

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 16, 1982

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 13

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister introduce her officials?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce my acting deputy minister, Mr. Cousineau, on my right, and Mr. Brown, the director of public works. Behind me, to my right, is Don Nevill, the director of planning and property, and directly behind me is John Law, executive director of operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Item 1

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I want to start out by saying that we probably won't be spending a long time on this department if the answers we need come quickly. We are very much encouraged by the government's co-operation in bringing the estimates forward quickly and I am sure that over the next three or four days that will continue and we will be out of here by Christmas. We will do everything in our power to make sure that happens.

The first question I would like to ask the minister is if she can send to me a list of the members of her staff, names and salaries.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — In the whole department, or . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My personal staff under government services: I have one special assistant by the name of Elizabeth Crosthwaite who earns \$54,000 per annum and whose qualifications are a B.A. from Carleton University, and an M.A. from the University of Toronto. Her employment history is that she has worked with Multiple Access General Computer company, the Toronto Board of Education, the Carleton Board of Education. She was a research assistant at Carleton. She was also a teaching fellow at Carleton, and a research assistant at a place called . . . (inaudible) . . . in Athens, Greece, and her last place of employment was with the . . . (inaudible) . . . board of education in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, can the minister tell me if any of these people in the group who are in the administration branch in the department are now on contract rather than full-time employment?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No contracts.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'd like as well a list of the executive directors as well as the deputy minister and any associate deputies or ADMs that you might have and their

December 16, 1982

salaries as well.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Would the member like me to send it across?

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Maybe while we are just waiting for that to come across. I could ask you a couple of other questions. Can the minister give us a list of the people in the department who have been dismissed since May 8 through order in council appointments?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The only two OC cancellations in the Department of Government Services was the former deputy, Mr. Dennis Foley and Val Senicar.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — These I understand, were . . .

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — And one more, I'm sorry: Owen Mitchell, who was on probationary.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister indicate whether or not settlements have been made with these people, whether there's arrangements being made at the present time or whether in fact settlements have been arranged with the three individuals?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — They're in the process of being made. To my knowledge they haven't been made to date.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister is saying that in all cases, in the three cases, that no compensation has been paid?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I believe all three of them are, will be . . . All three of them will be receiving a settlement.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister indicate a time frame that the three individuals, who have had their appointments cancelled, can they plan on a certain time frame that you're looking at to have that settlement arrived at? The reason I'm questioning in this line: Dennis Foley, who was the deputy minister and had a long history in the government as well as in the private sector with Poole Construction, I believe was terminated sometime in May — I think May 11. And that being almost eight months ago, I think it's very unusual that a settlement couldn't have been arrived at by now and lay this to rest.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I'll take your points under advisement that we are in the process, as I indicated before.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The question of a time frame, can you give any indication of the time?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, I can't be specific on that.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — These positions that you mentioned, Owen Mitchell, Val Senicar and I believe (who was the other one we were talking about?) Dennis Foley, were order in council. Have you got the list of other people who are not order in council who have been dismissed since May 8?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The only one not an OC was Mr. Harold Knight, research

officer 1.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Was there compensation or a settlement arranged with Mr. Knight?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's presently at grievance.

MR. KOSKIE: — I wonder if you could indicate any of the ones that you've mentioned that have been dismissed. Were any of them dismissed for cause?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — All I can say is that they serve at the pleasure of the Queen, and the Queen wasn't pleased.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Ladies and gentlemen, the minister says . . . I imagine implies that the deputy minister, Dennis Foley, was . . . I'm not sure what she's saying . . . Was not at the pleasure of the Queen, I guess is how she phrases it. But can she give us any indication what the Queen was displeased with in Mr. Dennis Foley, who had an outstanding career in the government and with Poole Construction for some 20 or 30 years prior to being dismissed, probably for the first time in his illustrious career?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — All I can say is that the order in council for the three individuals was cancelled, and that's . . . We don't have to show cause.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the case of Val Senicar, you're saying that she has compensation which will be coming to her. Can you give any indication of the type and the amount of the settlement, which will be arrived at? Will it be the regular so many weeks pay for years served? Can you give us an idea of what the settlement will be?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The compensation package is the one that's set out in The Labour Standards Act, and I believe it's one weeks pay for each year of continuous service.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the case of Val Senicar, can you tell me what position she was in when she was dismissed?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — She was a secretary to the senior architect within government services.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Who had hired her to that position, and who signed the OC that hired her in that position of a secretary. I believe it was a clerk steno 3, in the department in the engineering and architectural branch?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We'll have to take notice because we don't have the OC here. I'll get that information to you.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Could the minister get us that information tonight before we are finished?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We can get it to you tonight depending on how long we are here. It's in the deputy minister's files downtown, and he has indicated he will get it for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to return for a few moments, if I might, to the issue of

Dennis Foley. I want to begin by reminding the minister that the Minister of Agriculture stated that Mr. Foley had been released because he had made a \$200 donation to an NDP candidate. Do you affirm that as a reason for his dismissal, or disavow it?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — As Minister of Government Services I wanted to have my own person in there.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Because.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I think that the minister is stonewalling. Let me try this from a different tack. Let us deal with principles rather than personalities. Does the minister support the principle of a professional public service which carries on from one administration to another and does not support the party in power, but serves different administrations in a professional capacity? Does the minister support that principle?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I think so. And I think it's fair to say that that's probably what we have in the majority of cases within the civil service.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And was Mr. Foley's retention inconsistent with that policy, or that principle?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — As I indicated before, I wanted to have a person in there whose qualifications I had confidence in.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That was the answer to my question three questions ago. That was not the answer to my last question. My last question was: was the retention of Dennis Foley inconsistent with the principle of a professional public service?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — You say, "Was the retention of Dennis Foley in keeping. Well, we didn't retain him. We dismissed him.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Was it inconsistent with the principle of a professional public service?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I wouldn't say necessarily that it's inconsistent but it was my desire and I acted on it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — If you support the principle, and if it was not inconsistent, why was Mr. Foley not retained?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Because perhaps I didn't think he was a professional enough.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I see. You let him go because you did not think he was professional. Would you define what you mean by professional?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I indicated to you earlier that I wanted a deputy minister in there whose qualifications I felt comfortable with and had confidence in. Obviously, if I dismissed Mr. Dennis Foley. I didn't have confidence in his ability.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You stated because he was not professional. Would you define

professional?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I could get a dictionary. I believe being professional is having the qualifications and the ability to carry out the wishes of the government in power.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I take it from your answer that he did not have the ability to carry out the wishes of the government in power. Is that what you're saying?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, that is not what I am saying. I said I wanted someone in there that I had confidence in and I do now with Mr. Cousineau, my acting deputy.

MR. KOSKIE: — How long had you worked with Mr. Foley before you gave him notice of his release?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Two days.

MR. KOSKIE: — Were you able to form your opinions in respect to his professionalism within the two days?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Obviously, I must have.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to congratulate the minister on her ability to make up her mind. I just wish some other ministers in this government had the ability to make up their minds on some more substantial issues. We have been badgering this government for some months about some decisions on other issues. I just wish you'd show the same decisiveness with respect to some other issues such as the minimum wage and the final report of the workers' compensation board . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Listen, I was just complimenting the minister. Now, I hope all of the members won't object if I compliment the minister, for once, on being decisive. I'm still looking for your definition of "professional." You said you let him go because he wasn't professional. Would you tell me what you meant by "wasn't professional"?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't know how much clearer I can make it. I indicated to you that professionalism is being qualified and capable and obviously I have said to you I didn't have confidence in Mr. Foley and had him dismissed.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In what way was Mr. Foley not qualified or not capable?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't know. Call it woman's intuition.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You're saying you destroyed a man's career on the basis of woman's intuition?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't think we destroyed anybody's career. I believe Mr. Foley had been with the department for six years. You keep saying, "long-term government employee." He surely wasn't a long-term government employee, he had only been with the government for six years.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So is the minister saying that you feel perfectly free to end a six-year career? I'll tell the minister, it was a lot longer than that; if you will check with one of the gentlemen behind you they will tell you that Mr. Foley worked for the government before he worked for government services. You say that you have ended a man's career of many years on woman's intuition. Is that what you're now telling this House?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, I'm trying to explain to you why Mr. Foley was removed. He was removed at my request because I did not have confidence in him, in his ability to work with me and for me.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — On a point of clarification, Dennis Foley had worked for three and a half years with the compensation board, and then six and a half years with government services, for a total of 10 years with the government. What I think is important is the new milieu that we are attempting to create in Saskatchewan: Open for Business. The fact that he worked for 22 years with Poole Construction and had an impeccable career in the private sector as well as with government would lead one to believe that he was capable of carrying out the duties as a deputy minister of government services. I think it's going to be interesting to watch in a very sensitive area where government contracts are handed out. And there are other things we'll bring up in this area, but having a person of Dennis Foley's impeccable credibility is very important.

My question goes back to one Val Senicar who was dismissed by OC on October 6th, but it's also how she was employed in the department. She was hired by OC. The OC was not hired by the previous government but was signed by one, the Premier of the province, Grant Devine. What I want to know is why Val Senicar, who was hired by OC 933, signed by the Premier of the province on June 6, was then subsequently dismissed on October 6, by OC 1630. What was her crime in the department that caused here to be fired, having been hired by the premier of the province?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — For the clarification of the members opposite, Miss Senicar was not dismissed per se, she was moved out of the minister's office here, into the department downtown as secretary to the senior architect. Why she was dismissed is because the previous incumbent failed her probationary and actually bumped Miss Senicar, within her own rights.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Was the position a classified position or an unclassified position that Val Senicar was in?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — She was in an unclassified position and got bumped by a person within the classified position.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, I'm a little amazed that a person in the classified section . . . Is this not unusual for that to happen, where a person who is in a classified category would be able to bump someone who is in an unclassified area?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Miss Senicar was OC'd as you're aware and she was held against a classified position. When the previous incumbent failed her probationary on a promotion, she used her rights of provisionary bumping.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'd just like to ask the minister — you've sent out the number of your personal staff. The acting deputy minister at \$5,176 a month — could you indicate whether the acting deputy minister is a Saskatchewan resident, and some of the background?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — He was a resident of Saskatchewan for two years, moved down east, and has since established his residence in Saskatchewan.

MR. KOSKIE: — Can you indicate where he was born and spent most of his life?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Born and raised in Ontario; Ontario.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I have some questions dealing with the policy and procedure manual directive dealing with the policy concerning demonstrations at the Legislative Building here in Regina. I'm wondering if the minister can tell me on what basis or what grounds changes to that policy were made?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — This is the first actual policy that has ever been in place in government services. The previous policy was unwritten.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, in the Assembly in question period several days ago, you indicated that the new policy was based on the fact that the structure of the building was not sound and that you could only have so many people in the rotunda area and so many people on the steps. On what basis was the decision made that this was the policy of the government?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It was done as the result of analysis of the original plans, and done by the professionals within the department. I think one of them is Mr. Smith, chief architect in the engineering and architectural branch. I might also add to the member that I indicated that it was brought to our attention earlier this summer, but digging around in old files, we find that the previous government was informed about it in November of 1979.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The piece of paper that the minister is referring to in November of 1979 is probably this handwritten statement by a Mr. Smith. I'm wondering if you can tell us what the qualifications of Mr. Smith are.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — He is one of the very professional people in my department. He's a registered architect within the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister tell me whether or not the policy she is saying she designed is based on this one-page, handwritten statement by this individual?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The policy was generated within the department by people who I feel are qualified. I myself am not an engineer, nor am I an architect, but when people who have degrees in those areas tell me, based on their knowledge, professional knowledge, that the load limit out here is somewhat less than what was once thought, I take those people's word for it. And it was the people within the department that worked up the proposed policy.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — So was the new policy written and developed for the sole reason of the problem that you identified as a result of that 1979 November memo to do with the weight and the structure of the building?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes it was, in order to protect the safety of the public.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, in reading the policy and dealing with the Legislative Building — if the reason was the weight of people. I just want to quote into the record the steps that have been taken in order to avoid the building collapsing under weight:

- (a) The demonstrating group must appoint demonstration marshalls and

establish a method by which they can readily be identified, i.e., arm bands.

That seems a little removed from the weight problem.

- (b) Representatives of the demonstrating group must provide assurance that their marshalls shall enforce the guidelines set down by the Saskatchewan Government Services.
- (c) Access to hallways and Legislative Chambers, members' areas and ministerial offices must be kept clear.
- (d) Demonstrators must not attempt to touch, block, or in any way interfere with the actions of elected officials or staff employed in the building.
- (e) No bull horns, portable microphones, or other methods of voice enhancement are to be brought into the building.
- (f) Fire safety regulations regarding maximum numbers of persons present in the area, and fire exit corridors must be complied with.
- (g) The demonstrations and speeches within the Legislative Building are to be concluded once the Legislative Assembly has begun to sit.

All these points, Mr. Chairman, I find very difficult to understand how they apply to the weight load in the rotunda area. I say that the reason these were brought in on November 29 was in light of the fact that there was going to be a demonstration on December 2 by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor. Does the minister not confirm that?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I most certainly do not confirm that because that is not the reason it was brought in. It was signed by the deputy minister on November 14, and the SFL happened to be the first group to demonstrate here after the policy was put in place. I might add, for the benefit of all members, that the points given by the member for Shaunavon are no different than what you people had in place. Demonstrations here are not just willy-nilly, demonstrations are always negotiated — the time they're going to be here, the numbers that they expect to show up. These things are always negotiated.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that not all things made the shredder. And on November 20, 1981, a cabinet agenda item: a request from the former Speaker requested government services to have all demonstrators refrain from entering the Legislative Building.

AN HON. MEMBER: — From the Speaker's office?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — A cabinet agenda item, which you discussed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . The Speaker's office.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Right. And the reason given is the last two openings of the Saskatchewan Legislature have been hampered by demonstrators harassing the opening procession.

I would also like to indicate to the member that on the news one day you said something about them being asked to leave as something new. It isn't something new. Currently it is the policy of government services to have the deputy minister negotiate with groups who wish to participate in a demonstration. Following negotiations, the group wishing to demonstrate is allowed access to the interior of the building. They have been allowed to express their views during the processional ceremonies, but once the House begins to sit they have been asked to leave in accordance with commitments achieved during the negotiation process. So what this policy is, is putting it . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That wasn't our policy.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It was too your policy! It is putting it down on paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I thought you said we didn't have a policy. A minute ago you said we didn't have one.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — You didn't have one written down. This one is written down. This one is written down, and . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where did you read it if it isn't written down?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I'm reading it off your cabinet agenda item of November 20, 1981. I would imagine you guys took them when you took your files.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — It's a little difficult to follow the logic. At one point, not five minutes ago, the minister said that we had no policy; that's why this was developed. Then she proceeds to stand up and read what our policy was. A little confusing. There's a leap in logic here in trying to understand whether we had a policy or didn't have one.

What I'm saying is that (g) on the new policy, "demonstrations and speeches within the Legislative Building are to be concluded once the Legislative Assembly has begun to sit," was never a policy of our government. This is a new policy and has little to do with the weight load in the rotunda area. And I say that it's because of the fear of this government in dealing with demonstrators who come to display their displeasure with the government's policy on various issues. I think that it's obvious that we did have demonstrations that carried on well after the Assembly was in session, and the minister will be well aware of that. And this policy is a departure from what was in place prior to the election on April 26.

The other thing: she refers to a request from the Speaker's office and deals with that as if it's a policy of the New Democratic government. If you have a request from the Speaker's office, the government deals with it. In this case, when the SFL was controlled by police and chains, there was no consultation with the Speaker's office. I'm saying that if there is a concern about the building, that that's where it should come from, the way it did prior to April 26.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — For the member's edification, when you first started this line of questioning, I indicated to you that this is the first written policy of the Department of Government Services. What I read to you before was off a cabinet agenda item dated November 20, 1981 when you were in government. It states that it is the policy of government services to have the deputy minister negotiate with groups. That was your

unwritten policy. What I am saying to you is that this written policy is in fact using a lot of things that were in place before but now it's made public.

I think the member opposite also knows that demonstrators always appoint a marshall. They always negotiate, other than the anti-nuke demonstrations we had here, I believe. Anybody who wants to demonstrate at the Legislative Building has the perfect right to, but they do it in a very orderly fashion. They negotiate either with the deputy minister of government services or a senior official in the department. They will say how long they are going to be here, what time they are coming, and how many people are going to be in attendance.

We negotiated with the SFL. They said, "We will be here at 12:30," and they showed up at 1:15. This policy that we have written, which is similar to what you had unwritten, was accepted by them. After the demonstration period was over, they were invited to come into the minister's offices. They said no and they went back to Moose Jaw. So all I am saying to you is that what we have written down is an accumulation of what has been going on for many, many years. It's not something new and it's not a departure from what has been happening over the years.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that demonstrators who come to the building and find areas chained off know full well that there is a change in policy; that it isn't merely a continuation of something that was in place. The fact that you can no longer have bullhorns, for example, or sound-making devices in the building is a departure from what was there before. The fact that the demonstration has to end when the session begins is a departure from what was there before. It's not very difficult to understand that there is a new policy in terms of demonstrations which are held in the building. If you are trying to deny that, it's going to be very, very difficult to convince the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor that they are treated the same by this government as they were by the previous government. We can argue all night as to whether there is a new policy or not, but I can tell you when they came into the building in the past they were able to circulate at will as they should be able to in the seat of government. I think this argument could go on a long time. The demonstrators who came to the building for the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor demonstration found a different policy than what they were used to.

Question to the minister. Can you inform me who negotiated the demonstration that occurred with the Land Bank Tenants' Association?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The deputy.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can you tell me what process was carried out, who the deputy negotiated with, what kind of correspondence and the individuals he negotiated with?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The deputy met face to face with the president of the Land Bank Tenants' Association and negotiated. And I might also add they were invited inside the building and they said, "No, we prefer to demonstrate on the steps. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And they do it. And as far as your reference to police and chains, the chain or rope or whatever you want to call it leaves an access for the public, other than the demonstrators, to have access to the building and for fire safety. You have to keep a lane clear. As far as the police are concerned, they are Wascana police and they attend every demonstration. They attended every demonstration under your administration. They're always here.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister tell me the name of the person the deputy met with and what time and what day the meeting took place?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Nine o'clock in the morning the day of the demonstration. The deputy and the president met down in the cafeteria here in the building. The name escapes him and it escapes me too.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I want to congratulate the minister for abandoning a disastrous policy. I don't expect you to respond to this but I think you have abandoned the policy of restricting access to this building. It was symbolic that the chains disappeared after the protest and were replaced by a rope. I think that was symbolic. I think the federation of labor will be the last group who will ever be denied access to this building. As my colleague said, I've seen the weight of 450 people in Kentucky fried chicken in demonstrators out in that hall. That's without a word of a lie. There have been thousands of people out there. And I predict, Madam Minister, we have seen the last of the chains and we have seen the last of a policy which restricts the right of demonstrators to access to this building. I'll make that prediction that we have seen the last of it, and I want to congratulate you in showing enough good sense to get rid of the policy when it clearly was disastrous.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't know where you got your information because the policy that is set down has been used twice now and it will be used with anybody that wants to demonstrate at the building . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, how can you restrict people? They have access to the building. That's only, they're restricted — the area the demonstrators can be is restricted just during the time frame that they have negotiated that they will be here. Now if the galleries are empty and they want to come into question period after their demonstration, they're more than welcome to come. If they want to wander down the halls and see some of the ministers, they can come. But what I'm saying to you is that you knew in 1979 the possible hazard that was out there, and you did nothing. And the member for Regina Centre snickers. It's no laughing matter, my dear.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let's leave that subject and get on to one of your other striking successes, the purchase of the Nimbus water purifiers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I say let's leave that subject and get on to one of your other striking successes, the purchase of the Nimbus water purifiers. I have a series of questions. They will be short at the beginning.

Who placed the order for the purchase of the water purifiers?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The associate deputy minister of government services, who is now the acting deputy minister.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — His name is?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Cousineau.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Did Mr. Laidlaw play any role in the purchase of the Nimbus purifiers?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Well obviously Mr. Laidlaw was acting deputy for me for some time before Mr. Cousineau took over, and of course he knew about it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Laidlaw placed the order for the purchase of the purifiers?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Cousineau placed the order for the purifiers.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What role did Mr. Laidlaw play in this affair then?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — As acting deputy, Mr. Laidlaw was informed and it was discussed and concurred in. Mr. Cousineau, in his capacity as acting associate, placed the order; Mr. Laidlaw himself didn't.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Your present — deputy or acting deputy? — acting deputy signed the order?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That is correct.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — At whose request were the Nimbus purifiers purchased?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The purifiers were put in at my request. The decision to select Nimbus was made by the associate deputy minister at that time, after evaluating several systems that are on the market.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Were tenders called for the purchase of these purifiers?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, they weren't.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is it still your position that that is within the dictates of The Purchasing Act?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The associate deputy deemed it a specialty item and because I requested it they pursued it and this is what we have.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am fascinated to know that any deputy minister has the authority to deem something to be a specialty item. I thought (and I read the regulations), but I thought that was defined in the regulations. If your deputy deemed them . . . Are you saying he consulted the regulations? Are you saying he just woke up one morning and decided "It's a nice day to decide these are specialty items and away I go"? On what basis did he decide they were specialty items?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — On the technical points of the various types out. There are about three or four different types of filtration systems out, some requiring large storage units, some requiring whatever (the electric thing). He knew that we wanted them in the coffee areas and in the offices. It's compact; it's relatively maintenance free, and he made the decision.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You must jest, Madam Minister. These things can be purchased off the shelf. Any number of people make purifiers. You must jest when you suggest that any purifier is so unusual with respect to its capacity that it has to be a specialty item. You must jest. These things can be bought off the shelf.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No. I do not jest, because there is no reverse osmosis system available in package form anywhere in Regina that would fit under the sink.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Did the need to have pure water for visiting dignitaries play any role in your decision?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes it did.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you saying this is the only system that could provide pure water for the visiting dignitaries?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, but I indicated to you before that is the only type that would fit under the sinks that are in the building now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — All right, so it was because they would fit under the sinks that we bought the Nimbus system? Is that the answer?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We bought them because they were a reverse osmosis type that would be placed underneath the sinks, and they are maintenance free, I might add.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is the definition of a specialty item in the regulations passed pursuant to The Purchasing Act?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't have the regulations here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is your deputy aware of what a specialty item is under regulations of The Purchasing Act?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The deputy has indicated that he wasn't well versed in regulations at the time but he has boned up on them since.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I'll bet he has taken time to find out since he got you into all this trouble. We are going to pursue this a little further in revenue, supply and services. I say to you that any deputy of government services who doesn't know the basic rules of The Purchasing Act is going to get this minister into trouble really quickly, just as yours did. I would suggest that if he is acting deputy minister, he find out what The Purchasing Act says.

I may say that if it had been an error — an honest mistake on the part of a new official — I would have understood that and I think I would have not have made the fuss about it that I did. What bothered me about it was your attempt to defend what was clearly an illegal purchase, because there is an important principle involved and that is that items which are bought should be tendered wherever possible.

The regulations of The Purchasing Act have been the subject of years of refinement. I am not upset about the fact that a mistake was made, although I don't believe that it just by chance happened to go to Ross Reibling. I don't believe that for a moment. I am coming to expect that of this government and I would have not got so upset if you would have admitted, Madam Minister, that a mistake was made but that The Purchasing Act will be followed consistently and throughout. And what bothered me about the whole

affair was your attempt to defend the indefensible.

I am going to be getting into this again in revenue, supply and services, because that's really the area it comes in. Your deputy minister of government services should not have been purchasing the purifiers are all. The other deputy should have been doing it because you're also Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services. I want to get on to a different subject. I'll get back to that in revenue, supply and services.

I want some information, and if your officials have it, that's fine. If you want to supply it in writing that will do as well. I want to know the amount of new space, not the net difference, but I want to know what new space you have leased since May 8, 1972. May 8, 1982, sorry. What new space you have leased, and please be clear, I'm not asking for the difference. I want to know what additional places you leased, the square footage of the same, the rate per square foot of the same, and the entities from whom the space is leased.

You may have anticipated the question and have it ready. You may not have, and if you haven't, it will suffice if you undertake to give it to me in writing.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Do you want the renewals too or just the new space?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I do not need the renewals, just any new additional space that you've leased and the information I've asked for.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We'll get that information over to you as soon as possible. It might not be available tonight, by the way.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So long as it's as soon as reasonably possible, it doesn't have to be this evening.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, the member for Regina Centre was bringing up the tendering practices. While a member in opposition, I was continually asking about the tendering practices as well. And during that time there was a building called Saskatchewan House, and I understand we in the opposition were waiting for an answer (was it tendered or not tendered), and we believe that in those days it was not tendered and brought it before the former government. Could the minister now give us the answer when I've waited almost a year for it.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I can indicate to the member that in the estimates of 1979, the new Attorney General asked the minister of youth and culture about the restoration of the territorial administration building and specifically asked if the projects were tendered. And if so, was the successful bidder the high bid or the low bid, and the then minister of youth and culture answered. "Yes, it was tendered, and yes the low bidder got it . . ." That was not exactly accurate because it happened to be a multimillion dollar cost-plus contract that wasn't tendered.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The minister is misrepresenting the situation. That was a question asked in question period. The information was inaccurate, and it was corrected later on. If you will check the estimates you will find out that the member was provided with the information he requested. The building was not tendered. We never claimed it was. It was an historical property being restored along historical lines, for which no contractor would accept any contract except cost plus.

The member was told that, and I resent that sort of misrepresentation. I remember getting into a long argument with the member for Rosthern about this, about whether or not we should be tendering buildings like the Saskatchewan House. That's an honest argument. The information which was just attempted to put before this House frankly falls a little short of that standard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member for Regina Centre asked for a point of privilege. I think that it's more to do with facts than privilege. I don't think it is well taken. The member for Rosthern.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, the former government can make all the accusations they want. I have one advantage by not sitting on the treasury benches with the present government, but I was a critic of this department in opposition, and I had questions that never came and I'm attempting to get my answers after all the work I've put in. I think I have that right, unless you want to try to muzzle me that's your choice. In opposition I constantly gave the minister, who was Mr. Snyder at the time, advance information on some questions I was going to ask, and therefore he brought the documents with him. In one case the document was that thick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. You may ask questions of the minister.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, the members next to me seem to be a little . . . Let me go back. There were a couple of other things that I remember while I was in opposition, and one I remember that I never did find out, is when a Mr. Davey Steuart, a former member of this House, and I were speaking one time, there was some indication in Prince Albert that there was a building to be named after him. I asked that question in the House, when the building was brought forward: was there a policy, or was there not? I was also informed through my own sources that — sorry — I was informed then that there was supposedly no policy and yet I understood from talking to people in Prince Albert that the building in P.A. called, I believe, the McIntosh Mall, was to be named the Davey Steuart something or other, and I would ask the minister if she is aware of that and is there a policy or isn't there a policy in government services on naming buildings?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — There isn't a policy per se within government services. I believe that the general accepted policy is that government members have an input into naming of government buildings. As far as the McIntosh Mall is concerned, one of the former members did suggest that the McIntosh Mall be named the Davey Steuart Building, but some members objected to it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the information that I had received was that McIntosh was supposed to be Steuart, but somehow got changed around to another name, which was the way it was done in those days. Is that correct?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's difficult for me to answer that question because I wasn't part of the . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to get a little more information with respect to the minister's personal staff. The executive director of operation is J.C. Law. I just wanted to ask the minister whether J.C. Law was in fact executive director when she assumed the office as minister?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — He was transferred from revenue to government services on

December 16, 1982

September 8.

MR. KOSKIE: —

And the acting associate deputy minister at 4,628 a month, could you indicate who that is? We don't have the name of the acting associate deputy minister. I'd like to know who that person is and could you indicate if he is a Saskatchewan boy?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's a position within government services, but there's no one in that position right now.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to the executive director of property and planning at 4972, could you indicate who is filling that position at the present time?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Don Nevill, sitting behind me on the right.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to know if the minister could indicate: do any of the minister's staff and which ones are assigned the CVA vehicles, if indeed they are, and whether her special assistant is also assigned a CVA car.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Did you say personal staff within the building here, or downtown? The only people in government services who have assigned cars are myself and my deputy on the executive.

MR. KOSKIE: — I was thinking in respect to your personal staff. Are any of your personal staff assigned a CVA vehicle?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question to put to you again. You may answer in writing if you like. I'm trying to exclude the trifling contracts. With respect to capital projects over \$50,000. I would like to know if you could tell me those contracts which were overspent and those contracts which were underspent — if you could give me a list of contracts over \$50,000 which was underspent and those which were overspent — spent less than what was budgeted, like, came in under budget.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We'll take notice of the question and supply you with the response.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister. I have a number of questions essentially about the current state of proposed construction projects. I will just start down the list. With respect to the proposed archives building at Regina, can you tell me the current state of that project, by which I mean are plans complete, has a site been selected, have tenders been called?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The design is about 90 per cent done, and it's the Ikoy architectural firm here in Regina. The site hasn't been resolved, and the decision to proceed or not to proceed will be addressed to the '83-84 budget.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, do I understand the minister to say that the plans are nearing completion, being prepared by Ikoy architectural firm, in the Regina office of Ikoy, that the site has not yet been resolved, and that whether or not tenders will be called will be probably indicated by the 1983-84 budget. Did I understand it correctly?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, the site is picked but the location for the building, that's the problem right now, I think. We are trying to decide whether to have it on Cathedral corner or a different corner. The design is being done by Ikoy.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the site, you say that the piece of ground has been selected, if I understand you correctly. The location of the building on that particular plot has not been selected. Would you tell me where the piece of ground is?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The site is the Qu'Appelle Diocese on the corner of Broad and College.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I refer now, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, to the rehabilitation centre, the proposed rehabilitation centre, and I ask the same questions. Are the plans complete; has a site been selected; and have tenders been called?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Government services is not responsible for the rehab. Health is doing that themselves.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I will ask then, am I to understand that the Department of Health will be tendering that, if it is tendered?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I would assume so. Government services has never been involved in the proposed rehab centre.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I will just get this established, and I don't think I am in any doubt about what you are saying. The Department of Government Services has not been approached in order to assist in the preparation of plans and assist in the site selection, or to take any steps with respect to calling for tenders with respect to the proposed rehabilitation centre.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It has been discussed, but we have not assisted them.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn now to the proposed provincial laboratory, the new provincial lab, and ask whether or not plans are completed; whether a site has been selected; and whether tenders have been called.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The proposed provincial lab is in the very, very early stages. There is a significant siting problem. The site selected by the previous administration near the Plains Hospital — the infrastructure that would be required to put the lab there would be extremely costly, I think in the neighborhood of millions of dollars, and there is no guarantee that we would have an assured water supply there. And right now we are negotiating with the Department of Health to look at several alternative sites.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Do I understand the minister to say that a site adjacent to the Plains Hospital has, at least tentatively, been rejected for the provincial lab?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It hasn't been rejected but it hasn't been accepted either.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Is the minister in any position to give us a date on which it is likely that a decision will be made on the provincial lab, to proceed with, to tender?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, I cannot give you a date at this time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I now turn to the University of Saskatchewan and to the geology building at the University of Saskatchewan.

It is my understanding that the Department of Government Services plays a role in the construction of buildings at the University of Saskatchewan. Could the minister advise me of the role played by the Department of Government Services in the construction of major buildings at the University of Saskatchewan?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The only role government services plays in the universities is that we do look at the plans submitted to us by continuing education. We have indicated to them that the geological building can proceed to working drawings if funds are available.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I understand the minister to say that the Department of Government Services has approved the plans to the extent that they can proceed to working drawings and this approval on behalf of the government which, as I understand it, approves these buildings by order in council. Am I right in saying that the Department of Government Services has approved the plans to the extent that they may go forward to working drawings?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That is correct.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, could the minister advise me approximately when this approval was given by the Department of Government Services?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's just a matter of days since that was sent back to continuing education.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Not very many days ago is what you're telling me. I'm puzzled by that. Mr. Chairman and Mrs. Minister, are these plans significantly different than the plans previously approved by the department on behalf of the government some considerable time ago?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I'm not sure if I understand your question correctly. Government services, when we look at the preliminary drawings, and say whether they can go ahead or not . . . This is the first time that that building was given approval to this stage. It's the first time it came to government services department.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn to the technical institute in Moose Jaw, and my question to the minister is: what contracts have been let with respect to the technical institute at Moose Jaw; what construction contracts, if any, have been let since May 1, 1982?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That contract was let prior to May 8, and it went to a Winnipeg firm, Gateway Construction.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — And do I understand the minister to say that since May 1, 1982 no contracts have been let with respect to the Moose Jaw technical institute other than perhaps very small contracts? No significant construction contract has been let?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, that contract was in place when we took over on May 8. Yes. And . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no. I mean they are doing the building so . . .

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I'm happy that the minister appreciates that. On a goodly number of occasions I have heard this particular project being taken credit for by members opposite, and I just wanted to make the point that notwithstanding its frequent announcement by the current Premier, it was the previous premier who dug some dirt and one thing and another in connection with it. Just making that point.

With respect to the courthouse in Regina, the intended expansion of the courthouse at Regina . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's next. With respect to the intended expansion of the courthouse at Regina, could the minister advise whether or not plans are completed; whether or not a site has been selected; and whether or not tenders have been let?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The plans are not completed and the site has not been finalized, and the decision is at cabinet right now.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I saw a news story a few days ago which quoted the minister as follows:

“Expansion of the Saskatoon and Regina courthouses could be part of the province's new lease-purchase approach to the government's acquisition of office space,” Revenue Minister Joan Duncan said this week.

The story goes on to suggest that the courthouses might be built by private groups and leased by the government for the purposes of the courthouse needs of the government. Can the minister advise whether any consideration has been given to a rent-to-own system for either the courthouse at Regina or at Saskatoon?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The rent-to-buy or lease-purchase is an option that was analyzed by officials in my department, and as I indicated before, is at cabinet right now. That's about all I can say on it. It is an option and there are several alternatives, and that's one of them.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — What conceivable argument can be mounted for lease-purchase or rent-to-own of courthouses? One can indeed possibly mount an argument (I think it's a bad argument) for an office building, on the ground that if you don't use the office building someone else can use it. With respect to a courthouse, is it reasonably supposed that anybody would build a courthouse other than on a lease which gave them a complete return? Is there any likely other tenant for a courthouse than the Government of Saskatchewan?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Lease-purchase is an option, as I indicated. Somehow we have to provide buildings for government. This is, we feel, a better alternative than building them ourselves. Ownership eventually reverts to us, and the buildings are constructed on specific specification as put out by our department. We think that virtually any building can be built on a lease-purchase arrangement. There is one advantage, too. Instead of whacking out \$50 million in one short period or one or two years, the people who will be using these buildings over the length of a lease are actually contributing their taxes and actually paying for the use of the building.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: —Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I would have thought that this was somewhere close to the ultimate, until I recalled that in Newfoundland the legislative building was owned privately and the government leased it for a while. I

wondered whether there were any plans perhaps to sell this building and then we could lease it back and then the people could pay their taxes on an annual basis for the use of this building, which presumably will go on for some time to come.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, I don't think you will have to worry about us selling the legislature, but are you suggesting we do?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I think we'll attempt to get that commitment in writing, but perhaps not tonight.

With respect to courthouses, my point, Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, is that there is no prospect of anyone building a courthouse and leasing it to you, except on lease terms which guarantee to him total recovery. He is not going to ever take the chance of that being vacant. Unlike an office building, where someone might build you lease space on a 10-year firm lease and thinking that at the end of 10 years if he can't lease it to the government he can lease it to someone else and he's broken the back of his capital costs by then, no one is going to lease a courthouse on that basis. Because the alternative uses for courthouses are not obvious.

Accordingly, at the outset, you are going to have to enter into a contractual arrangement with guarantees that the government pays 100 per cent of the cost of that courthouse for sure. The only difference is whether or not you pay it when you build it or pay it when you rent it. There are possibly tax considerations with respect to the private owner, but the overwhelming cost of a building like that is the capital cost. There's no doubt it's not the operating cost of a courthouse but the capital cost of putting one up that is the nub of the problem.

It cannot be justified that it be private unless you can show me that private people can raise money cheaper than the Government of Saskatchewan. Otherwise, how can it possibly be economically sound to get a courthouse on a rent-to-own basis rather than on a total ownership basis.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — All I can say, as I indicated before, it is an alternative. It is one of many, and we are looking at it. I think we will be looking at every building we, as a government, will have to have down the road. This is one of the options we are looking at. I didn't say it would be accepted or rejected. I said it was one option rather than owning it yourself.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn now to the courthouse at Saskatoon and ask the same questions. Perhaps I will ask a preliminary question there. Is an expansion of the courthouse at Saskatoon or a replacement for the courthouse at Saskatoon in the planning stage?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's at cabinet also.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to that, what decision is before cabinet? I am not asking you what the cabinet decision is, but with some particularity, what is being asked — shall we build one, or to whom will we let the tender, or shall we do it on rent-to-own, or what?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I think the former premier knows that cabinet documents are confidential. I can't answer that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, I will direct my questions to the minister then, not as to what is at cabinet, but what is the policy of the government? Has the government, in the planning stage, a proposal for expanding or replacing the Saskatoon Courthouse.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Has an architect been commissioned?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, an architect has been commissioned — a Saskatoon firm.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Could you give the name of the firm of architects?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Forrester, Scott, Bowers and Walls.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The Forrester firm. Has a site been selected, Madam Minister?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The site is being reviewed at this time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Do the instructions to the architect involve an addition to the existing courthouse or a new courthouse?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We're looking at two alternatives — an addition and/or a new one.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, I refer to the matter of accessibility standards and would ask the minister whether she can tell us what projects to make government buildings accessible to the handicapped have been proceeded with by the government in the last six or seven months?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — School for the Deaf, Saskatoon, to provide enclosed lift on the outside building and handicapped-accessible main floor washroom; STI in Moose Jaw, handicap accessibility completed; Saskatchewan Valleyview Hospital in Weyburn has been completed; the WIAAS Parkway completed; WIAAS south Albert is in progress; St. John Street campus, WIAAS, is completed; Gordon Building, Regina for the Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan completed. North Park Centre, Saskatoon, completed; and we're in the second stage, too. Yorkton Courthouse was completed and as I indicated earlier on, those type of accessibility standards will be . . . Oh, pardon me, it is slated for '83, the Yorkton Courthouse. Right. It's slated for '83.

And it's just an ongoing program. Of course, you do the areas where you have the highest concentration of population first and then spread out.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . I find out from the minister about North Park Centre in Saskatoon and exactly what is that?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — . . . (inaudible) . . . Prince Albert, pardon me.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — On the courthouse in Gravelbourg, can you tell me how many square feet are being rented for the minority language office?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We don't have that information, but we will get it to you.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Maybe in getting that information, you could get me the square footage that is rented in the Gravelbourg Courthouse as well as the cost of that area.

Moving to the P.A. tech the minister will be well aware that the previous government had made a commitment of some millions of dollars toward the construction of a facility that would house about 450 students and, through Outreach, would have served about 1,500 others. Can the minister tell me whether or not plans are moving ahead on that project and whether an architect has been hired to carry out the design of the building?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we have Tomporowski, Taylor and Moore as a consortium on that project . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Tomporowski, Taylor and Moore. I believe they're in Prince Albert. It's a consortium of firms in Prince Albert that got together on it, and they're under contract to government services.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister inform me whether a site has been chosen for the building and, if so, where?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we have the site in Prince Albert.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — When does the minister expect the sod turning to take place? Can you give us any indication of a time frame — January, February, March, during 1983?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We are a long way away from design completion. It is quite a massive building: you know what technical schools are like; they are not just something you can design quickly. And I might add also, it is at cabinet, and I'm sure the Minister of Continuing Education will invite you to the sod turning.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister is then saying she doesn't anticipate a sod turning for that P.A. tech in the near future — January, February?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, we don't.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister inform me about a job creating program — I believe, and I don't just see it right offhand — worth approximately \$5 million? Can you give me a bit of detail on the program?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The government services share of that \$5 million is approximately \$700,000, and we propose to spend it throughout the province in different areas. I can give you a few examples if you like. Some money will be spent in Glaslyn; some money will be spent in Porcupine Plain; we are going to be doing some work on the Centre of the Arts, and that type of thing.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The projects we have talked about tonight in looking at what the previous government had budgeted in provincial development expenditures — the provincial lab, the Saskatchewan archive building, the expansion of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Moose Jaw — the total was some \$17 million, and in looking at your budget it's \$2.9 million, or a reduction in the area of \$14 million. It seems difficult to explain that you would cut \$14 million out of significant programs, and announce a \$5 million program, and expect anyone to believe that this is a great wondrous announcement that's going to create more jobs than what there were before?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — You said our capital expenditure was \$2 million. I would indicate that even if you take out the \$5 million our capital expenditure budget is still in excess of \$15 million

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister inform me whether or not there are any plans to build a new government building at La Loche at the present time?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's not within our jurisdiction. That part of DNS doesn't come to us until January 1.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — These estimates are until March 31. Are there any plans once you can take over that operation, between January 1 and March 31, for a government building at La Loche?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That is not normally the construction period in northern Saskatchewan. I could probably say with confidence that nothing will be built there between now and March 31.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think that in all the questions that we have been asking for the last 15 minutes we have been talking about plans, drawing and technical work being done. I don't think we are going to do a lot of construction on any of them. Can you tell me whether or not there are any design plans or a location then for a government building in La Loche?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — To our knowledge, we don't know of any plans but we can check with DNS.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister will then send me a note on that, if in fact there are plans? On the Cypress Hills development, can the minister inform me what projects have been cancelled since April 26 in the department that were planned and scheduled to be studied or the technical work done on this past summer?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's all tourism, not government services.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the budget of March that the previous government had planned, in the Department of Government Services there was \$3 million scheduled for capital expenditure in the Cypress Hills Park. I'm wondering if you can tell me which of those projects have been cancelled, because I believe at the present time there is \$80,000 in that area to be spent this year.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — In the proposed March budget there was stuff in government services for tourism, but it was given back to tourism to be a decision on them and they haven't let us know. I believe at Cypress Hills right now they're building a new sewage treatment plant and pumping station and that type of thing. I think the member is aware of the perennial water problem out there and the proposed \$10 million expansion was. I must say, never well accepted down there.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I think we can debate whether or not the expansion at Cypress Hills was accepted or not. I know it was in Shaunavon during the April 26th election.

But when you say that there is no money in your department for tourism. I see under subvote 9, tourism and renewable resources, in your budget \$1.6 million. Can you explain to me how you can have no money for tourism and yet have \$1.6 million?

December 16, 1982

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That money doesn't relate to Cypress Hills. That's for the fish hatchery at Fort Qu'Appelle.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the area of the Cypress Hills development, you can't inform me which projects were in your department? This is what I'm asking. Which projects were in your department which have been either moved to tourism or cancelled, which were ready to go and on the drawing boards?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I can only indicate to the member that the proposed programs that we were to take care of for tourism have gone back to tourism. We don't handle it anymore.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — That's what I want to know. What were those proposed projects?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — You would have to talk to tourism because we don't have the status of those.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a number of questions which are really wanting information and not any particular point of disagreement between the minister and I. Were there any contracts let which were not tendered?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Not that we're aware of, no.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you supply me with a list of the capital projects that you have in your budget, the nature of the project, its estimated cost and any changes in the project since May 8, 1982? I don't expect you to get up and recite that, but if you would supply that in writing?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we'll supply it in writing.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you undertake to supply me with a list of all vacant space: the location of the facility; the person from who the facility is leased; if it is leased or, if it is owned, an indication of that; the size and the cost of the vacant space; and the reason why it's vacant?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we'll supply you with that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have any of the projects which were planned by your department been cancelled since May 8, 1982? If so, I would like a list of them with the same detail.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we'll supply you with that information also.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are there any plans to change from the maintenance of the building? I'm phrasing this very poorly. If the minister will bear with me, are there any plans to contract out maintenance of any government buildings for which we now employ the maintenance staff?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is any serious consideration being given to that? I recognize your department at any time is probably considering everything. But is there any

serious consideration being given to that change?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Maintenance, no. We haven't even talked about it.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Over the session that we've had here, we're referred to vacant space and government lease space. I believe there is a document (a computer printout) that would include all this information. It's a rather involved book, about that thick. Can we get a copy of that? Will you send that to us?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we can get that over to the member for Shaunavon.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the department of DNS there's a portion called project management. Would that be shifted to your department as of January 1, 1983?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, it will.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — All of them, Madam Minister?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Just building services.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I have one short question here on person years. Madam Minister. Can you tell me why the large increase from 535 to 656? And also, why the large increase in non-permanent workers from 104 to 152? I want some clarification on those two items.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That is a result of the realignment of DNS.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The second part of it, why would you, when you are transferring them, transfer them as non-permanent?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — They are labor service people.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, would you provide us, so we won't take the time in the committee, with a list of any employees of the department who are on secondment to any other agency of the government, and any employees of the department who may be hired by contract? That's an odd sort of phrasing but I think we know what we mean: any people who are on personal services contracts with the Department of Government Services? And I'm not now speaking of professional services, but substantially full-time services.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We have no personal services contract in government services, and we have one person seconded from the systems centre working in government services.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Have you anybody who is included in this budget of government services who was seconded to any other agency of government?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — All of them are working at the services included in this vote, or these two votes.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's correct.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mrs. Minister, two other questions that I've always asked in the past . . . I guess I would have to go back, I guess it's 21 months since I've last been able to ask this question before. Have we in the last while given any tenders, sorry, any contracts out to the non-low tender?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, we haven't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, 24 months.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mrs. Minister, the last time that I was able to ask this question must have been 21 months ago approximately, and the minister used to always tell me 12 months prior. So I guess this time I have to ask for 21 months, because that's the last time I had a chance to answer.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — To our knowledge, we have never, in the last 21 months, awarded a tender to anyone other than the low bidder for construction.

MR. KATZMAN: — One other question, Mr. Minister — too used to talking to Gordon Snyder, I guess — Mrs. Minister. Under the former government, there was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Under the former government, the antique furniture, I guess you would call it, was allowed when we first came in '75 in opposition, and then it was not allowed. Is there a policy in place on that antique furniture? Over the years I have noticed that it is being refurbished constantly through this building. Is it contracted out when it is done and do you have any idea how much money the government has been spending on refurbishing all the antique furniture. I guess is the word, rather than the Chamber or something?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The antique furniture is an option for ministers' offices only, and we do the refinishing work ourselves.

MR. KATZMAN: — Madame Minister, I keep hearing rumors of a grandfather clock refurbishing in the government that was rather expensive. I keep hearing past \$5,000 or \$6,000 and I am just wondering if that is correct.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — There is a grandfather clock in the building, an antique one that was refinished.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is the rumor correct that it cost \$5,000 or \$6,000 to refix it?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't have the breakdown but it was part of a larger package of antique furniture that was refinished for a minister's suite. The total price was around \$8,000.

MR. KATZMAN: — A minister's suite?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, for a minister's suite. A minister has the option of having antique furniture in his or her office. Some ministers do have it.

MR. KATZMAN: — To refurbish this particular clock and whatever else was with it cost over \$8,000?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — There were other miscellaneous items with it. It was around

\$8,000 but there were the table and chairs and the clock and different things.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is it tendered out or do we do it ourselves, did you say?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Our own forces do it. We do the refinishing ourselves.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to

Item 3

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Am I correct in assuming that the increase in other expenses, which is fairly hefty, is as a result of your absorption of DNS? Operations administration, subvote 3, we're on

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, it is.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm going to save some time. Am I correct in assuming the same explanation holds true for 4 and 5?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's correct. And 5? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And 5.

Item 3 agreed to.

Item 4

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, item 4, the very substantial increase in personal services again, is that as a result of the absorption of DNS.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's correct.

Item 4 agreed to.

Items 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Item 8

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, a substantial increase in other expenses from \$5.5 million to \$6.2 million . . . Sorry, from 5 million to 7.7 million. Could you give us a brief explanation of that substantial increase?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That would be rents, utilities and taxes, over which on our lease basis, we have no control.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, it goes up by that sum, 50 per cent?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's cleaning, the operating, the maintenance and the

December 16, 1982

additional space to our client tenants. The increase is as a result of the space required by client departments.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Could the minister give us some detail on that, exactly what increases that would be? I notice, just going back for reference to 7, the increase is nowhere near 50 per cent the way it is in 8, and I would believe is nowhere near in 9 as it is in 8. Could you give some detail as to what the increase is?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's contracted space in the MacPherson, Leslie, Tyerman building and the Williams building and accommodation in other locations.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — It would be easiest if the minister would give us a list and a breakdown of that. Could you do that for us?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes, we will.

Item 8 agreed to.

Item 9

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, back to my original question on this legislative area. I assume when the minister is referring (because it is furniture we are refurbishing), and from some side comments I got to my right, by the sound of it we are talking about a cabinet minister's office with a grandfather clock. From the comments made by one member across, we are talking about Mr. Shillington's former office. Is that correct? I'm just going by what was coming across to me sideways.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Well, I indicated the policy is that for those cabinet ministers who desire to have antique furniture in their offices in keeping with the décor of this building that's within their realm of preference. I might say that that particular clock is now in the cabinet room.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not sure how much in order I am. That clock was in my office. I was sitting there one day looking at it when I should have been meeting with someone. I noticed that the clock had an identical beaver to that one on it, and it had lion's feet on the bottom, the same as some of these tables and chairs used to. I asked the Clerk of the Assembly to have a look at it. The Clerk did and eventually discovered that that clock was built and designed for the Chamber, and sat in the Chamber for some 10 years before it was moved to the cabinet office where it sat until the '50s. So, in fact, between the Clerk and me, I think we salvaged an extremely valuable piece of Saskatchewan history. That's how that clock came into being, Madam Minister.

Item 9 agreed to.

Items 10 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 13 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Capital Expenditure — Vote 14

Item 1

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You were going to give me a list of all projects since the estimated expenditure for which had changed May 8, 1962. I assume I will then get explanations as to the changes in all these figures. Is that accurate? When you answer that question, will you answer a series of questions which might well be asked, and that is why the changes in the figures?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — You mean from the proposed March budget? If there's any changes in items 1 to 10? Okay.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

Item 4

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I wonder, in order that we might save the time of the committee, whether the minister would provide me with a breakdown of the projects, all of them let's say over \$100,000, unless someone else has already asked for that. I'm interested in having them. The first big one is item 4, and if someone has asked for that, my apologies; if not, I would like it.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It has been asked and we have said we would furnish that information.

Item 4 agreed to.

Items 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Item 8

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, can the minister indicate why the big change there? Is that one item, or a couple of items that have changed there?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Are you asking for the reasons for the change from the 1981-82, like a big drop? In '81-'82 there were some big projects completed, like the corrections centre, and that's that . . . (inaudible) . . . The proposed March budget allocated \$2,183,000 compared to our \$1,986,200.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I believe our March budget allocated \$4.8 million.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The figure here doesn't reflect the proposed permit or security as proposed in the March budget.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Would that be the total, or would there be work at Moose Jaw that would be included in that as well?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — This figure reflects our forecast and as you are aware, with the construction strike on for this summer, a lot of the work that was to be done didn't get

December 16, 1982

done.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — This doesn't reflect then any projects cancelled at the Valley View institution in Moose Jaw, for example, construction of different types of fire escapes and that type of thing?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, any programs that were identified for Valley View were carried out.

Item 8 agreed to.

Item 9

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have one question that is a standard question of all ministers. Do you have any plans to hire a press agent or a public relations agent who would work with you?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Not at this time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you considering hiring such a person?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Not at this time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You keep saying "at this time."

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I might change my mind and decide I would like to have a press officer. I don't see a need for it at this time.

Item 9 agreed to.

Item 10

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, would the minister send me a list — you mentioned a number of them but I didn't get them all written down — would you send me a list of the projects, locations, and the value of the projects for the \$5 million?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We would be more than pleased to.

Item 10 agreed to.

Vote 14 agreed to.

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 14

Items 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Item 6

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I just want to re-ask a question I asked earlier. This sum does not contain funds for a sod turning before the end of the fiscal year?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Not to my knowledge.

Item 6 agreed to

Item 7 agreed to.

Item 8

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, just a final note on this. It's hard to believe that in the minister's own riding and in our beautiful part of the country in southwest Saskatchewan that we have lost a major development in the Cypress Hills Park. We had anticipated a \$10 million expansion of Cypress Hills which would have included such facilities as a 37-room hotel, a snow machine and a ski lift. We find now that this project is not going ahead. It would not only have served as a destination for many Saskatchewan residents, but also created a large number of jobs in the Swift Current area which is presently experiencing about 100 per cent increase in people looking for work at the Canada Manpower Centre in Swift Current.

I just want to make the point, as a member from that part of the province, the disappointment that is expressed in the lack of the \$3 million which had been in the budget before.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — It's, as I indicated before, gone to tourism, and I might add for the members of this House that the people in my riding do want to see Cypress Hills developed. But no one was too keen on having a \$5.6 million 37-room lodge. What the people of my area would like to see that money go toward is a new golf course and a snow machine and a new pool. We take the view on this side of the House that we are going to increase the recreation facilities at Cypress before we would even consider building a \$5.6 million lodge.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister: is she giving us a commitment here that there will be a pool and a snow machine and a ski lift in place at Cypress in this fiscal year?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I can't give a commitment for tourism at all.

Item 8 agreed to

Vote 14 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 13

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Item 6

December 16, 1982

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, actually it's on no. 5 but if the minister wouldn't mind, I would like to have included in the list that she was sending for the Regina west district the \$70,000 as well for this project or increase.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Agreed.

Item 6 agreed to.

Vote 13 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

LABOR

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 20

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the Minister of Labor introduce his officials.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to introduce to the Chamber Mr. Peter Grady, the acting deputy minister, Pat More, director of administration, Merran Twigg, director of women's division, Don Goss, policy and planning — Don's at the back — and Mans Crozier, director of pensions.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I want to ask a question or two about the operations of the minimum wage board, but they may deal with some other agencies so I will ask them on the admin vote here. Have you received a recommendation for an increase in minimum wage from the minimum wage board?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Chairman, I advised a member during question period that we are preparing some recommendations for cabinet now and will be looking at that package and those recommendations in the next week or two.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, is it true that you have received a recommendation from the minimum wage board more than three months ago?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It would be two to three months ago, yes.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There's a series of questions we're asking all ministers. It is the name, salary, length of your deputy minister, any contractual benefits which may be accrued to him in addition to his salary — any perks, as we call them. You may supply this in writing if you choose. I don't particularly need this orally, but I would like this information ready — his salary, any other contractual benefits which may accrue to him in addition to the salary and in addition to the vehicle with which deputy ministers are traditionally supplied.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The answer is no, that he is just on a basic salary, and we have a list of the salaries of the people in my department that I could send over for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Okay, why don't you send them over there?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — May I introduce one of my people, Mr. John Alderman, the inspector of mines and with the occupation health division. Sorry, John.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I will be asking for the same information for your personal staff, Mr. Minister. Again, every minister has been asked for it. Most have had it in writing. I assume you probably do and I assume you will send it over.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, that's right. We have it for our staff in the legislature here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to your policy, planning and research branch, are there any positions vacant in this branch? For your information, I will also be asking if there are any vacant positions or any such positions that have been frozen.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have four vacancies in the policy planning area at the present time and none of the positions are actually frozen, if we feel the need to fill them.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you have any positions which are frozen in your department?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, there are not.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are there any plans to expand or contract the operations of policy, planning and research?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — To answer your question before, there are some frozen positions in the branch but not in the department. Or vice-versa, pardon me.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You don't have the information readily available so you may supply it in writing. I see your deputy nodding his head, so perhaps you want to supply in writing a list of the positions which are frozen.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, we have the list of the positions that are frozen.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are there any plans to expand or contract the operations of policy, planning and research?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Right at the present time, no.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What were the reasons for the dismissal of the former deputy minister?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The former deputy minister was on secondment from the Saskatchewan potash corporation and he would have been going back to the corporation within a few more months so we made the move now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, let me rephrase the question. Was the choice his to leave at the time?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I will ask you the same question with respect to Mr. Sass. Why was Mr. Sass dismissed?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We felt that the executive directors level of people that we released was not required. We wanted to make some organizational changes to the department and we decided to let that group of people go.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, have you abolished his position? Is that what you're saying? You don't need his position?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, the position hasn't been abolished but it's not going to be an executive director's position when we fill it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, what is it going to be then? What is it going to be?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Specifically, Mr. Sass's position was an associate deputy minister and we are not intending to fill that position.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are looking at restructuring the entire department, and there's going to be some changes made.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Was Mr. Sass given the option of remaining in the department and of continuing to work with the occupational health program?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Will Mr. Sass be working in it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Was he given the option of continuing to work in the department with the occupational health and safety?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, he was not.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why not?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Because I want to have a group of people who are with me that I can have confidence in, in carrying out our wishes.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you feel that Mr. Sass was against you?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — All I can say, sir, is that when you're putting a team together there are professionals, but there are professionals who could sell a General Motors car, and there are professionals who could sell a lot of cars. I wanted the person who was going to work with me on the things that we wanted to work on.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Did you feel that Mr. Sass couldn't sell occupational health and safety?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — He could sell occupational health and safety, certainly, but there are lots of other people who could sell occupational health and safety also.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you just be specific and explain to me the particular shortcomings in Mr. Sass that resulted in your feeling that you couldn't work with him?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I have known Mr. Sass for some time, and the people in the

executive directors group and the associate deputy minister I felt would not fit into the plans that I had as a Minister of Labor. I wanted to get my own people in, just as the former Minister of Government Services was saying, we wanted to have our own people in place.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There was no other reason, just a desire by you to have your own people? There was no other reason for it than that? He exhibited no shortcomings in the position that you can name for me. He discharged his duties in an exemplary fashion. You just wanted your own man. Is that what you're telling me?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, it is.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You're telling me that you brought the career of a dedicated public servant to an end who had performed (and you just finished saying this) his duties in an exemplary fashion, because you wanted your own man. Is that what you are telling this House?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — There are people that I can get into place who are going to carry out the wishes of the department as well, if not better, than the people who were there before. We have no intention of hurting the occupational health department or any of the departments in the Department of Labor.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You're admitting, Mr. Minister, that there was something personal between you and Mr. Sass. Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, I'm not saying that. Another reason is, when I reviewed the records, I found out that he was outside of the province most of the time speaking to people from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, did you ask him whether or not he was doing so with the consent of and on the instructions of his minister or deputy? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you complained that he was outside the province a good deal. Did you ask him whether or not he was doing so with the consent of and on the instructions of his superiors?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — All I know is that I have a list every month of the people that are travelling outside the province, and on checking that for the last several years, this is what we discovered.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have you received any complaints from trade unions with respect to the dismissal of Mr. Sass?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, we had a number of letters from trade unions across the country.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have you received any complaints from any employer groups with respect to the dismissal of Mr. Sass?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I can't recall that many. There may have been one or two, but there was some that congratulated us for doing it, also.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, and isn't that the reason why Mr. Sass was dismissed? It was because he was worshipped by the trade unions and in fact was despised by

management. Isn't that why he was dismissed? You felt he was just simply too pro-union for your style of government.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, that's not true. We'll take exception to that. That is not true whatsoever.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm going to leave it for the moment. I suspect I can continue to say that black is black and you can say that black is white. We may not agree upon the subject. I want to register, Mr. Minister, in the strongest possible terms my disapproval of the dismissal of that man. He had pioneered occupational health and safety in a fashion which had made this province the leader, and had saved the lives and the health of countless numbers of Saskatchewan workers. To have dismissed him for what I allege, Mr. Minister, are personal reasons . . . You said you didn't want to work with him and I suspect that's the truth. To have dismissed this man for personal reasons, a man who had done so much for the workers in Saskatchewan, is making a scant contribution to the labor field of Saskatchewan.

I want to ask you about the . . . I'm not sure if I've asked you this. I think I did. Have you any plans for a public relations or a press officer in your office?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I already have one. It's on the list.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have not had an opportunity to review this since we got it. Where on this list is the press officer listed? I'm sure it's there. I just don't see the words "press officer" on the list.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It's the seventh one down on the list.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The seventh one down on my list is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The seventh name on my list is Cliff Magen. I'm surprised to hear that he's your press officer, actually. I wonder if we could just save time if you could just give me the answer in writing. I don't particularly need it orally. If you could just give me in writing his name and salary.

I would like, Mr. Minister, from you an explanation for the delay in raising the minimum wage. I would like your explanation for the lengthy delay in increasing the minimum wage. As you know, the opposition has been very upset about it. I think that, in fact, we haven't gone out of our way to conceal it from you. I would appreciate your explanation.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I've been getting a lot of letters and that from people around the province saying that we shouldn't do it. They are afraid of the impact on the business community now with the recession the way it is. This is why we have been holding off, but that's not saying that we will not act on it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, don't those on minimum wage suffer from inflation the same as those who are above minimum wage?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I agree with you, but a job is better than no job at all.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you have any evidence, Mr. Minister, that an increase in the minimum wage results in a decrease in employment? Is there any evidence to support that theory?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have had letters from business saying that if the minimum wage goes up they'll have to lay off one more person. I've had quite a number of letters from businesses saying that if the minimum wage goes up they will have to lay off one more person; quite a number of letters stating that and with some of the statistics that we are hearing, it is truly a fact.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The province for many years, for some years, has had the highest minimum wage in Canada, and we have had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, and I wonder if that suggests anything to the minister opposite.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, that's why we don't need to change. We'll leave it the same.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I suspect, Mr. Minister, I should give you high marks for integrity, because I suspect that is the honest answer. It has nothing to do with saving jobs. It has to do with the fact that you believe the minimum wage is now too high and you're waiting for events and inflation to catch up. And I want to congratulate the minister on a candid answer because I suspect he just gave me the real reason why you haven't increased it. You think it's too high as it is.

I had better get on to a suggestion that I think was made for the Minister of Labor. I think it was a good one and I want your reaction to it. Those involved in dealing with the labor relations board, by and large the legal profession, have suggested that decisions of the labor relations board should be published and indexed so that they are available to members of the legal profession the same as the decisions of court are. I saw the suggestion made to the Minister of Labor, I think it was at the annual meeting of the Law Society of Saskatchewan. I wonder if this idea has been considered and if you have any reaction to it. It would make the work of lawyers dealing with the labor relations board so much better, and I think it would improve the law relating to labor law in Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We haven't had a submission to our office at this time but it's something that we would consider.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I put it no harder than that. I wish the department would consider it. I don't think it would be costly and it was requested by the Law Society of Saskatchewan and it would make quite a contribution to the development of labor law in this province. It's a highly esoteric topic that I don't expect is going to start rioting in the streets, but I wish that the department would seriously consider it.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Chairman, I'm led to believe that there are decisions. There are volumes 1 and 2 out now on decisions, and volume 3 is close to being available.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let me just ask you, Mr. Minister. Are they published on a regular basis, annually, biannually, or every six months, or are you publishing a compendium of the decisions to date, without any regular publishing schedule?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — What is being practised at the moment is that it's 10-year volumes; '44 to 1954 is volume 1, and volume 2 is '52 to '64; volume 3 is up to '75.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, what I was suggesting, was something a little more timely than that — periodic publishings at least once a year. My understanding is that that is

now available from Alberta. And I raise that because I know your deputy minister's background and I wonder if that's been considered here?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well I'm aware that Alberta is doing it, but it's from the private sector in Alberta. As I have said before, it will be considered.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't particularly like dwelling on such things, but they stand in sharp contrast to your treatment of minimum wage people. I wonder if you would give me the rate of remuneration of . . . I wonder if you would first of all give me the names of the chairman and the members of the labor relations board? Have one of the pages bring it over.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — There have been no changes to the board itself. The chairman is the only change. We'll get that list for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm going to use these figures publicly because I'm going to complain about it, Mr. Minister. Would you give me the rate of remuneration of the former incumbent?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The basic salary was \$35,000. There is no change. The expenses were increased from \$250 a day to \$500 a day.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — How do you justify the 100 per cent increase in the per diem, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — That's what we had to negotiate to get our new chairman.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Were there any alternatives who would have come at say, let's pick a figure out of the air, an increase consisting of 1 per cent less than inflation? Was there anybody in the province who would take it at a time less than that?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We had a number of people who we had asked and they were considerably higher than that. We couldn't even talk to them, what they were asking for was so high.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I did a calculation, Mr. Minister. Assuming the board sits the same number of days this year as last year, it comes to about \$70,000 for a part-time job. I would have thought that you could have found someone who would take a part-time job at something less than \$70,000. For a part-time job 77 days a year, which is I understand the number of days the last board sat, that comes to \$70,000 a year. I am surprised that that's the cheapest you can get yourself a chairman.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The number of days, Mr. Member, are considerably higher than that. They usually sit two weeks a month. Then there is the writing of all the decisions and judgments. I can get the numbers of last year's hearings and give that to you also.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You certainly got a willing buyer there. I would like to know the number of days the former chairman was paid for. I had assumed, I guess in error, that the former chairman was paid only for sitting days, that preparation and travelling time came out of the \$35,000. I now understand from what you say that that isn't so. Is he paid the \$500 for every day he works as distinct from every day he sits?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The previous chairman got travel and expense allowance on

top of the \$35,000

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Paid \$200 a day for travelling time and \$200 for preparatory time and for writing judgments?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, the 250 days was for sitting time, and the expenses covered the other.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — 250 days? Is that how many days the chairman is paid for?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — \$250

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Ah, you said 250 days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! Order! Would the minister answer from his feet, please.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — That was \$250 per sitting day.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The minister will confirm he's going to supply us with the number of days and the amount, is that right? One final question. Since you had so much trouble getting someone who would do this, who would try to keep body and soul together on less than \$70,000, did you consider sticking with the former chairman, who was doing it at a lot less than this?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No. Mr. Sherstobitoff came to see me shortly after us taking over and suggested that possibly he would step aside. We didn't do it immediately, but five months, six months later, we did.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, let's be honest. I don't think I would know Mr. Sherstobitoff if I saw him in a crowd of 30 people, so I haven't had a conversation with him. But I have this abiding suspicion that what he did was come to you and say, "Listen, Mr. Minister, if you can't work with me, then I will go." And you said in words to the effect, "Well, thank you. I appreciate that. Go." Is that not in fact what happened?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — In fact, it isn't. What I said to him was, "Business as usual."

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And did he resign?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No. Three or four months later we decided that we would make the change of the chairman. That's when we contacted him.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Since you got so completely taken to the cleaners with the finding of a new chairman, did you consider asking the old one to stay on, who was doing it at a more reasonable price?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I don't believe we got taken to the cleaners with the price that we're paying for the present chairman.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to get on to what I consider . . . I have a couple more trifling questions, then I want to get onto another issue that I consider with some seriousness. Occupational health council. Any change in the membership?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The occupational health council, all the appointments have

expired and we will be working on setting up a new board very shortly.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So you don't now have an occupational health board. I guess it is they call it. Is that what you're telling me?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Till term is run out.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And what was their term?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — My understanding, one-year terms.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would you, in addition, when you respond with respect to the former chairman's pay . . . Let me be clear. I see a wrinkled brow above the glasses of your deputy minister, so let me be clear about what I'm asking. I want to know what the former member was paid (and I know that was \$250 a day); I want to know the terms under which it was paid; and I want to know what the total amount was, so that I may make my comparison between that and what the former person is paid. By the same token, I want to know the contract — I guess it would be a contract — with the new chairman. Under what conditions is the per diem paid, of \$500? I just would like your undertaking that you'll supply that information.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, we'll get that information for you.

MR. KATZMAN: — I gave notice to the minister and the opposition critic that I had one question. It goes back to my days in the opposition. I'd like it on the record, that's why I'm asking the question on my feet.

Mr. Minister, as I indicated to you earlier, could you tell me who is now responsible for the inspections in northern Saskatchewan at the uranium mines? I know the province was for years, and then the feds all of a sudden came in and there was a big dispute. Has it been settled and who's doing it now?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — There was some discussion between the federal and provincial governments. We believe that it should be the provincial responsibility to do the inspections of the mines, and, in the meantime, we have agreed to continue their act as federal agents, as we have for the last two years. This leads to increased efficiency as we have some obligations to monitor uranium mines as proposed by the Cluff Lake inquiry board.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just a supplementary. So we are still doing it, Mr. Minister, and that's the way we hope to leave it. Correct?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, we are, and we hope it continues that way.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wanted to ask you, Mr. Minister, about the women's division. That's a reduction in expenditures in the women's division. I wanted to ask you what you were reducing expenditures on particularly.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It's my understanding, Mr. Member, that last year the affirmative action budget was underspent by more than \$200,000, because the program was not fully developed and did not include in-scope personnel.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, is the program fully developed now?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are working on that program now, and it is not fully developed as yet.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, could we have some sort of indication, Mr. Minister, as to when you think this program might be fully developed?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I'll let you know in due course. As I say, we're working on that program.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let me ask you a question, Mr. Minister. Are you satisfied with the progress that we're making with respect to women in the public service? Are you satisfied that we're promoting enough women to enough senior positions.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, we took a count the other day and I'm pleased to say that we've got considerably more women working in our government departments than the previous administration had. I just noticed in the labor statistics that there are 6,000 to 8,000 more women working in the workforce right now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have no complaints about the number of women in the workforce. My complaint is with respect to the average salary which those women work. I don't have the figures with me, but I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the salary of the average female employee in the government is a great deal less than the average salary of the male working in the public service. Am I correct that the responsibility of your women's division is to promote and seek the advancement of women in the public service, or do they extend to the private sector as well? Do their responsibilities extend to programs which might promote the advancement of women in the private sector?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Sure, it's our desire to promote women within the public and the private sectors and that will be in our affirmative action programs that we are working on.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not being combative, Mr. Minister. At the moment, I'm seeking information. Does your women's division have responsibility to promote women in the private workforce as well as the public sector?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Sure, we do a lot of work in both areas.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And do I understand the minister to say that he is satisfied with the progress we're making in this regard?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, I think it could be improved. Part of the problem is of course the slowdown of the economy right now. I would like to remind the member opposite that I like women, in fact I am married to one, and I am certainly not going to jeopardize women in the workforce whether it is public or private.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This may come as a stunning surprise to the Minister of Labor, but not everybody who is married to a woman in fact seeks to promote women in the workplace. It may come as quite a surprise, but there are some who are married who have not been very diligent in the area. If you are not satisfied with the progress we are making, why are we taking so long to develop the program?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, we're working at developing a program, and we've had to

December 16, 1982

have some budgetary cuts in all our departments in the Department of Labor. We are doing our part to try and contribute to coping with the slowdown of the economy, but as soon as it picks up we will certainly be getting more active in that area.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I missed your last sentence. What event is it we are awaiting before we become more active with the women's division?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I said we are becoming more active now but we've had to cut back in a lot of areas in the department, and the women's division is one of them. As soon as we have some upturn in the economy, we are going to be spending extra dollars in that area.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Apart from the grants to organizations, agencies, institutions concerned with labor policy, what other subvotes in your budget are cut back besides the women's division?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We didn't hear your question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You said you are cutting back all over. I don't have the access to the information you do, Mr. Minister, but I've run quickly through your estimates, and I'm having some trouble finding those other subvotes that you cut back in. It seems the one you cut back in was women, and I may say you are not going to be singled out for this type of complaint. My learned friend had some vivid language to describe your treatment of women and children. We will be getting to the social service estimates presumably in due course. But I am just wondering where else you have cut back. What other subvote did you cut back in besides women's division?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have cut back in pension benefits and the other expenses in the pension benefits.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I should have guessed — the old people. Well, apart from the women and the aged, are there any others who aren't your priority?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I suppose I am getting a little mixed up in our '83-84 estimates.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Sorry, there was so much laughter from this side of the Chamber that I couldn't hear your answer. Would you repeat it please?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I just said that maybe I'm getting a little mixed up with our '83-84; estimates we're doing that now also. But the two major areas are the women and the pensions in the present estimates.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I don't know where to take this line of questioning. You've been so distressingly candid that I am thunderstruck. I do want to congratulate the minister for being candid . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, the one old one is gone, may I say to the member for Rosthern, the old one is gone. We now have a candid minister who admits that women and the aged are the groups he cuts back on. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you want to take a crack at trying to justify that?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are not cutting back on the aged. I'm taking about the other expenses in the pension area. The women's area — I told you why the figures are less

because we had an over, an underspending of the \$200,000, which is showing up here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The hill; we're going around and around and around. I started 10 minutes ago asking you why the program wasn't fully developed. You were candid enough to tell me that it was a budget cut and you'd cut back all over. So I asked you where else you've cut back. It turned out it was the aged who had suffered this similar generosity. And I wonder how you justify making your cuts. Let's leave the aged out of it for a minute. I don't quite intend to get into that but I may.

How do you justify cutting back on the women's division when you admit there is a very serious problem with the position that women occupy in the labor force? It's just simply a scandal in western society that women are paid what they are. I think the minister has too many brains to admit that in front of a mike. So I don't expect that answer, I may say. But if you would just explain to me why you chose to cut in the women's area — was it because you didn't think you had any problem there to be solved?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — There was no real money cutback in the women's division. We had the extra money from the over, the underspending from before.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, Mr. Minister, you told me a moment ago that you cut back in this area because of budgetary restraint. I suspect that's accurate. I was a minister myself. I know the problem. You don't get everything you ask for. So you've got to cut back in some areas. And you did. You made those hard decision a minister has to make together with his deputy. I just wonder why you chose the women's division to cut back in. Why not cut back in some other area but that segment of the work force which is paid the poorest?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I am advised that we have not cut back this year. We are still providing the services.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There's little point in you and I getting into a hair-pulling session. Mr. Minister, I don't think you're going at it nearly as fast as you could and I don't think you're proceeding with this program with nearly the vigor that the problem deserves. And I think you have been candid enough to admit, this evening, that when you chose the areas to cut you chose the women's division. I asked you for the other people who are being similarly over rewarded economically and we chose the aged. Let me just deal with the aged for a moment. How is it that we decided to cut back on pensions? Do we think the aged in our society are overrewarded? Are they just living too high off the hog? Is that why we're cutting back on pensions?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have not cut back on pensions. Decreases are directly or indirectly related to the branch's reduction in activity associated with the pension reform issues.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh, is that no longer something your department's going to be pursuing, pension reform?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — On the contrary. We're going to be doing more of it in the very near future.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What are you doing it with, the staff of the women's division that you're cutting back?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We'll be able to do it. I've just had memos come in the last couple of days on getting into the reform side.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let me guess. You're going to use your public relations officer to do all the work.

I want to deal with some more mundane topics for a moment. The fire commissioner's office: how many plans have you received and how many have you approved? How many have you approved with modification? How many of those plans have you rejected?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We'll have to get that information for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — If the member will bear with me for a moment while I find the page in the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. Why doesn't someone else with some questions go ahead?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and, Mr. Minister, I have a couple of questions, one of which I was just leading up to earlier. On July 6 you told this House, Mr. Minister, that we're already doing quite a bit to help the minimum wage by reducing the gas tax and the mortgage interest reduction program. The minister will be aware that when you failed to raise the minimum wage by 25 cents on July 1, and when you failed to raise the minimum wage by an additional 25 cents on January 1 upcoming, you cause a loss to an average minimum wage earner, who works approaching 40 hours a week, of about \$1,000 a year. And you will be aware, I think, that with an ordinary compact car, in order to get \$1,000 a year back on the cut in the gas tax, someone is going to have to drive something more than 100,000 kilometres a year. Now not many of the minimum wage recipients in my constituency drive 100,000 kilometres a year, remarkably few of them.

What I am asking is: can you give us any indication of when you will be able to announce an increase in the minimum wage, and will it take into account the fact that one year will have elapsed? And, even a 10 per cent increase — and over the period of the last year I think the cost of living, particularly for people in the minimum wage level will have gone up 10 per cent — would indicate an increase of the order of 45 cents. Can you give us a date and some indication of the level of the increase?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — No, I can't give you any date, and I can't give you any level of the increase at this time. But we're talking it to our cabinet, and I might add that there are other factors. We raised the rental rebate for renters this year and with the gas and the mortgage it adds up to quite a few cents. And we're the king in Canada right now.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and, Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that the minister is unwilling or unable to give us any additional information on that subject, may I simply urge him to give this matter sympathetic consideration since these people have suffered, at least in relative terms, a substantial loss in their income compared with your income, sir, and mine, as we vote to increase our own pay by . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, we're still MLAs, notwithstanding, and we're getting 6.5 per cent on perhaps \$29,000 or whatever the figure is. I haven't quite calculated it out, but it's a good deal more than 25 cents on minimum wage, I know that. And I need it less and, with all deference to the minister, he needs it less.

I want to turn to another subject and ask the minister whether or not he is giving any request from the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association or from the Minister of Urban Affairs to attempt to define essential services, and to consider any special legislative treatment for essential services as has been requested from time to time by regional meetings of Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I suppose the answer is that we're looking at all aspects of The Trade Union Act. Yes, we have had letters from SUMA; we've had letters from other associations as well. But, as I say, we're not making any decisions at this time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, you indicate that you're not making any decision on this matter of essential services at this time. Are you in a position to indicate when any decisions will be announced with respect to that?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — With regards to essential services, no, not at this time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and, Mr. Minister, one further question. On November 20 in this House, you declined to give assurances that no right-to-work legislation would be introduced. You indicated at that time that you would not give any assurances "until all briefs are in" was the quote, referring to briefs in respect of revisions to labor legislation, which briefs you were evidently soliciting at that time. Will you now give the House assurance that no right-to-work legislation will be introduced by your government within the next six months, let us put it that way?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, I can't give that assurance at this time. We're still reviewing all the options. I've had union leaders come in to see me. They're telling me that there's still not enough teeth in the act yet, and it goes across the whole gamut to right-to-work. We're still listening to all the groups that are presenting briefs and coming in to see us, including union leaders and business.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Let me get this very clear, Mr. Chairman, and, Mr. Minister. You have no excluded the possibility of right-to-work legislation in the next six months. That's what I'm asking you. I'm asking you to exclude that possibility, and I understand you to say no. Did I understand that correctly?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, I'm saying no, and that covers all areas of The Trade Union Act, not just right-to-work.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wanted to deal with one of your other notable achievements, Mr. Minister, and that was the creation of 11,000 jobs. The claim was made to one of your more appreciative audiences, the federation of labor, and I'm sure you remember the comment. You still stand by that comment that this government has created 11,000 jobs?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — At that particular time the answer is yet. We had 466,000 people in the workforce now. On April 17, when you people were still in government, there was 455,000 people with the unemployment rate the same. So that tells me there were 11,000 more people working.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, is there just the remotest possibility that some of those jobs might have been seasonal adjustments in the economy? Does that possibility exist at all?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Would the member repeat the last question? We were talking here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just wondered if there was the remotest possibility that any part of those 11,000 jobs might have been a seasonal adjustment in the economy?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I think that a lot of the 11,000 jobs were the extra construction starts we have this fall. There has been . . . All I can go by is StatsCanada. We're using the same book. I used the same book when I referred to April 17. I'm not jumping around with different books, it's the same figure.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, your success was fleeting, because there are now 5,000 fewer people employed in Saskatchewan than there were a year ago. Does that suggest that your success was somewhat fleeting in creating jobs?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I am not aware that they are 5,000. Could you give me those figures?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I'm going by an article in *the Leader-Post*, another appreciative article on your speech. It says that the labor force in September last year, after the kids had gone back to school — this is the labor force — was 462,000. In September it's 467,000, an increase of 5,000. But the number employed, however, has dropped from 444,000 to 439,000, a loss of 5,000 jobs. Does that suggest your success was just a bit fleeting in creating jobs?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — That doesn't sound like the same book that I was reading (inaudible) . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, Mr. Minister, would you tell me at this point in time how many jobs you're taking credit for? Is it still 11,000 jobs? Is that still the number, or has there been a new book?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I have some new figures for up to November. We still have more jobs created, but they have dropped. It's not 11,000 anymore, after the school students went back.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I want to ask some questions for information, particularly with respect to your pension policy, and whether or not you have adopted a different pension policy. The previous government believed strongly in improving pensions, and improving pensions based upon an improvement of the Canada Pension Plan or possibly a provincial pension plan, something based upon an improvement of universal or semi-universal plans. Is it your policy to pursue those avenues or are you adopting the position which has been promoted, let us say, by the Government of Ontario, suggesting that what was needed was a considerable expansion of private pension plans?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are not excluding any options at the present time. The Canada Pension Plan is one of the areas that we want to investigate.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, a newspaper report indicated that the premier in a speech in Winnipeg advocated or at least favored a change to make the Canada Pension Plan voluntary. Is that the policy of your department?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, it's not our policy. The premier was raising concerns on the fact that the Canada Pension Plan was not being fully funded.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — That raises another question, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister. Is it the policy of your department and your government to advocate the full funding of the Canada Pension Plan.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The answer is no. Any amendments or any increases, we would want to feel that those would be fully funded.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wanted to ask you about the branch of your department which has the conciliators. I think that's industrial relations. I'm not sure. I see your deputy is nodding his head. Are there any positions vacant in this branch? If so, how many?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have three vacancies at the present time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The vacancies are conciliators themselves? How many are administrative staff?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Two of the vacancies are conciliators.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have the number of work stoppages and the number of industrial disputes gone up or down since you assumed office? This year versus last year, have the number of work stoppages and industrial disputes gone up or down?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We don't have the exact figures. We can get that information for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I suggest to you that they're gone up fairly dramatically. My question to the minister is: how are you coping with reduced staff? You've got a reduced number of conciliators and yet you have more labor disputes this year than last. I'm not necessarily suggesting that you went out with the intention of creating them all, but I'm wondering how you're coping with this reduced staff.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have advertised for conciliators and we have just today talked to two people.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Borrowing staff, I suppose, from the women's division and the pension division to assist you there. Workers' advocates — how many vacancies do you have in workers' advocates?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have two vacancies in workers' advocates.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — How many of those are workers' advocates themselves?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Two.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Has the number of requests for their services gone up or down or remained static?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. King isn't with me tonight. We'll get that information for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In fact, he is here. All right, while he's getting downstairs, let me deal with another issue. I won't be long about it. I trust I'm not being facetious. I started out to ask the Premier this question this morning. I just got nicely started when the Speaker ruled it was 10:30. I want to put the same series of questions to you. It has to do with unemployment. I think we can agree in a more serious vein, Mr. Minister, that the unemployment rate in this province is up, and it's up very substantially; it is double what it was last year. I asked the Premier what was being urged or presented at the conference of finance ministers to deal with this problem, which is admittedly not isolated to Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, I'm not sure what the Premier will be saying at the first ministers' conference. He hasn't talked to me about that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm sorry. My attention was distracted through no fault of yours. What was your answer?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I was saying that the Premier hasn't discussed what he's going to be discussing at the first ministers' conference.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I was inquiring about the finance ministers' conference.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — They have not consulted me.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you know if they're suggesting a public works program, something that wouldn't be dwarfed by your own social services payment? Are they suggesting a public works program?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, we're entering into the make-work program. Our department hasn't been involved with social services or the Department of Finance except as far as the promotion of the plan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that that program is just so small. It's just so paltry, it's laughable. It's dwarfed by your own social services payments — it's a fraction. What you're spending on that job creation program is a fraction of what you're spending on social services. As my colleague from Shaunavon has said, it pains to point out repeatedly.

Is the Minister of Finance of this province urging at the conference any more substantial program of public works for this country?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I can't tell you. I haven't been in contact with the Minister of Finance.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — If I may say, I find it just amazing that the finance minister would have gone to a conference to deal with an economic situation, the most severe portion of which is unemployment, and the Minister of Labor was never consulted as to what should be suggested at the conference. I find that a surprising way to run a government . . . Mr. King is . . . Yes, he's here. Perhaps I could have the answers to my questions?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The workers' compensation board doesn't keep track of the statistics of the claimants.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Does your official have an estimate as to whether the number of claims have increased dramatically? Decreased dramatically? Stayed about the same?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, he advises that it has pretty well stayed constant this year.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — How are you coping with two less advocates?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have been advertising for a workers' advocate. We have a short list at the present time.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, a couple of short questions. Could the minister inform us as to number of people and the names of individuals who have been dismissed, either OC or otherwise, since May 8, in the department?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — There have been eight OCs dismissed.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Could the minister give me the names of the individuals, and you're saying there were eight OCs cancelled? Any others in the department that were not OC appointments.?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, there haven't been. You have the list.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, you have been indicating that you were considering having a wage differential, a minimum wage differential. That is for teen-agers entering the workplace, and I know that you were advertising for submission. I'd like to know whether the minister has a position, whether or not he is going to implement a wage differential as Ronald Reagan is considering in the United States.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have asked the minimum wage board, in their ads, to asks for all the various options to do with the minimum wage, as a lot of . . . Almost every province and the federal all across Canada do have it. But we have not taken a position on that.

MR. KOSKIE: — Can the minister indicate when we are likely to get a decision in respect to this?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I think I've answered that question several times this evening. We are getting a recommendation ready now to go to cabinet, and it'll be up to my cabinet colleagues to decide on the route that we're going to go with the minimum wage.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, you indicated that eight persons hired by OCs were dismissed. Was one or more of them a conciliation officer?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — There was one conciliator released in the OCs.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Was that some time ago and has he been replaced?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, it was some time ago but he hasn't been replaced. This is

one of the two that we've been talking to today.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could tell us what was the urgency to dispense with his services when you couldn't get a replacement, as is evidenced by the fact that you've had a vacancy there for several months.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It's just been the workload, I suppose, over the last several months. We wanted to get our ads out and have a good look at what was around the country and we're getting to that point now where we are down to two people that we have interviewed.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — For how long have you been without a conciliator because you dispensed with the services of a conciliator before having anyone to put in his place, or her place?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I'll get that date for you. We don't have it with us.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — You've indicated that eight persons hired on OCs were dismissed. Were any of those workers' advocates?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, there were two.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, there are or were four workers' advocates. You dismissed two. For how long has there been a vacancy of two workers' advocates?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It would be the same answers of the information that we will get for you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, is it not true that you have had vacancies there for upward of five months?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It could be about four, depending on the date that we advise you of.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, once again, what was the urgency of getting rid of those two workers' advocates when you didn't have anyone else to put in their place and thereby cutting in half the services available to injured workmen.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I've said earlier that we were wanting to get some of our own people in some of those positions in the Department of Labor.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, you don't get any of your own persons into any position by firing someone, but only by hiring someone. If you wanted to hire your own people, given that, given this idea that you couldn't have a workers' advocate that isn't your own (why I'll never know), whatever that may mean, even if you did, why didn't you hire your own person first, so that there wouldn't be a break in service, and so that you wouldn't leave injured workmen with only half the available services for a period of four or five months?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We've managed to carry on with the two. I realize that it's been an extra load, but we have been working on it: we've got the advertising out, we've got the short list now. Those two paid positions will be filled very, very shortly.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, of course you have managed, because it's the injured workmen who suffer and not the minister. The short question is whether the injured workmen have managed. My information is that there is a very considerable backlog in providing services to injured workmen and this, in fact, arises from the fact that you were in great haste to fire two people, and in no great haste to put as you call them, your own people in to replace them.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — You are prejudging, because certainly, we've had an increase of people coming in. I suppose, because we are a new government, they're coming in trying again. We have had a backlog of that, but I don't think that a lot of workers had suffered because of that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, there was a time when there were no workers' advocates and you could then say probably that no workmen suffered. As it turned out, when there were workers' advocates, a very considerable improvement in the service available to injured workmen resulted. Anyone who was an MLA here in the early 1970s when there weren't workers' advocates, and knew how many cases were brought to MLAs and how that system was effectively improved by having workers' advocates, wouldn't in any way denigrate the value of workers' advocates.

I want to now turn to some other aspects of the workers' compensation board. Have there been any changes in the membership of the board?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, there have been no changes in the make-up of the board.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, are any changes contemplated in the membership of the board in the next immediate future?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Two of the members of the board are asking to be replaced. They are wanting to retire.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, would you advise which members are asking to be replaced and wish to retire?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It's Mr. Elkin and a Mr. Bourne.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, Mr. Elkin will be what is known as the employee representative and Mr. Bourne will be what is known as the employer representative, I don't know whether formally or informally. May I ask whether, in replacing Mr. Elkin, it is the intention of the government to follow the practice which has been followed on a good many occasions in the past and consult the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, I can give you that assurance, and also the building trades.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, with respect to the third member of the board, the chairman, are there any proposals to replace the chairman?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are talking to the chairman at this point in time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, are your conversations

designed to extract from the chairman a resignation, or are they designed to encourage him to continue the valuable work which he has rendered to the people of Saskatchewan and to injured workmen in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We are not asking for his resignation. He can work out his contract if he so wishes with us.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I'm delighted to hear that since it has been my experience in dealing with both employers and employees throughout the province that there's a great deal of confidence in the current chairman. If the minister is in any doubt about that, I invite him to consult with employer groups. He may know a Mr. Malinowski from the constituency of Yorkton, who has to me expressed confidence, on another occasion in quite a different context, in the current chairman. I commend to the minister the current chairman. Is he able to give us any indication of who the likely replacement for the employer representative on the board will be?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — No, we haven't looked at either board member as far as replacements.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Just one additional issue. It has to do with accessibility. It's an issue, Mr. Minister, which we've all motherhooding. We're all for the handicapped, and our society wants to do everything for them. I'm just wondering if we're ever going to get started doing something concrete. We sat on the treasury benches, we've moved a bill which would guarantee, in rough terms, handicapped accessi . . . accessibil . . . accessi . . . that the new buildings would be accessible — I'll try that way. A hard way to say a relatively easy thing.

That was aborted by the election and now the same bill has been standing in the name of the Minister of Social Services for some time. Can you tell me when we are going to stop motherhooding accessibility for the handicapped and start doing something about it?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have been meeting the last three weeks. We were in Saskatoon meeting with the accessibility committee group that were part of the report. One of the things that is holding us back right at the moment is the fact that we understand that the national or federal people are coming out with a new national amendment, or national code, and it's our feeling that we should see that first before we make any changes of our own.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, you're going to postpone the program. You're going to postpone this beyond the life expectancy of this government, even given the most optimistic assumptions. The National Building Code is not expected immediately. I just got a letter. I may say, from your counterpart in B.C. They are considering revising theirs when the new National Building Code comes into effect, but I don't expect that this week or this month and certainly not this year. Why can we not go with the bill which we have all agreed to in one form or another and then fine tune it when we see the National Building Code? I told the minister that I was minister of government services for some time and the revision to the National Building Code was ponderously slow. I wonder why we can't go to the bill to which we have all agreed but have apparently

refused to take action when our feet are put to the fire.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Part of our problem is that some of the people who have presented briefs to that report, who are part of the committee, are not agreeing totally with the report. That was the reason that we went to Saskatoon to meet with the group. It's our understanding that we have just got the federal amendments and if we are going to make changes in the code, it doesn't seem proper to me to have Saskatchewan completely different or some different from Manitoba or Alberta. These people will be moving back and forth. If we can consolidate and get something that's fairly standard across the country, to me that makes more sense than us making a bunch of changes and them not fitting in with our next door neighbor.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, if we go with the bill which I introduced and which stands in your colleague's name, I can promise you that you'll get every co-operation in getting that passed. I can also tell you that if there are changes to the National Building Code which are designed to improve accessibility for the handicapped, you'll get every co-operation in making those changes at that time. Why can't we go now with the bill which I placed before the legislature, which is identical to that contained in most provinces, and would therefore meet the goal that you sought of having uniform legislation throughout this country?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It's our feeling that we will have legislation ready for the spring sitting.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's my next question. Do we have a commitment that legislation will be introduced at the next session of this legislature?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I think I can make almost a guarantee on that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I must say that I'm pleased to hear that. If it is all satisfactory, you will get all the co-operation we are capable of mustering to get it through the House. I would be delighted to do everything I can to get some good accessibility legislation in this province. If you introduce it at the spring session, you will get nothing but co-operation from the opposition, providing it is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You don't have to introduce what I introduced. If the bill which you introduced meets with the general approval of those organizations which represent handicapped people, it will get our support and our co-operation.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I have just a short question. On the severance pay, the note that you sent over, there's a total of 95,983 paid out so far. There are two other people who are still awaiting severance. Is that correct?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I understand there's just one more to settle with.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, does the minister anticipate that the final settlement of the associate deputy minister will be forthcoming relatively quickly, like before the end of the year?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — It was being negotiated between solicitors at this time.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

December 16, 1982

Item 10

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wonder if the minister would undertake to supply to me a list of those organizations which in the 1981-82 year received grants under subvote 10, and the amount that each received; those organizations for which money was budgeted in the March budget and the amount which you expected to give to each; and those organizations under this budget which are likely to share the largest of a budget reduced to one-sixth of its former size.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — We have the lists that we can pass over to you right now.

Item 10 agreed to.

Vote 20 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

LABOR

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 20

Items 1 to 4 agreed to

Vote 20 agreed to.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We're at the end of the labor estimates. I want to take this opportunity to thank the minister for the honest way in which he answered the questions. I want to thank your officials as well for the assistance they have given us this evening. We very much appreciate this time they've spent here and the efforts they have put into preparing for these estimates, Mr. Minister.

Just one additional comment. There may have been some confusion about that last question. What I got in writing was not what I asked for. It is late at this point in time; let's leave it. You will see the verbatim tomorrow, and you can supply the information from the verbatim tomorrow because I think I asked the question in a precise fashion. If you look at the verbatim and supply that information, that's all we need.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:05 p.m.