At the present time, there is no final agreement on how it will come down in the end result. We hope to have the new program ready for July 1. Therefore, an announcement would have to be made some time in advance of that, so everyone in the province would be able to gear up for it.

MR. SWAN: — You know, you have been studying this thing for a long time. It is two years since the study was undertaken. We were told last year that you were going to have a solution by midsummer or fall at the very latest, that both health and social services were involved in the study and that they would come to an understanding. This year we have the same kind of thing coming up in estimates. We are being told again that by July we'll have an answer. I think it is time your department gives some answers here in the legislature when your estimates are before the House.

I would like you to declare before this House what the intentions of your department are with regard to the provision of services to the people in special-care homes.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I would like to inform the member that our first go at this began on February 9. The first formal meeting took place March 17. I think, if anything, some of the homes are saying, "Why are we going so quickly? What is the big rush all of a sudden?" To announce something now would be premature, because we are going through the process of consultation and discussion with the people, the Saskatchewan Association of Special-care Homes, the nurses and the Saskatchewan Health Care Association. We will be making an announcement in due course. To say that we are dragging our feet — the people who are involved in the negotiations now for the Department of Social Services — is unfair, because we have only been working at it for about six weeks. We do anticipate that we will have an agreement and a new formula in place for July 1. I think the freeze which we put on nursing home rates and the agreement to pick up a 12 per cent increase in the interim is an indication that we do plan and do anticipate having a new arrangement arrived at by July 1.

MR. SWAN: — You tell me that you have only been involved since February 9. What happened to all the studies which took place last year? In estimates last year I was told by social services that the study was going on. In health estimates we were told that same thing — the study was going on and there would be an announcement by

April 16, 1981

midsummer or early fall. Here we are coming to another summer and we are still being told the study is just getting under way.

What happened to last year's study? Did you study it, then throw it away and start studying again? What really is going on? Can you tell us that?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Of course, you will be aware that there were many studies done by former ministers, studies which are very important to the negotiated agreement which we are involved in at the present time. We are not going into a long-term study of how we are going to go about bringing this new formula into place. We are in the final stages of negotiations with the special-care homes and with the Saskatchewan Health Care Association. What I am saying to you is that the studies which you are talking about are very important to the final negotiations. They are being used. I think you will be pleased to know, and your constituents will be pleased to know, that a new formula is coming forward which we hope will be in place by July 1.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, could I have copies of the studies which were done last year?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed that the documents which have been made available to the consultation process of the other groups involved can be made available to the member and we will do that as soon as we can get them put together.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, how much money is your department planning on spending in this upcoming year to construct new nursing homes throughout the province? Also, how many applications do you have before your department from different towns and organizations requesting new nursing home facilities in the province?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — We are anticipating spending, and have budgeted for, \$1.7 million for new construction. Regarding the number of applications which we have had, we don't have that information here but will get it and send it across to the member for Wilkie.

MR. GARNER: — Just a minute, Mr. Minister. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear. Did you say million?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Million.

MR. GARNER: — Okay. How many nursing homes is that money going to be spend on for construction, and what are the sizes of them?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed that the department picks up 20 per cent of the cost. Simply by going through the process of dividing out the \$1.7 million and extrapolating, you have about 130 beds, with one room costing about \$60,000, which is about the rate that we're letting contracts at the present time.

MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Minister, (you are not aware, it was the former minister) I had a delegation in from the Wilkie and District Centennial Nursing Home Board. Would you bring me up to date as to the negotiations (the stage they are in) regarding that nursing home facility? We can get into some details about how badly that nursing home is needed there. Just bring me up to date as to what stage the negotiations are in.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — There have been meetings taking place. It is not on the agenda for this year. We will get back to the member in writing, in terms of future planning for the Wilkie area.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I don't know what criteria you expect from these other ones which are being built. I suggest to you (and I know and appreciate that you're a very busy minister) after having toured the nursing home last winter when it was about 25 degrees below that if you take patients out of a room temperature of about 72 degrees Fahrenheit and it goes down to perhaps 40 degrees Fahrenheit, it's not very nice. The staff there is excellent, but the facility the staff has to work in is terrible. I would suggest to you, Mr. Minister, if you could possibly work it into your schedule, that you go out there and see first hand (not one of your officials) that nursing home facility. It is very bad and the conditions are very tough — storing cleaning fluids in the hallways and the washrooms.

These people have come to Regina two or three times to meet with you. You are going to have to take action. I think you should be looking at this project for this year. Will you go down there, meet with the board, Mr. Minister, and view this nursing home facility on your own? I don't think that's asking too much. I'll even have you out to the ranch for supper that night if you do that. I'm trying to be as hospitable as possible, Mr. Minister . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's bribery.

MR. GARNER: — It's not bribery. It is just a real sincere concern about the facility there, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I mentioned to the member that we weren't planning to build this year. I'll change that a little. We will have a look at it again, and we will get back to him in writing. We will be going around the province to look at some of the institutions which are run by the local boards. I'm not sure if Wilkie will be one of them, but we will make an attempt to go out there and have a look at the situation.

I realize that we have had consultations with the group from Wilkie. We are considering it and we will get back to him in writing on it.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, there is no sense to your coming out to Craik to look at the facilities there because we haven't a home for you to look at.

I mentioned to you before about the request from the Craik area to have a nursing home in this district. The request came from the R.M. of Craik approximately a year ago, and this is what has happened to date, Mr. Minister. The R.M. of Craik and the R.M. of Sarnia, and the R.M. of Dufferin, are interested in building a senior citizens' home, and an application has gone in. They have been dealing with Ms. Marlene Giles, I believe.

I've been doing a little calculating over here, Mr. Minister. It looks as though you have allocated not quite \$2 million. I guess I'll have to wait until the minister is listening.

You are going to assist in approximately six or seven homes (depending on how many beds — 30, 35, 20, or whatever) — that is approximately what you have allocated. I wonder if you realize the seriousness of the need for nursing homes in Saskatchewan.

April 16, 1981

When this started in my area, there were 30 people who came to an R.M. (rural municipality) meeting. It boomeranged and petitions were taken. The petition included approximately 100 letters from the Craik and Aylesbury and Chamberlain communities. They want a nursing home there, and they need one badly.

I'm sure Craik isn't the only area. It's all over this province. I can't understand why you allocated only \$1.78 million.

Society in North America has chosen the route that we put our friends and loved ones in nursing homes. We're not taking care of them at home as we used to. So, if we are going to go this route, there must be a more serious look given by social services. We need a few millions of dollars, or there is going to be panic on who is going to get these homes.

One question I want to ask is: how do you determine who will be getting these five or six homes? I understand that, in the financing of these homes, 20 per cent comes from the provincial government as a grant, 72 per cent is backed by the federal government, 2 per cent is financed, and 8 per cent is to be raised by the local communities.

In our area, this has all been taken care of. The people have indicated what towns want to belong. There are two R.M. communities who want to join in. There are two municipalities sitting waiting for social services to say how large a home they will be permitted to build. So, the request is there.

We have taken, Mr. Minister, a slight survey of our own. We have contacted the municipalities and town involved, which takes in Craik, Aylesbury, Chamberlain, Penzance, Holdfast, Dilke, Findlater and Bethune. We have more than enough people in homes now in Regina, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, who could be brought home to fill the new home — many times over, really.

Our concern is: are we going to have the chance to build these homes in 1981? Are we on the agenda for 1981, 1982 or 1983? Where do we stand here? Just give me a few comments on that, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member brings up the point of senior citizen care in North America. I would like to take just a moment to comment on the understanding which he has that the senior citizens are anxious to go to institutions.

If one thing is done during the time that I spend in social services, I intend that not one senior citizen who doesn't have to go to an institution will ever have to go to one unless he absolutely needs the service. I think that the most humane and most proper way we should be dealing with our parents and our grandparents is by keeping them in their own homes as long as possible. Most of them can live out their total lives there, given a few extras through the home care program.

At the present time, 8 per cent of the population goes through the institution of nursing homes. That's not a large percentage but I think it's still too high. I think that rather than building a number of nursing homes, we should be spending some of that money in home care, sheltered housing and also in prevention.

I think that some of the reasons for people going to senior citizens homes are not necessarily because the seniors want to go, but because their families want them to go. I think that's a very sad commentary on what is happening, as you mentioned, across North America. I think that is something that we, in Saskatchewan, are coming to grips

with. And, we intend to do something about this through the home care program and through sheltered housing. On the other hand, we realize that there is going to be a certain percentage of people who have to go into an institution for levels 2, 3 and 4 care. We want to cut the percentage from 8 per cent to something that's much lower. At the same time, those who have to go, do (as you mentioned) need the best care possible.

The philosophy, which you mentioned, that it's inevitable and a logical conclusion to end your last years in nursing homes, is something which we are very committed to changing at the present time in our department. Seniors, through a positive approach to their mental and physical health, do not have to end up in institutions. If we don't do anything else over the next few months (and I'm sure that we will do many things), one of the main points that we've been emphasizing (and we've met with literally thousands of senior citizens) is to make sure that that takes place. We want to make sure that the independence, which our seniors have exhibited over a great number of years in building the province, is not taken away from them in their last few years.

In relation to your particular circumstances in Craik, we will get back to you in writing. I'm not sure of the details on it. Let me tell you that we are concerned about those who have to go to institutions, and we will be making every attempt to upgrade the levels of care in the province.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I thank you, Mr. Minister, for those comments. I agree, mostly, with what you say. But I don't think you understood my concerns regarding nursing homes in Saskatchewan. We have too many people taken from the small towns; I mean people who have to have nursing home care. I agree with you that we shouldn't push people into nursing homes, but sometimes they have to go there for level 1, 2, 3 or 4 care. In these smaller towns there is a level 4 care in conjunction with the hospitals. Let me get it straight that I mean when they have to go. Goodness knows, there sure is a need.

In my constituency there are two homes — one in Davidson and one in Outlook. The people who live in these communities and can get into those homes are happy people. But the ones you take away from their communities, where they have lived all their lives, and put into an institution in Regina or Saskatoon, pine away. It's really sad. What I'm saying to you is: if we're going this route of putting people into homes, let's put them into homes in their communities where they have lived all their lives, so they don't pine away. Some people can come into Regina or Saskatoon, who might have relatives or friends here, and get along fine. But I know many, many people in my own area of Craik, who have had to go into nursing homes. They've gone to the cities, and they're unhappy people because they see no one with whom they've lived their lives.

I would like to see social services put more emphasis on building nursing homes out in the country, and not open so many in the cities. Maybe you have to fulfil the need here and act accordingly. But we have to stop moving senior citizens, who have to go to a home, from their home communities into institutions in the cities. This is my concern. I'm not going to ask you any more questions after you give your comment on this. Is there any chance that we may be able to get a home constructed, in the near future, in the community of Craik?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — As I mentioned to the member, we'll get back to him in writing. I'm not absolutely up-to-date on what has taken place in the application and in that process, or what direction the department has given them. In talking about keeping nursing home care in small centres, I think I agree. We shouldn't be looking at

centralizing everything in the bigger places. On the other hand, I think it's important that we use the home care program to make sure as many people as possible never have to go to homes, but stay in their own towns in their own houses or apartments. That, in fact, will make sure that those nursing homes which do exist will be used for the people in that area rather than having them shipped off to Regina or Saskatoon. I think that is a big concern and we would like, in every instance possible, to make sure that the people are allowed to stay in their own area in their own community.

One example is where we now have people who, because there's a long waiting list, have to go in to Regina; in the past they haven't been eligible to go back out when a vacancy occurs, whether it's in whatever town near Regina. We are reviewing that to see whether or not we can't make allowances for the person to move back out to his own nursing home. We are reviewing that policy and it's one that we're concerned about.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — One more question, just to get it on the record, Mr. Minister, so I can get back to the people of these communities: Craik, Aylesbury, Chamberlain, Penzance, Holdfast, Dilke, Findlater, Bethune. Whenever we do get a home in our community, is the decision made entirely by you, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The ultimate decision is left in the hands of the minister, but it's done in consultation with the local boards, because they are involved to a great extent in raising part of the money that is put in by the local community — 8 per cent. As well, CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) is involved, because it is involved in funding of the nursing homes. But the final decision is made by the department as to where the nursing home is going to be built.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, there is an outfit in Saskatoon called Community Aid. Do you fund it?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed that Community Aid is funded by our department. They work in conjunction with the mobile crisis unit. They are in the same building and man telephones 24 hours a day to respond to crisis situations and to report them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, there's a whole bunch of groups in that building or two buildings (depending on what you want to call them). How many of them in that building do you fund? That's on Avenue F in Saskatoon — the 100 block, I believe.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Only the two that I mentioned are known. There could be more; we'll run through our list. We don't have the addresses on our list of grants. We can check and get back to the member for Rosthern.

MR. LANE: — Would the minister table all grants made last year of under \$10,000 that are not in *Public Accounts*, which were made to individuals, associations, community groups or whatever?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, we can get a list of those grants under \$10,000 made to community groups. It will take a little while, but those that aren't shown in *Public Accounts* we will get for you.

MR. LANE: — That includes individuals as well as community groups? I'm not asking for

it today. I know it is going to take you some time to prepare it.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — We make grants to everyone who is involved in day care — foster parents, and that sort of thing. Some of that is confidential, and I'm not sure if that was the direction of the question or whether it's more for the community type of operation.

MR. LANE: — Okay. Until, I believe, five or six years ago, *Public Accounts* listed all grants over \$5,000. Then the amount was increased to \$10,000 and I agree with that, but the grant expenditures are public information. Where would the confidentiality come in, first of all?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, I'm informed that all grants under minister's order we can get for you.

MR. LANE: — Answer for me as well about the confidentiality — where would it arise?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed that in cases of foster children where grants are given, that it would be considered inappropriate to make public what the grant is to the foster parent.

MR. LANE: — I understand it for foster children. Are there any other areas?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — No, I don't think so; we can get those for you.

MR. LANE: — Okay. We'll exclude those; supply the others. Would you also list any investigations undertaken by the department into homes, day care centres, or anything of that nature, during the past two years, and the results of every investigation?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Here, again, I think, we do investigations or inspections routinely throughout the province.

MR. LANE: — Okay. I'm referring to when a complaint is raised.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — You mean to the minister? Ministerial investigations? That type of thing?

MR. LANE: — I don't know under what category they would fall. I assume there are situations (I know there are situations) where complaints are made where problems have arisen as opposed to the normal routine investigations.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes. I am informed that a lot of that as well is confidential — the child abuse registry, for example. Where we get a complaint, we go out and check. Those are all considered to be investigations. We wouldn't want to make that known either, because many of them are questionable and the person's reputation could be spoiled needlessly. So there are many areas, in that sense, where we wouldn't be able to give that information out.

MR. LANE: — That's fair. But those areas where you have investigated, other than the normal routing inspections and update, in ministerial investigations . . . Is that the phrase you use for extraordinary circumstances?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The ministerial investigation, I am informed, or cabinet

April 16, 1981

investigation of that type (I think that is what you would be referring to, rather than the individual cases), we could make available.

MR. LANE: — In all case? I am asking for it by the end of the session. Am I being unreasonable? Am I being unreasonable to say June 1? Is that fair enough?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — June 1 is probably suitable. There is a question on legality. For example, we would have to check with the Attorney General's office as to whether or not something like the ombudsman report or investigation, that sort of thing, could be released. We should check the confidentiality of some of the things which we do. But I think we will be able to do the ones which you are referring to by June 1.

MR. LANE: — On the correctional centres: would you supply me with the criteria you use which were forwarded to the architects and planners of the centre? I haven't had the opportunity yet to visit the new ones. How many inmates are there to each section? What amenities are to be supplied to each section of inmates? I understand those are all listed and that the criteria were supplied for design purposes.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The requirement report which you are referring to is actually government services. Can we check that out with them? We see no problem with it. On the other hand, we would like to take the opportunity to check it out with the minister to see whether or not he has any problems. From our point of view there are not, but it is their report and so we would have to check with them.

MR. LANE: — I am assuming that you would have significant input into the design of a correctional centre whether it's under government services or not. I'm looking at it from your perspective as to what goes in.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — On that point, if government services is in agreement, we are in agreement with it now. We just want to check out that point.

MR. LANE: — Okay. If you're not, I will be back.

We got into a bit of a dispute with the Premier as to the number of people receiving assistance. I have the December 1980 quarterly report which the department sends out; I don't have the most recent one. It refers to the total number of persons, as opposed to cases. That number is 40,581. In addition, we are informed, and we have checked with the Department of Indian Affairs, that they have an assistance program as well. Those figures take us up, approximately, to 63,000.

My first question is: what is the most recent number you have — that's number of persons as opposed to number of cases? Secondly, is there any duplication with the figures and the system used by the Department of Indian Affairs?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The total case load at February 1981 is 22,427. That includes Saskatchewan social services and DNS. The total number of persons you were asking about is 43,635 as of February 1981.

MR. LANE: — Okay. Now, just so there's no confusion, that is totally separate from any assistance plan the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development may have. Is that correct?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, in straight terms it is. If there was an overlap it would be double payment. There could be one, two, three or 50, I don't know. In real terms that is correct.

MR. LANE: — I missed a question which I wanted to ask regarding the correctional centres. Would you supply your program criteria? I believe they came up about five or six years ago. I want to know the education programs and recreational programs which are available, everything of that nature. You had fairly lengthy criteria at that time of what you supply. Would you supply those criteria again please? I think they came up five or six years ago but I'm asking for the recent criteria now, as opposed to what came up five or six years ago.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — We can provide a current program. We will table that and send it across.

MR. LANE: — I would like to know the number of inmates who are taking education, what type of courses they are taking outside the centres and where they are taking them, how many have taken the courses? Do you have any records or statistics to show the recidivism rate for those who have been taking education outside of the centre? I would also like to know the success of that program.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I am informed we can get the answer to the first part of your question. I am not sure whether we can get the return rate for you, whether or not we have that documented. If it is available, we'll get it to you.

MR. LANE: — I am concerned about the success of the program; that's what I am trying to determine. I am asking for any statistics which you have on the recidivism rate of the correctional centres and what you are doing to monitor the success of your programs. Am I being unfair, Mr. Minister, in asking for it by June 1?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think we can get that information by then. The only problem would be whether or not we can get the return rate pinned down on a certain program. We do have some statistics on the return rate, and we will get what we have available for you.

MR. LANE: — I would also like to know the number of SAP recipients who have been receiving assistance for a period longer than one year. I would also like to know the number of recipients in the last year who came from other provinces, the number being paid out of province and the number of recipients who are under the age of 17 not living at home.

I raised this question earlier and I say this from personal experience. There is a very long waiting list on adoptions in the province and I certainly don't hold the department responsible for it. I tend to the view that there is a role for a private agency, if it is increasing the source of children available for adoption. I have very pointedly indicated that to you. If there are people, as we are advised from the Ontario organization, who don't want to deal with the government agency for different reasons or doctors are reluctant, then perhaps that is a role which should be pursued. I asked you at that time whether the department would investigate whether there is a role that could be played. I suggest to you, and very carefully stated then, that it should be supervised and non-profit. I really think there are grounds for study there. I would urge the minister to consider that to see whether there is, in fact, a role to be played.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — In terms of the adoption waiting list in Saskatchewan, I'm informed that it is about 2.5 years. As you mentioned, it's a little less than in most other provinces. Some are 3 to 3.5 years at the present time. In terms of whether or not we are looking at private adoption agencies, I told you that we would have a look at it. We have some documentation together on how it all fits together. We maintain that the very best possible way is through a universal program where every child coming into the system has an advantage of having access to all the parents who apply. To break that down and to fragment it we feel is not in the best interest of the child, who is the main person of concern for the Department of Social Services.

That's not saying that the people who are on the waiting lists aren't important, and, as the member for Elrose brought up yesterday, we have looked at a better system of keeping people on the waiting list informed. Possibly we could send letters out on a 3.4 or 6 month basis to keep the people updated. Now they are waiting and are not sure whether they have done everything. I think we can improve in that area. But to go to private adoption agencies at the present time is not in the cards and we are not considering it seriously for the reason that I indicated to you.

MR. LANE: — Would you table your study on that, please?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — What we have done is not a formal study. Through consultation within the department, by looking at the data and the statistics that exist in other areas where private adoption agencies are in play, we have come to the conclusion that our system is probably the best and we intend to maintain it for the foreseeable future.

MR. LANE: — Well, would you table the internal report then? You could well be right in the information that you have. I remain to be convinced and I'm prepared to accept it. If your report shows it's not feasible, that's fine with me, but I don't know why you couldn't just supply me with the figures. Your department could be 100 per cent right. I don't have the answer.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, we can give the member the for and against argument that we based our decision on. I suppose we could argue about whether or not we made the right one, but we will forward that type of a letter to him giving him the reasons the decision was made.

MR. PREBBLE: — Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to be extremely brief in view of the time. I just want to make two or three comments with respect to day care. I was disappointed that they have not been raised so far in the discussion, Mr. Chairman. I have one comment on the employment support services program. I want to begin by congratulating the minister for what I think is an outstanding improvement in the day care program in the course of a single year. I want to urge the Minister of Social Services to look seriously at some additional steps that are needed to upgrade the quality of day care offered in the province. I think the one that is the most urgent is to improve the ratio between children and day care workers. Right now for school-age children we have a ratio of one worker to 15 children. I think we need to work toward improving that to a ration of approximately 1 to 8. Similarly with children ages 4 to 6. I think that we need to reduce the staff-child ratio from 1 to 10, to 1 to 5. If we don't take these kinds of steps, we can never have a truly high quality program with respect to day care.

We need to take similar steps with respect to upgrading the regulations that are now in

place for nutrition in day care centres and for space that is available in day care centres, Mr. Chairman. I particularly want to urge the minister to greatly improve the guidelines and regulations with respect to space for school age children. The present guideline is 25 square feet per child and I think for a school age child, that is clearly inadequate. Similar improvements are needed with respect to space allotments for all children in day care centres, Mr. Chairman, and I hope this is something the department will look at very seriously in the coming months.

I also want to urge the minister, in next year's budget, to address much more seriously the need for a special subsidy to day care centres with respect to accommodating children who are there on a part-time basis, and accommodating infants. I think part-time provisions are very important and at present, there is no funding for parents who need to leave their child in a day care for 15 to 20 hours a week. I think this is a need which our government needs to address as quickly as possible.

Members opposite have mentioned the need for increased spaces for day care. I want to urge the minister, in a similar way, to address that problem quickly. That is going to mean that we need to double day care funding within the next two budgets. I believe that we should be aiming for at least 10,000 spaces for day care at the end of a three-year period. That would be up from the present 3,100 spaces that now exist.

Finally, with respect to day care, I want to urge the minister to look seriously at the requests being made from day care groups to establish a monthly operating grant to all day care centres in the province. I believe such a grant is required, and that this is the most satisfactory way to ensure that we will have improved quality of child care, proper salaries for day care workers, and to provide some assistance to part-time day care and parents who need day care facilities on an after-school basis.

The only other comment I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is with respect to the employment support services program. I want to urge the government and the minister to substantially upgrade the funding to this program in the coming year. I'm disappointed that we don't see a substantial increase this year in the employment support services program. I think it's an excellent program. I think its excellence is demonstrated in its tremendous success rate in getting people, who have been formerly on welfare, working and into the regular job market. I think it's a shame that this program has been cut back by this government in the past. Some of it has gone over to industry and commerce and I don't think it has been spent as effectively there. I believe there is a need for increased support in the Department of Social Services for this program in the coming year and I hope the minister will look seriously at that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member makes some points on day care, and I would like to comment briefly on the program which we announced after the budget was announced. The 100 per cent increase in funding for day care moved us a long way in the right direction. I'm not saying that it's a panacea, or that it's the final result. It's phase 1, and we plan to become involved in phase 2 which will include some of the things the member pointed out.

One of them is native day care for which we have allocated money in the budget for this year. Another is day care for infants under the age of 18 months, for which we intend to have a pilot project over the next year. As well, in terms of maintenance grants which he mentioned, we see that the subsidy increase to the parents is the way to go. On the

other hand, we have increased equipment grants significantly, which goes a long way to subsidize and stabilize the day care centres.

On the issue of ESP (employment support program), the program for employment for people on social assistance, I think I agree very much with the member that it has an excellent record. Our statistics show that 86 per cent of those who are involved in ESP remain off social assistance once they are finished their program. So I think, in the future, we have to concentrate on that program. It's a good one and it's something we will be looking at for next year.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I just wanted to make a comment and I have a question regarding my constituency. I think it's very interesting, Mr. Minister, to note that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is contradicting the government's policy. On the one hand, the government is saying that it doesn't want to institutionalize as it relates to senior citizens. We, on this side of the House, concur. We agree with that. We don't want to institutionalize our senior citizens. We want them to be in their homes as long as possible, as well, but we also recognize there comes a time in their lives when they must be put in a nursing home and that's unavoidable. Certainly we can appreciate that and I'm sure the minister can.

We have made the argument (and I think quite clearly) this morning and this afternoon that there is a shortage of nursing home beds. There's no question of that. We have documented that different times before; we can document it again. I just want to make the comment that it's very interesting to note that we (the government and the opposition) don't want to institutionalize the senior citizens, but it would seem that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland wants to institutionalize the young people — to get them all in an institution, right away quick, and get them all brainwashed real early and get them prepared for the next election, I suppose.

I think that's a very interesting contradiction of government policy. That's not the first time the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has stood in his place (which is usually closer to the members' room over there), argued against the government policy on a particular bill or a motion in the House. And then when that bill comes to a vote, he stands up and votes for the government. I think that's the height of hypocrisy and I think that member should be flagged on that. He does that consistently in the House. If he would stand in his place and take a firm position, in many instances stand and vote with the government and vote with his principles and his conscience, then we, on this side of the House, could have a lot of respect for that member. But we see him constantly standing up, contradicting government policy, and then turning right around and voting with the government.

I think it's a sad state of affairs in the province when the man gets so much press. He gets up, makes a little speech on something and gets great big headlines: "Prebble to Institutionalize Children" or something like that. (I don't know how it will read tomorrow, but we'll see.) I think it's a sad state of affairs; I think the truth should be known. He's very hypocritical in his approach in the House.

That member isn't the central focus here in the legislature; what is, is the care which we require for the senior citizens in this province. I want to ask the minister to look into a particular matter for me. I'm going to give you the names, if you'll just take them down, please. I had a letter from Lyndon Christian, telephone 645-2969. He has a mother-in-law who lives in Whitewood. The name of this person is Mrs. Aileen Roper. She is currently in the hospital in Esterhazy, soon to be released. She has been living in her

own home in Whitewood and she is not in a position to adequately care for herself. In-home care would not be sufficient because, according to the family, she needs care on a pretty regular basis. Therefore she needs to be in a nursing home and there is no home that has a bed to put her in. That is the argument we have been making on this side of the House — the shortage of nursing home beds.

If you say there isn't a shortage of nursing home beds, then I would appreciate it very much if, within the next two to three weeks, you could have this person (and I've given you her name) placed in a nursing home. If she isn't in a nursing home within the next two or three weeks, then I'll have to assume that we're right and there is, in fact, a shortage of nursing home beds, and so you should be looking at that very seriously and getting some more nursing homes out there.

The town of Wawota has asked for a nursing home institution in that town. They have done all the groundwork study through their local people. I don't know whether or not you've made a decision on that. If you have, I would certainly like to know. If you haven't, I suggest that you make a decision very quickly.

Whitewood and Wapella are in the same situation in my riding. But the bottom line, and the point I am trying to make is that there is a need for more nursing homes out there. I don't think it's going to advance the concept of institutionalization to put the beds there which are required today.

I just gave you the name of a person who requires a bed now, and I ask you to look into that and see to it that they're put in.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — The member brings up a number of points, one of them being an individual case. I think we have it documented enough, but if he would send us a memo on this to be sure we have all the details, we will take a quick look at it and make certain the person is on a list. Of course, the member knows that we don't make the decision as to whether or not a person gets into a nursing home. The local board does.

I would also like to say that in terms of nursing home beds on the Trans-Canada East, as I mentioned to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley yesterday, we are looking at that area. We realize that we do have to do something. It's probably one of the areas in the province where there is a shortage.

Both the member for Moosomin and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, I think, are going to be attending the opening of the Pipestone Home Care Board in the near future. I'm sure they will be promoting home care, as I know all people in that area and in Saskatchewan are very much interested in this.

I would just like to say that in terms of nursing home care in that area, we will have to look at it. And, on the other problem, if he sends a memo we will take it into consideration.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, earlier I was asking about the Community Aid building in Saskatoon. Would you advise me (I assume it will have to be later, in writing) of the agencies which are in that building on Avenue F? Actually, I think they have two buildings. Who is getting funding in there, either directly from your department, or through Community Aid (an umbrella association which you fund and they get parts of it)? Would you give the reasons you fund them and for which function?

April 16, 1981

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think we can arrive at that. We will get a list of the grants which they receive, and just a brief outline of what each organization's definition is.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I have one other question. I am now receiving a lot of calls from people in the Saskatoon area who are concerned about the information available to them on what services are available in the area. In fact, it is so bad that some of the social services people are telling them to phone single parents' associations, etc., because they know where the information is — apparently your officials don't. I would like to suggest that if community aid performed this function years ago, it seems as though they have stopped doing it. Maybe we should be looking back at what people originally applied for, and what they were going to do, and make sure they are still covering areas for which they were originally planned. Some of them have forgotten what it is they are supposed to do.

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm informed we're reviewing their role in the process right at the present time. The information which flows out of social services is very important. It's one thing to have a program; it's quite another thing to make sure that every individual knows about it. It is a point well taken and we are reviewing it.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 35 inclusive agreed.

Vote 36 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOWS (SUPPLEMENTARY)

SOCIAL SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 36

Items 1 to 7 inclusive agreed.

Vote 36 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:13 p.m.