

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 1, 1983

EVENING SESSION

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. KLEIN: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this committee, some eight young girls from the constituency of Regina North, sitting in the Speaker's gallery up here. They are representing Girl Guide Company 11 from Ruth Pawson School. They are accompanied here tonight by their leader Judy Sveinbjornson.

Hopefully they will find their visit to the legislature here this evening informational and educational. I look forward to meeting with them a little bit later, and determining how they enjoyed our committee of finance.

I ask all members to join with me in welcoming them here tonight.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1 (continued)

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, just prior to our break for supper, we were questioning the rationale behind the cutbacks to basically two areas of your portfolio — mainly the continuing education branch cutbacks from the former administration to what is proposed in your '82-83 budget and along with that we were questioning the cutbacks on funding allocation for the community colleges in northern Saskatchewan.

I have noted cutbacks in those two areas and as well, a total loss in both categories of moneys that were just definitely cut, like in the area of continuing education — \$527,830 that wasn't reappropriated to another line department in the South. That's in regards to the Department of Continuing Education, and also with regard to the community colleges — capital grants to community colleges and educational institutions.

There's a definite cut of \$582,490 that, as well, wasn't reallocated into another line department in the South. I wonder if the minister may want to comment on the rationale behind those cutbacks that have accumulated over and above what was cut back from the former budget of 1981-82.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, if I could reply to the hon. member for Cumberland. The 1982 April budget, from the figures that I have been handed for northern continuing education, was roughly \$5 million and of that amount there was a

reduction of \$469,830, and I would like to account for the purposes for the reduction. First of all, there were two new programs that were entered into, one of which was located at La Ronge, and another for the northeast facility. Money was provided for planning for these programs to the extent of \$150,000. So that accounts for \$150,000 of that \$469,830. The remainder was attributed to restraints and efficiencies. So that's where the total reduction, according to the figures that I have of \$469,830, came in, for that first portion of the question.

Now I'd like to respond for the community colleges. For the community colleges, according to the figures that we have, there was an increase for the community colleges in the North to the extent of 14 per cent over 1981-82. This was retained in the North — the 14 per cent increase was retained in the North — whereas in the South it was reduced by 7 per cent as I pointed out earlier. That's according to our figures. If you wish to get further elaboration — and there is some difficulty in getting exactly where we are because of the realignment and money is going here and there — but if you are not satisfied with this, I would be pleased to equip you with something in writing.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, thank you very much for the offer to provide us with more specifics at a later date with regards to these reappropriations that you mentioned. I, for one, understood that there was a complete deliberate cutback on the community colleges portion of the estimates for '82-83 but you've stated to me that actually this was not the case. So looking at the book of estimates here, I've mentioned it before and I'll mention it again, there's been asterisks . . . I took it for granted that certain portions of those budgets were reappropriated to various departments elsewhere. And this is very confusing to us up North and I'm sure it is confusing as well to a lot of other people involved, or who have some interest in the development of programs up North.

However, getting back to your estimates, my apologies if I have missed a comment or two with regards to my next question. But with regards to the trades, special trades and vocational institute that was approved for La Ronge, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might comment on what status this facility is at in this point in time. It's quite an important matter for the residents of the immediate area and I would like to have an official comment from you on that.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, to respond, at the present time the plan is to use some of the underutilized government space that exists in La Ronge and area. One of these facilities that we have in mind at the present time is the upper Atco building, to turn this into classroom space in conjunction with Outreach programs that will eventually come from the Prince Albert technical institute. But in addition, what we have in mind is to extend the Outreach and to double the training spots that exist in the La Ronge area.

MR. YEW: — Thank you very much. Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might want to provide us with some detailed information as well with regard to what priorities and budget allocations you have for northern training programs — NTP, ABE (adult basic education), the northern careers program, the trapper training program and native outfitters program — those program areas that you have under the wing of nor.con.ed. I wonder if you could provide us with a list of your budget allocations, your policy with respect to those programs — your present policy and whatever future anticipated plans you might have — for those sections that you have under this particular portfolio?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Would it be in order for me to provide that to you in writing so that

I could give you the detail on it?

MR. YEW: — That would be just fine, Mr. Minister.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I won't be taking too much of your time. I have a few questions I would like to direct to you and most of them will be pertaining to the West Side Community College and its operations.

Before I get into that, I would like to ask you a question. You indicated when you first got up that there were 177,000 citizens in Saskatchewan who have grade 10 or less. I wonder if your department has broken that down any further to how many would be with grade 8 or less, or any other break down. I'll let you answer that one first.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I could be wrong in responding to this, but as I recall — I read the report myself and perhaps not as intensely as I should have — I did not notice that there was a break down into different groups, like people with special needs, like women, handicapped people, and so on and so forth. Is that what you meant?

MR. THOMPSON: — No, all I wanted, Mr. Minister, was the break down. You indicated that there were 177,000 that had grade 10 or less, regardless of who they are — the citizens of the province. I just wondered if you had broken that down any further to say 100,000 or 50,000, maybe, that have grade 8 or less. That was my question.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I can give you some information. We have a break down which shows 70 per cent of the people in the North have grade 9 or less education — 70 per cent, yes.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when you bring figures like that out, it most certainly indicates that there is a great need for secondary education in northern Saskatchewan. I know that you're fully in favour of a good educational system in the North and in the province as a whole, and I was quite impressed with your remarks the other night when you were talking about the West Side schools at Green Lake, Beauval, La Loche.

I want to ask you this question. You indicated that there was a 14 per cent increase in the continuing education budget for northern Saskatchewan. I wonder if you could break down that 14 per cent and indicate how much was capital, how much went toward training programs, heavy duty mechanics, carpenters, etc., and how much of that 14 per cent would have gone into planning.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, Mr. Chairman and the hon. member for Athabasca. I'm not sure I have precisely what you're looking for. The figures I have here and the percentage increase that I referred to for the grants to community colleges in the North refer to the administration only, not to programs. I have figures like West Side Community College, \$399,000; La Ronge, \$365,000; North East Community College, \$304,000. So the total is roughly \$1 million. But that does not refer to programs.

When I referred to the amount of reduction in total, that was referring to the amount that was reduced in total in the north community colleges, that \$460,000. Those were the program cuts. It came out of what would have gone into programs.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I guess I'm just not quite following you here. The question I was asking is: is the increase in the budget to northern

Saskatchewan for community colleges? I wanted to find out how much of that 16 per cent went into capital planning, and how much went into programs.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I'll try this again. As far as capital was concerned, there was no decrease. As far as program was concerned, \$312,000; and planning, \$150,000. But alongside of that, the basic commitment to running the northern community colleges went up by 14 per cent. Of the total of the \$1 million, it would roughly break down in these percentages, which prevail in what we call the southern community colleges: 20 to 25 per cent is spent on administration; 35 per cent is spent on program support; 40 to 50 per cent on direct program delivery.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you are indicating then that there was over a \$400,000 decrease in the budget for community colleges in northern Saskatchewan. There was no decrease in capital projects. I think when we are discussing the situation as it is in northern Saskatchewan, with the high unemployment rate that we have (the 70 per cent as you have indicated that have grade 9 or less), and we take a look at a community college budget where we should be emphasizing training and getting this labour force skilled (there's just such a large unskilled labour force up there right now, and we cut over \$300,000 off of programs), I'm sure, Mr. Minister, that you'd have to agree with me that we're not going in the right direction.

I think that there just has to be a lot more emphasis put on training and the type of programs that the community colleges can administer in northern Saskatchewan or any part of the province. There's absolutely no way that we can wait around for the college, or the community college, or the training facility that you are going to establish in Prince Albert, to be built to handle the situation that we have. The situation has got so bad in the last couple of years, and is getting worse each year with more and more young people coming on to the labour force with the type of education — as you have indicated, 70 per cent of them have grade 9 or less. We have to provide this type of training for them. Could you indicate to me at this time how much of a budget cut was incurred specifically for the West Side Community College, both in capital and program delivery?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — This is an approximation but it would have been approximately 100,000 or 100,000-plus, as far as the program is concerned. That would have been the only cut in West Side Community College.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, could you indicate to the committee the reason why they would want \$100,000 off of programs in an area that has that high unemployment rate and so much unskilled labour? When citizens up on the northwest side of the province where the West Side Community College serves need these types of programs so much, could you indicate why they would want to cut \$100,000 off the programs?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Basically, the cause would have been just simple a general slowdown as far as the economy is concerned, a general restraint policy. This policy, as unfair as it seems, which you have pointed out, would have applied to all parts and to some parts perhaps more than others. At the same time, I think one of the encouraging factors is that we have been busy trying to put into gear a training program and an educational program for northern Saskatchewan which will have as much meaning as

it possibly can have. We are trying to integrate it with the national training act and the basic skills program so that we can have it as cost efficient as possible. I think we are all aware of the fact that these are very, very costly programs and it doesn't matter whether they occur in southern Saskatchewan or in northern Saskatchewan. It is really incumbent upon us to do everything we can in order to realize what savings we can. As far as the cuts were concerned, that would have been the primary reason for those holdbacks on money at that particular time.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am not going to take much more time on this issue. I know we'll be going through the same estimates in another month or six weeks. At that time we'll have another chance to go over this.

I would say to you, Mr. Minister, that I find it quite discouraging that when we run into tough times and we want to cut the budget down, we would cut it on the backs of the type of people who you have just indicated and we have been discussing in northern Saskatchewan. I think it is the wrong route to take. I think when we have tough times, and we have a situation like we do have in northern Saskatchewan with a high unemployment rate, with a high number of people who have grade 9 or less in education, we have to put more money into these types of programs, and I would just urge you and your department to reconsider. I sincerely hope that when you bring out the next budget that you will have a lot more money in there for programs, and will get the West Side Community College going, and going full bore, and especially build it up until you get the facility in Prince Albert on stream. I know that will relieve a lot of the pressure there.

Another question I would like to have answered: could you give me the make-up of the West Side Community board, the number of individuals who sit on that board, and their names?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Would you like me to send this over? All right. There's Florence Hansen from Beauval, Ben Siemens from Stony Rapids, Jonas Janvier from La Loche, Evelyn Fidler from Green Lake, Joyce Taylor from Buffalo Narrows, Joe Favel from Ile-a-la-Crosse, and Dana Spence from Uranium City. Seven in all the community colleges.

MR. THOMPSON: — Two defeated candidates, yes, I know their qualifications. That board, Mr. Minister, has been changed, has it not, from a five-person board to seven individuals? Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'll just leave the department with that, and I want to sincerely stress once again that you put extra emphasis on training in the community colleges on the west side. I sincerely hope that the next budget will reflect that. Thank you very much for your answers.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A couple of comments I wish to express. I don't know that they deserve a lengthy response from you; you have already commented this afternoon. The matters were raised this afternoon by my colleague for Elphinstone in a very articulate fashion.

I want to express my regret, Mr. Minister, that your government should have been so indecisive with respect to facilities for the university. It would have been unfortunate enough if it merely had happened in a time of widespread unemployment and a time where we are already suffering from this Tory deep freeze with the widespread unemployment we have. It is doubly unfortunate, Mr. Minister, that you should do it in the period of such overwhelming needs by the university.

We had before the public accounts committee the universities commission, and they described for us in stark terms the needs that the universities have in terms of facilities. It has been brought on in part by the Tory deep freeze, the widespread unemployment and young people who are going to university because the kind of economic ship you run leaves them no alternative. In part, Mr. Minister, it comes about because a lot of those young people don't believe the jobs that they can't find are ever going to be here again, and they are going back to university because they believe many of those semi-skilled and unskilled jobs are just simply not going to be there. Universities are being overrun with students. The universities commission told us, Mr. Minister, that it would simply not be possible to accommodate the kind of enrolment they expected. They simply didn't have the buildings or the classroom facilities to put them in, and they were going to have to find some way of restricting entrance to university, and that is nothing short of a tragedy. That is nothing short of a tragedy.

For years this country has suffered because of a lack of productivity and everybody ascribes that to an inadequate level of education. At a time when you should be encouraging young people to seek more education, you are discouraging it by the sort of indecision which your government has exhibited over the last nine months. I simply have difficulty believing, Mr. Minister, that in nine months you've been unable to determine what, if anything, the university needs, and what, if any, buildings you should be starting on. That is simply not credible.

I may say it's surprising coming from someone with your brilliant record in working with young people, and, I readily acknowledge, the member's brilliant record in working with young people. It's something which people in the city of Regina are proud of, and I would have hoped that you could have taken your colleagues in cabinet and welded them into the sort of a team that you exhibited so brilliantly on the football field and rid them of some of the indecision which is killing this province. And I would ask you to assume a position of leadership in that cabinet — get rid of the indecision and do something for the universities, because their needs are critical. Their needs are more critical than any other group that we have dealt with, and you just told us this afternoon you've spent nine months wondering what, if anything, universities need.

We left them in far better shape after 11 years than you have placed them in after one. The minister said this afternoon that he could not be expected to solve the problem in nine months, and I may concede that to you because the problem has overtaken you with some rapidity. But, I do think the public expects you to try, and what we found out this afternoon is that you have made no effort to solve the problem that the universities have with respect to facilities. And I urge upon the minister to make an effort and exhibit some interest and concern in the problem before your estimates come up next.

I also want to raise the matter of the building for the provincial archives, and I want to express the same regret in this regard, in part for the same reasons, in part because those jobs were badly needed by a lot of people who are now the clients of the member for Swift Current. And they could have been something else, had we moved on some of these badly needed capital projects such as the archives building.

But there is an even greater need for this building, because this building is needed to preserve the history, the tangible history, for our children, for our children's children. We have documents which are deteriorating, which are in an essential part of our history, and without this building to preserve that tangible history, they are not going to be available for our children's children, and our children's grandchildren. I urge you to get on, Mr. Minister, with this badly needed facility so that we may preserve our history

in a fashion which befits a province with the brilliant history that this one has. So I urge you, Mr. Minister, to get on and get started on the provincial archives building.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, Hon. Member for Regina Centre, I want to thank you for your generosity and your kindness extended to me in making reference to my work with young people, my work in coaching. Quite frankly, it was my good fortune to have had the opportunity to have worked for such a long period of time with young people, people for whom I had the utmost respect, and still do to this very day. Coming into this austere environment is not going to change my attitude or my thinking with regard to my belief in the young people of this province. I can assure you of that.

Now, having gotten rid of that, in reference to your thought that perhaps I could generate and motivate some people in the direction of working together as a team, I couldn't help but think (the thought just had to go through my head as I was sitting here), and I was wondering, now you know, perhaps you were getting to me so much there that for a moment I almost crossed the floor and I could have been associated with this team over here. The only thing, I was trying to figure out what the heck kind of a team could this be? Let's see now. If I did join, it could be a baseball team. We'd have nine, wouldn't we?

In respect to your remarks, I think first of all, the one thing, at a time when we have to recognize that there is a degree of austerity, I think that it's incumbent upon all people to practise a certain amount of restraint and saving and efficiencies. I think this refers to you and myself, who've worked with the government. I think it's also incumbent upon those people who attend university, and those people who are teaching at the university. I think we all have to do our duty. You know, in time of war, there's a military crisis and people ought to go off and do things that they don't really care to do.

In times of economic crisis, which is what we're faced with, we've got the same kind of responsibility, just as important, except that we really don't even have to lay down our lives for it. But I do think, I really do think, that all of us have to do a little bit of belt tightening, and a little bit of sacrificing, and putting out, in addition to what we normally expect is our right and our lot in life. I think that we have to expect the universities to do some of this. And I'm not saying to deprive them of quality and programs, unless it is absolutely essential for us to go that route.

I think that the universities have, quite frankly, increased their productivity level considerably. They have responded. They have done certain things, such as the rescheduling of classes, such as the increase of sessional classes, such as increasing the use of lab time, and it goes on and on. This is one of the ways which we're going to help to resolve our problem.

As far as decision making is concerned, and the idea that we would be deliberately trying to stop the growth of the campuses at Regina and Saskatoon, you couldn't be farther from the truth in that. I think, quite frankly, that our government has made decisions, very deliberate decisions, and some of the decisions were: "Hold the phone! Let's stop and regroup. Let's take a look at where we are going and be darned sure that we have to spend the money!" As far as many of the projects were concerned, I think that that is what we did. I think that we've addressed ourselves to very deliberate decisions.

Now, if you think for one moment that in nine months we are going to revolutionize

things as far as facilities or programs are concerned, well, go ahead and think that, because I don't think it's realistic to feel that that can be done. I think that you are asking for something that just can't be.

As far as the archives building is concerned, sure, I feel the same way as you do. I think most of us in here have a heritage and feel that we want to identify with this province and we're proud of having grown up in this area. My father homesteaded in this area, too. So, you know, we certainly have a feeling that we should preserve as much as possible our heritage for the future and for future generations. We would be very, very quick to go ahead and do something like that in the case of the archives building. It was simply a matter that we considered it alongside of many other expenditures. When you consider that we were looking at a good, healthy deficit as far as our budget was concerned, the decision was that we would not build it this particular year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to turn now, Mr. Minister, to a number of questions. If indeed you want to send the information over to some of them, you could indicate that to speed up the process. I want to wind this down as fast as possible.

I am impressed each time you get up to give your speech in respect to your devotion to education. I have no doubt about your sincerity. I just want to say that, in my opinion, in closing off on this particular item, I really have a strong feeling that many of the cuts, and the ones which have been alluded to this afternoon — the archives building, the geological science building, the institute in Prince Albert, the STI — in my view, were delayed probably by the input of cabinet to allow an opportunity to put your political input into decisions which have firmly been made. To that extent, I am disappointed, but I don't want to go any further than that.

Certainly we look forward to the subsequent budgets in order to determine indeed the direction and the commitment of this government to education. I just want to ask a few additional questions, many of which we ask as a routine for each department, and I think we can wind down.

I would like to know, Mr. Minister: what are the names, the positions, and salaries of all members of the minister's staff? I think you are clear on what I am asking for.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Would it be all right with the hon. member if we sent this information, or did you want it right now?

MR. KOSKIE: — You can send over the details, Mr. Minister, to save time. If you could just mention the names, just so that I am clear as to who, in fact, is on your staff, on your personal staff. You can send that . . .

HON. MR. CURRIE: — On my staff in the minister's office, there are two people: Bill Barry, who is a special assistant to the minister and Judith Bergen, assistant secretary to the minister.

MR. KOSKIE: — Fine. Just in respect to Mr. Bill Barry: could the minister indicate to me the professional qualifications of that individual? I think if you could, that's what I want.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, I think I can remember this because Bill was on my staff at one time when I was at the Balfour Technical School, and then at Cochrane High

School.

Bill is a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan. I know he had a military career and has taught for, I would say, 15 to 20 years. He has been the superintendent in schools in Saskatchewan and he has had an educational background.

MR. KOSKIE: — Fine. With respect to the minister's staff: are any of the individuals on contract as opposed to being hired through OC?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — As I recall, they are all OC. The other person, Judy Bergen, was an OC appointment by the previous government and is in my office, and so was the other secretary.

MR. KOSKIE: — I would like it if the minister could provide me with this: we'd like the total amount of what we term, again, as entertainment expenses, incurred since May 8th, 1982 by the minister, the deputy, each special assistant, and each executive assistant, if you could.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — We'll provide this information to you.

MR. KOSKIE: — We would like also the names of each person in the department who is on contract — whether you have any contracts with any individuals or any consulting firms, if you'd indicate how they are, when the contract was entered into and the rate of remuneration in respect to it.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — All right. We'd be pleased to send that information over.

MR. KOSKIE: — Can the minister indicate how many vacant permanent positions there are in the department?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — The number is 27 vacant positions at the present time.

MR. KOSKIE: — And do any of the minister's staff have an assigned CVA vehicle, and if so, what are their names and positions?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — None of them presently have a CVA vehicle.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, we would like a record of all CVA aircraft flights charged to the department since May 8, indicating the date, place of departure, destination, names of persons whose flight was charged to the department, if you can provide that.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — We'll provide that information.

MR. KOSKIE: — We'd also like the number of all charter flights charged to the department since May 8, indicating the date, place of departure, destination, person whose flight was charged in the department and the cost of each such charter, if you could.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, sir.

MR. KOSKIE: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, could you indicate (and this may not be relevant), but do you have a press agent or a communication or a public relations person associated with your office?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — No. No. I do not have one.

MR. KOSKIE: — And I would like also a list of all the persons whose employment, whose services, were terminated or who were in fact fired from the Department of Continuing Education since May 8, 1982, and the particular positions that they held at the time.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — We'll provide that information, yes.

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you. And I'd also like, Mr. Minister, if you would give us a list of all the persons whose services were terminated from any of the boards, commissions, or agencies under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education since you took over on May 8.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, we'll have that information. You meant Department of Continuing Education, right?

MR. KOSKIE: — And I just want a clarification here. I wonder if the minister, in respect to any of the employees whose services were in fact terminated or fired or however you wish to word it, if you could indicate out of that number how many of those employees that were dismissed were, in fact, for cause.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, we'll include that.

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you. I would like also the names of any consulting firms which the department may have been using during the course of the year. That may be covered under the previous question, indeed, but I know that the department often has consultants hired, and I would like a list of all the consultants and the particular purpose for which they were hired, the nature of their consulting work, and also the indication of the amount being paid. Can you do that?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, we'll provide that information.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, I note that in choosing a deputy minister you did in fact go to a consulting firm and back sometime around September there were ads on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan through a consulting firm. I would ask the minister to indicate who the consulting firm was, and could he indicate the amount it cost for the consulting services in the search for the deputy minister?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Would you want that information now, or can I provide that with the other information?

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, if you have it, I guess we could take it now.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I would be pleased to provide that information, but I understand that there is a bill or two to come in yet.

MR. KOSKIE: — Okay. Well that's fine, you'll undertake to provide it, that's all we want. Good.

I note that within the ad by the consulting firm — and I found it a little strange — it indicated the compensation level will appeal to those now earning in the '60s range, and it went on to say: "An employment contract is offered."

I am wondering whether it was the intention of the government at the time of placing this to go by way of contract, rather than the normal appointment of the deputies by OC.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — The answer to that is no. There was some consideration being given at that time to go the method of contract, but there has been a change of heart. So the deputies will be appointed in the normal manner.

MR. KOSKIE: — Would the minister also provide me with, not the names, but the number of applicants that replied to the advertisement? In other words, applied, submitted their credentials and applied for the deputy minister's position.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, sir, we'll do so.

MR. KOSKIE: — You indicated that your deputy minister . . . Not deputy minister, but assistant, I guess. I was wondering what duties with the provincial government did your assistant deputy minister have prior to his moving to continuing education? Mr. Evancio, if I'm pronouncing correctly, what were his duties prior to joining continuing ed?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Lawyer.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Evancio was with the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. He went from there into the Department of Finance with the provincial government, where he was working for the special adviser to the Executive Council in an organizational capacity.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'm just wondering whether the minister can indicate whether or not you anticipate any major organizational changes in the department. I know that you can't probably spell out the details, but I'm wondering whether or not, during the year that we're discussing, some organizational structure of the department is being reviewed.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — This is actually under continuous review right now. We don't have any immediate plans for any major changes. But it is something that we have done as one of the things that we felt was pretty essential to bring about a reorganizing with regard to the structure and the organization of the Department of Continuing Education.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to indicate, Mr. Minister, as you will know, the average annual increase in provincial operating grants on a full-time equivalent basis, the FTE, was in fact 10.2 per cent from 1974-75 through to 1981-82. The record will indicate that. I wonder if the minister will be able to give to the House a commitment that the policy that he will adopt will in fact keep the funding at an equivalent to the average which has been established from the '74-75 to the '81-82 at 10.2 per cent.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Quill Lakes could be a little more specific. We're having difficulty zeroing in on exactly what information he would like us to give him.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want quiet; I just want to repeat this once. The average annual increase in the provincial operating grants on a full-time equivalent basis, the FTE, was 10.2 per cent from 1974-75 through to '81-82. What I'm asking is: can the minister

give a commitment in the House today that it is his policy to see that next year, and in later years, the budget will be maintained at that particular level?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, after giving some consideration to this question, I really feel this would be a cabinet decision. It would have to be made at that level, and I don't feel that I can unilaterally go ahead and make that decision.

MR. KOSKIE: — It took all that time to come up with that answer? I just want one other closing remark: as the minister will also know, in every year from 1975-76 through to 1980-81, the proportion of the total university expenditure borne by tuition fees declined and it declined from 11.6 per cent of the total expenditure in 1975-76 to 10.5 per cent in 1980-81. I would like to ask the minister if he would indicate and give us a commitment that the trend whereby tuition fees would carry a less and less percentage of the cost. Can he give us that commitment? That trend, I think, is much appreciated by the students attending, particularly under these very difficult economic times, since April 8th, 1982.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I'd like the hon. member to realize that I share his empathy for the young people. The only thing is, once again I think I'm out of my territory because this is a decision that should be made by the board of governors, and I would respect that decision.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want really to impress upon the minister that the students, of course, with the economic times . . . I don't want to be facetious in respect to that. I want also to indicate that the job opportunities are less available than they were two or three years ago. I want to say that many of them now will be forced into taking ordinary jobs, maybe at the minimum wage. I want the minister to understand that tuition fees are an ever-increasing burden on students. That is, the minimum wage hasn't been increased and any of them who get employment on this reduced minimum wage — not reduced, but a minimum wage that wasn't increased . . . In other words, to many of the students, their income potential has been frozen by no increase in the minimum wage.

Secondly, the job opportunities are very, very difficult. I would ask the minister to consider the financing of the universities, treat the students in a way which I think is fitting and agree with the board of governors (and certainly they'll agree to it if you give them enough financing) that a freeze on the tuition fees can be implemented during the rather difficult economic times.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I would be pleased to take notice of what you have said, and treat it in the manner in which I am able to.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 28 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

RESOURCES DIVISION

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 5

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

PROVINCIAL LIBRARY

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 29

Item 1

HON. MR. CURRIE: — I'd like to introduce the officials from the Provincial Library. This is Leah Siebold, the acting provincial librarian. Sitting behind Leah is Marcel deLaforest, who is the director of administration.

MR. KOSKIE: — I only have two or three questions here, Mr. Minister. First of all, I think that throughout Saskatchewan we have a library system that is pretty commendable and I just wonder whether the minister could indicate whether he has received any representation in respect to funding or areas of concern out in the field.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — In responding, Mr. Chairman, to the areas of concern and funding, I am pleased to say that the increases that were given for this year to the regional libraries were 14.8 per cent, 16 per cent to Regina and Saskatoon, plus a substantial increase in the northern grants from 2,000 to 15,000.

MR. KOSKIE: — And you solved all the problems, I take it, with that? I just want to ask the

minister. The previous government had established a new formula for the funding of the libraries. Very much dialogue had taken place . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, sir, a lot of consultation, and I want to say that there was considerable support throughout and a lot of anticipation of the implementation of the formula that was developed by the previous government. What I want to ask is whether or not your government, in its funding of the libraries, adopted that formula.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, the hon. member will be pleased to know that we did implement that.

MR. KOSKIE: — I can understand why the problems have been resolved, and I'm glad to hear that. Just one further question. In the first subvote, there is in fact a decrease in the number of positions. Could the minister outline what deletions have taken place?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — There were 4.5 decreases and 4 added, so the overall change is a decrease of 0.5.

MR. KOSKIE: — Similarly, can the minister indicate to me, and you can send this over, whether the services of any employees were no longer required by the present government, whether there were any dismissals and the positions that they held at the time? You can send that over, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Yes, I'd be pleased to.

MR. KOSKIE: — Finally, can you indicate the number of vacant positions throughout the Provincial Library estimate?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — The number of vacant positions is 10.

MR. KOSKIE: — If my colleagues have no further questions, I have no further questions.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, for once I'm not going to be abrasive, neither abrasive nor aggressive. I have a passing interest in the automation system. I would appreciate a report from you on how the automation of the library system is coming along.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, for the information of the hon. member for Regina Centre, the current cataloguing is done by using the University of Toronto library automation system. The retrospective cataloguing — as far as that is concerned, a joint venture agreement has been signed with the Regina and Saskatoon libraries. The third thing that I could point out is that a request for a proposal has been approved to research an in-province data base to replace the . . . (inaudible) . . . system.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — By what period in time do you expect to have the card system entirely automated? That's not an easy question. Let me divide it into two parts. By what period of time do you expect to have the card system, the card cataloguing, in Regina and Saskatoon automated, and by what period of time, if ever, do you expect to do that throughout the entire province?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, for Regina and Saskatoon, probably around January of 1984, and for the regional libraries, largely depending upon what their wishes are, probably a year to two years for automation.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm interested to hear that you will have the regional libraries automated by 1975. I'm going to be asking you that one again . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . '85, yes. Well, '95 would have been more my guess than '85. I'm surprised that you can do it in a year or two. I want to congratulate the minister for once, in this area at least, not suffering from any indecision, if you can do all that in a year's time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, well, you've followed in some very competent footsteps, I have to say.

I want to ask you as well about the ongoing problem with municipalities who drop out. The library structure has long wanted mandatory participation in libraries, just as we have mandatory participation in hospitals and schools, and frankly, logic has every recommendation for that proposal. On the other hand, the municipalities, I think, are less enthusiastic about such a system and some have dropped out. I'd appreciate knowing at this point in time how many rural municipalities have dropped out, how many urban municipalities have dropped out, and where you stand on the ongoing controversy between the municipalities and the libraries, the library system which wants mandatory participation.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Chairman, in 1981 there were 57 notices of withdrawal in effect and there are less than half that in December of 1982. Altogether there were 21 notices at that time. It's interesting to note that 93 per cent of the population is participating so that really the withdrawal notices indicate a pretty small portion of the population in its entirety.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, just very briefly, does the minister have any intention of legislating mandatory participation in the library system? Is that a proposal that you are seriously considering?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — No, I don't think that the minister has any idea of proposing that.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

Item 4

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just have one question. I think it is appropriate under this last item. Does the minister have any intention to abolish the structure of the Provincial Library and amalgamate the services provided by your staff into another department? Do you have any intention of abolishing the agency itself?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — The answer to that would be no.

Item 4 agreed to.

Vote 29 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

PROVINCIAL LIBRARY

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 29

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 29 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 33

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — My officials were introduced last night. Is that satisfactory?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a number of issues I want to raise. I think we have thoroughly canvassed the Van Mulligen-Sharon Young-hiring guidelines issues. I think we've thoroughly canvassed that.

Mr. Minister, I want to take you back in time to last July. You, after considerable criticism from the opposition that you had done nothing for the superannuates, did bring in a bill on July 5 and 6, I believe, which did provide the superannuates, as I recall, with the same benefits we would have provided had we been returned to office, although it was somewhat belated.

At that time, we raised with you the issue of the right of people to transfer from the old to the new plan. It had reference to section 38. We urged upon you at that point in time, Mr. Minister, that the amendments we would have made be incorporated in the bill you passed. You accused us of panicking and indicated that you were going to give it due consideration and in a short period of time would have a decision on it.

Well, no one, I think, will accuse you of panicking, having not acted on it in this period of time. I would appreciate a statement of what your intentions are with respect to this matter, which is important for those involved.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, we have met with the superannuates. They also advanced that particular argument. I think that there will be legislation forthcoming in this session. Whether it will deal with that problem remains to be seen. Clearly, I think I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition last night, an overall look at pensions is being undertaken by government. Although maybe not quite into that area, we're trying to address the question with the amount of money that we do have, and in the most equitable way we possibly can.

I know your concern there. We have looked at it. Any decision will be announced in due course, with legislation as to what we're going to do.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I assume when the minister says he's going with legislation in this session, you mean the next session of the legislature, not the one we're concluding. Can we take it from that that you will deal with the question of increments to

superannuates in a timely fashion this year? We'll deal with it in the spring?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — You can take from that statement anything you want — that the legislation will be introduced. I think, as the normal tradition of this House, when the legislation is introduced, it states the policy. Until such time, I wouldn't want to speculate, or have you speculate, what might be in that bill.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I think the superannuates are hoping I'm not wrong.

I want to deal with an issue which, Mr. Minister, is permeating the entire public service. It is corroding the morale of the public service. That is the ongoing firings that continue and continue and continue and continue.

Mr. Minister, I can go and meet public servants as I do, and in the old days, I used to be able to say, "Well, Bill, how's it going?" And they'd tell you what they're doing in their department. They'd have some project that they're working on in their department. They'd stop and tell you about it, and it was usually of interest to myself as well. Now you get a stock response: "Well, Bill, how's it going?" "Well, still working, still working."

The morale in the public service is as low as the earl of hell's boots, and that comes about, not particularly, Mr. Minister, because of your approach to the issue. It comes about because of the continuous ongoing firings, the lack of security. And I beseech the minister in the name of good government to bring the firings to an end. And it just doesn't come to an end; it just goes on and on and on.

I know that SGI is a crown corporation, but it is symptomatic of the problem. You continue to decimate the public service. You could do yourselves and the public of Saskatchewan a great favour if you could get it over with. And it might look like a Saint Valentine's Day massacre if you could get it over with, but you might be able to do something about the morale in the public service, and frankly it's terrible. It's terrible, and it is affecting your ability to implement programs.

As partisan as I may be, I hate to see the public service become what it has today. I simply can't find a public servant who is cheerful about his work these days. It simply doesn't exist in this city or in the province, and it's these ongoing firings. I beseech the minister in the name of good government to bring the process to an end.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I take it that you are referring to the various dismissals at SGI was the basis of the ongoing question as it relates to this, if that was in fact meant. So I interpret your question to be then clearly that's not in the purview of the public service commission. That is something more appropriately brought up to the minister as you did in question period today. With regard to SGI, certainly it is a question to be brought up in crown corporations.

With regard to the implementation of programs, I would say that, quite frankly, the programs that have been implemented have been in fact done in a very, in a very good manner. I think we've delivered our programs very well. The changes that we've made have been implemented by the civil service very well, and I suppose you indicate that the morale is at such and such a level. I suppose that's your opinion. I suppose everyone's entitled to their opinion, but I don't think I can say a lot more than simply that's your opinion with regard to the morale. I would tend to disagree with you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't frankly know, if I were in your position, how I'd respond to

these comments because I don't expect you to admit it. And I don't think there's any real way you can deny it. So as I say, I don't know quite how I'd respond to it, but I tell you it is corroding the public service. I've been around long enough to have known the public service in the last days of the Thatcher government, and it was terrible.

But I'll tell you quite frankly, Mr. Minister, it's worse right now than it was in the latter days of the Thatcher government. The morale is awful! It is awful! . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it is not among party members. It is among all kinds of public servants who don't have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They'd all be gone tomorrow if I named 50. If I named 50, they'd all be gone tomorrow. They'd all be gone tomorrow if I named 50.

I want to get off the subject. As I say, I frankly don't know quite how the minister would respond to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Could we have order, please. May I have order, please, so that we can continue with the process.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to ask you to comment on something else; it's part of the same problem. It's part of what contributes to the lack of the department in the public service. I want to refer you to a remark made by the Premier on May 13, 1982. He said,

We expect the public service to be thoroughly professional and entirely loyal at all times and, to that end, we want to ensure that no civil servants hold membership cards in any political party.

Is that still the policy of the government?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I wouldn't want to comment with regard to that question. The Premier's estimates are coming up, and I think you can ask the Premier that question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Surely, Mr. Minister, the public service has an overall responsibility for policy with respect to the public servants. Surely that is your responsibility in a direct fashion, not the Premier's.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, I don't think there is anything in the laws or the regulations or the policies that basically say a civil servant cannot hold a political card.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So you've refuted the Premier. I'm glad to hear that. Glad to hear that.

I want to ask you some questions about employment contracts. I want to ask you how many employment contracts there are. I want to know if there are some standard terms that go into employment contracts. I'm particularly interested in what provisions there are with respect to termination of the contracts and severance. And I will ask those one at a time, if that's confusing. I want to know how many employment contracts the government has entered into. As the minister will note, by way of background, the opposition has suspected that you are overutilizing employment contracts as distinct from OC appointments, a practical effect of which is to give a very considerable degree

of security to positions which used to be high-risk positions.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Any employment contract of course, as you well know, is not subject to the public service commission. I think if you want to ask those particular questions, as the Leader of the Opposition did, in the Department of Finance. I indicated that there were two in the Department of Finance. I undertook to get the amounts of that to the Leader of the Opposition. There are obviously contracts within the government. There were contracts within the previous government. I don't think you would deny that. The likes of Roy Atkinson, etc., had contracts on an ongoing basis with the previous government. That has existed in lots of governments. And I'm sure it exists in the province of Manitoba, in that particular government. That doesn't fall under the purview of the public service commission. I don't think it's a proper question for us to try to answer.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, we're not suggesting that there's anything wrong with an employment contract per se; it has a place in government. What we're suggesting is that the number have increased very dramatically under this administration. Do I take it that you have no central record of how many employment contracts you have?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I can only speak from the public service commission, which is what is on trial here tonight. And I can say that the public service commission is not involved in it at all, and I would not be able to answer that question in my capacity.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would be interested in knowing — and if you have the figures I'd appreciate them now; if you can't, I would accept them in writing later on — I'd be interested in knowing the total amount of severance which has been paid by this government to employees who have been permanently laid off, which is a current euphemism that's making the rounds — permanent layoff — or who have been severed, or OCs terminated. I'd be interested in knowing the total amount of severance which has been paid.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — As I understand it, and I will undertake to get the numbers to you, if you like — they're all by way of OC, which you could check through the orders in council — I understand the total is \$1.3 million.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'd also appreciate, when you're getting that, knowing the total number of people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yeah, check the OCs. I'd be delighted to do that if you people gave us any amount of staff. We haven't got anywhere near enough staff to do that sort of research. We don't have the vast resources . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You guys had a good deal and you people had more than we had. You had 17; we have eight. And that affects the amount of research capacity which you have very dramatically. If you'd treat us with anywhere near the generosity the opposition in Alberta is treated, we could do that kind of research ourselves.

I want to know (and you may have to supply this in writing) how many positions are vacant in the government at this point in time. Of the positions which are vacant I would like to know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely impossible to carry on estimates with this ruckus that is going on right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Could we have order, please, so that we could continue with the public service commission, so we can wrap it up.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would like to know, Mr. Minister, if I might, how many of those

positions are frozen in the sense that a determination has been made not to fill them for an indefinite period of time. So, how many positions are vacant? Of those, how many positions are frozen?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I'll deal with the first two points you raised. Number one, with regard to the staff component from research, you are, of course, covered by exactly the same rules that were put into place while you folks were in government, not us, with regard to the number of research staff you had. And I can assure you that I was on that side as well with the amount of research that one has. Sure, we had 17 members. I suppose if you had one member over there, you'd want it the same as if you had 34. That's hardly valid.

I won't go any further than that, other than to say that you haven't been treated in any way different and the matter came up and was approved unanimously in the board of internal economy, which I'm sure your members would have passed on.

And with regard to vacant positions in the government today, there's 1,625.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I also asked how many of those had been frozen in the sense that there was no intention to fill them for an indefinite period of time.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 500.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to deal with a topical issue, Mr. Minister. It has to do with the employee disability plan, the dispute between the public service commission and the SGEU. I don't think I have to outline for the benefit of the minister the nature of the problem. I have gathered some information on it. I would like to know where the public service commission is heading with this problem. The SGEU say, as they have said publicly, that they had a commitment, first of all, that it would be done on January 1 and that was moved back to January 20. A scant few days before January 20 of this year, the commitment became inoperative, and the deductions have not been made. The SGEU alleged they have been put in a difficult position, because some of their members discontinued other plans on the assumption that this would be going forward. I would be interested in knowing what the public service commission is doing to resolve what I think is a legitimate complaint from SGEU.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — If we look at the thing, I think you say the dispute is between SGEU and the public service commission. Our interpretation is that the dispute is between the SGEU and some of the members of the SGEU. In fact, a number of members of the SGEU have sued the union, as the labour standards officers brought the action against the union, challenging the legality of the deductions. Clearly, we stand as a third party, or an outside party, with regard to that. They've had ample opportunity as a third party, or an outside party, with regard to that. They've had ample opportunity to bring the action either before the labour relations board or before the arbitration board. Now they are, in the most recent letter to me, requesting that we change the regulations. The legal advice we have is that to change the regulations per their request would be an illegal act by us in the public service commission. I don't think we would want to do that. I'm sure you wouldn't want to suggest that we do that.

What we are doing to try to expedite the thing is simply sending out authorization cards to members of the union, so they can sign the card and then that can be deducted from them. We can maybe get around it that way. That's what we've tried to do.

Surely you wouldn't suggest that we do something that somebody is challenging as

illegal. And surely if SGEU are serious with regard to this, they could bring the matter to the appropriate authorities and have the matter resolved.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — But, Mr. Minister, the SGEU has agreed to indemnify the public service commission for any liability. Surely that ought to be adequate. The principle is important, and I want to spend a moment on it, no more. I'll get to it in a moment. But the sums are not earth-shattering. Surely the undertaking of SGEU to indemnify the public service commission ought to be sufficient.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The argument against that is that no one can indemnify someone against breaking the law. That's like saying that I will indemnify you if you rob a bank. It doesn't work that way. It's legal or it's not legal. There is a form by which you can determine the legality of it. It's not simply the court system., it's also the labour relations board or an arbitration board here. And that's the proper form to go in, and not simply to try to pull us into it. Once that decision, and it should be easy; you as a lawyer should know that, it should be easy to appear before that, determine the case (the legality or the illegality of it), and certainly once that is determined we will act according to that judgement, or that ruling of that particular tribunal.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It seems to me, Mr. Minister, and I'm going to leave it with this, that there is a substantive issue here. It is the right of the unions to determine via their own constitution the level of dues. It strikes me that in some ways this is in fact a due. It's a union due. It is earmarked for a specific purpose, but it strikes me that this is a union due.

It has heretofore been axiomatic that a union, in accordance with its own constitution, could determine what the dues are. If the public service commission takes the position that, on the strength of a complaint, they aren't going to allow the dues to be increased, then you are going to emasculate, over a period of time, trade unions. And surely there is a substantive issue here of the right of unions to determine, in accordance with their constitution, the dues which they are charging their members. And it has been suggested by the SGEU that you are in fact thwarting that right, and I would appreciate your comment on it.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Okay, as I understand it, on the advice that we have with regard to and why, and you said it's a fundamental question, and surely if it's that fundamental a question, it should have a resolve of a tribunal. But the understanding and the challenges, I understand, from the members is that the deductions are not in accordance with the constitution of the SGEU and it hasn't been before their convention and that's apparently the legal argument. Until such time as it comes before their convention there's no legality to it. So that's the argument that you're talking about; it becomes an internal thing and I think you can see, as an internal problem, where it puts the public service commission. As I say, if it's so fundamental as the member opposite seems to indicate, then surely it could be resolved quite quickly at one of those tribunals and clearly that's what tribunals are there for.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The minister is assuming that it's the sort of issue which can be arbitrated as distinct from litigated. If it can be arbitrated, it can be done with some dispatch; if it's got to be litigated, which was the assumption I was operating on, that is going to be a time-consuming process. It will be some years before the thing quits bouncing around in the various appellate courts.

I want to ask you a question, Mr. Minister, about your affirmative action program. I

would appreciate a status report on them. How many women have you succeeded in moving into senior positions, how many natives has your affirmative action program succeeded with, and how many disabled people have you succeeded with? I would appreciate a status report on this.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — You had two questions there. The first question as to how, what remedies they could seek, the advice that I have is, number one, they could go to the arbitration board through the grievance process, they could litigate it in the courts, they could take it to the labour relations board, or they could send out authorizations — the member authorizing the union to do that. The only option that we can do in that particular regard is to send the authorizations out, get the authorizations, then we're protected and then we can make those deductions. And that's the process that we're trying.

With regard to that other information, if you could bear with us, or do you want me to send the material over to you when it's recovered?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It would be satisfactory if you sent it over. I say this not particularly as a criticism of the current administration, because I remember the frustrations of being in office: I remember being minister of culture and youth, the member from — I don't know the name of the Saskatoon riding — I remember being a minister, and I remember announcing that it was policy that we were going to hire some native people. I remember eight months later having two people in the Department of Culture and Youth, both of which were working in my office, and that was the extent of my success.

I know it is a difficult problem and I know the difficulties in moving natives into senior positions in the government. I say this not as a criticism, but I urge the government, and I urge the minister in charge of the public service commission, to make every effort to see that this program succeeds; every effort to see that women are represented in senior positions in government in a more equitable fashion than they are, and every . . . I'm not sure what the minister is saying — if he's saying he's got two people in senior positions, I'll regard that as a stunning success . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's a political success. That's not the affirmative action program. The affirmative action program is intended to get women into administrative positions in government, of which there are not nearly enough.

I will readily admit that the problem didn't begin with your administration. It began long before the former administrations. It's been an ongoing problem. It has been an ongoing problem with women; it has been an ongoing problem with natives, and I would urge the government to redouble its efforts to try and make these programs succeed.

I gathered from a discussion with the human rights commission before the public accounts committee that the success with respect to the disabled is almost non-existent. Virtually nothing has been accomplished with respect to the disabled. I urge the government again to redouble your efforts to assist these people in attaining some positions in government.

It is simply a tragedy that in a government which hires 20,000 people, there isn't anything a man in a wheel chair can do. That is just something not believable. I know it's the mentality of the public service, and it's only going to come to an end if the political arm of the government makes a decision that they're going to bring it to an end and if

you've got the steel in your backbone to make it happen. It takes that. It takes the will and it takes a good deal of determination. So I urge you to continue, and I would be prepared to accept the status report in writing. I would be very appreciative to have it.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I can give you a rough answer, if you would like, with regard to the natives and the handicapped that have been hired to date. The women — the question would have to be directed to the Minister of Labour as those statistics are kept over there and not through the public service commission, but we can arrange to try to get those for you.

In 1981-1982 year, there were 2,684 people hired by the government. Of those, 160 fitted into the class of natives and handicapped. In the year April to February, which is not quite a full year, there has been less than half that number of people hired — 1,056 have been hired through government of which 70 have been natives or handicapped; 60 of those were native; 10 of those were disabled people.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I admit, Mr. Minister, that's progress. I'm not satisfied with that and I would be surprised if the minister opposite were satisfied with that degree of progress either. It's an ongoing problem. I urge the government to make every effort to see that the program succeeds to a degree it hasn't. I'm glad to see we've got virtually unanimous agreement from the front benches, from the members that sit opposite.

I would appreciate, Mr. Minister, receiving the names of the members of the public service commission. I gather the members of the public service commission were chanted, were they not?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — In response to that question: Roland Muir, Isabelle Butters, Harold Hoffman. Bill Fyles is a new member on, replacing one Roland Crowe who had requested that he be removed from that position as he was not interested in doing the job and had not attended the meetings. Bill Fyles is a former . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, okay. That's the only change that was made.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would like, Mr. Minister, a list of the positions transferred to the unclassified division or excluded from the operation of the act, pursuant to section 46 of The Public Service Act. I have heard rumours (but no evidence of this) but I have heard rumours that the numbers transferred have increased quite dramatically over the last year, and I would be delighted to be told that this rumour is unfounded.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — As of March 31, 1982 — that's when you were in office — there were 627 positions OC classification. As of January 31, 1983, when we were in office, there was 586 positions classified OC.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I think that's virtually it, Mr. Minister. I want to thank you and your staff for your courteous and co-operative attention to the questions we've put to you during your estimates.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wonder, with leave of the House, if I might ask for some information in writing. I've asked for it in other departments. With respect to subvote 7

and subvote 3 of vote 33, the public service commission — in all of the other subvotes you in fact have modest increases over what we had budgeted in March. In subvote 3 and subvote 7 — and that's training and staff development, which is subvote 3 and communications which is subvote 7 — you have budgeted less than what we budgeted in March, the only two subvotes you have. If you could supply me in writing with an explanation as to how the decreases in spending were achieved, I would appreciate it. And I well appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that I do this with leave of the House.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The information I can give to you is some of that is vacant positions that were recognized into the budget. The other I will undertake to get to you and send over to you, if that's fine.

Vote 33 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 33

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 33 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 26

Item 1

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

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I have with me the acting deputy minister, Mr. Dick Bailey, on my right. On his right is Jim Paul, acting manager of the administration branch. Directly behind me is Gerry Stinson, director of municipal services. And behind Mr. Bailey is Marcel L'Heureux, director of the economic development branch.

MR. YEW: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I want to begin my line of questioning with regard to the dismantling of DNS. Basically, I would like to have your comments on: what was the consultation process used by your department to determine the need to dismantle DNS in such a rapid, immediate format that you have initiated over the past several months? I wonder if the minister may want to respond to that.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, if I caught it right the hon. member asked what the consultation process was. Is that right?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's right.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay. I know the hon. member for Cumberland has asked this question a couple of times in various forms, and here in question period before, regarding the consultation process and asking why we didn't have a major consultation with the people in the North about the way in which the department would be administered, the way in which government services or government programs would be delivered in northern Saskatchewan. And my response at that time was the same as it is tonight. It hasn't changed. We didn't see the need for consultation on how those services would be provided to people in there any more than in 1972 or . . . I'm not sure of the date there, but about 1972 the former administration did not carry out major consultation processes before the establishment of DNS. The former administration decided that that would be the establishment of this one all-encompassing department would be the way in which they would deliver services to northern Saskatchewan. And we can get into the pros and cons of some things that happened there and some things that didn't happen. But, you know, it's not my intention to do that now.

But it was our belief when we came into power . . . I believe if you're honest with yourself in your heart of hearts you'll know that it was a very necessary thing. And if you're also honest with the House, you'll say that many people in your riding are also saying that we did it in a good way, in a very clean way, in a solid way — that we broke it down and realigned the department with the rest of the province. And I think that the people that live in northern Saskatchewan, from what I've seen, have been very pleased with the good results.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond further to the minister's comment. And I for one would certainly like to agree with you, Mr. Minister, that the people in my constituency and people in general throughout the northern administration district would sympathize with the way that you handled the dismantling process of the department in such an expedient way, in such a way that it didn't entail the consultation process with the majority of local government with the majority of various interest groups. And I mentioned a few — the Northern Contractors Association, the Saskatchewan Trappers Association and Northern Outfitters Association, the Northern Lights School Division, the LCAs, the LACs, the trade corporated centre and there's dozens more of various organizations and particularly people at the local level.

You mentioned the issue of how this department, how government set up this single agency concept back in '71-72 and the lack of consultation in those days. But I just want to explain to the minister that in those days I just started to be involved in community issues and developments with respect to local government. I just left the trapline in those days and I was very nil, nil in political awareness. But I do recall there were some consultations held with northern residents. I recall distinctly two major large northern area meetings to discuss the single agency concept, to discuss the various departments: social, cultural, education, local government, concepts of the single agency (the concept was introduced) and what it would be responsible for. Those meetings were held in La Ronge in '71-72.

And also there was discussion about the establishment of a northern municipal council. It wasn't referred to as a northern municipal council in those days, but, however, that process was also discussed — the possibility of electing a northern municipal council that would be responsible for local government throughout the northern administration district.

And in respect to economic development, there was discussion in those days about

how the communities would have input by way of local loans committees, district loans committees, etc. So, I have to differ with you. There was some consultation, probably not satisfactory, but certainly the dismantling of DNS in recent months has, from my opinion (and I want to be very sincere and honest with you, Mr. Minister), from my discussions with the people in my constituency, and people in general throughout the northern administration district, have raised serious concern about the process. There is a lot to be desired as far as I can conclude from my discussions and my findings throughout the northern administration district about the dismantling process.

Getting back to the line of questioning with regard to the dismantling process, what is your government doing to ensure that decisions concerning northern people's lives are not going to revert back to the pre-1970s or the '60s, etc.; that the communities in the North, the people living in the northern administration district, will have some input, some understanding, of what type of government programs and policies — of how those programs and policies will be applicable to them — what type of input and information they can acquire through your department?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — As the hon. member will know, and you did readily admit, the way in which the process was carried on, as far as the people in the various communities are concerned (and I've heard this from many of them) they've seen little change. They didn't have the daily consultation, or weekly consultation, with senior officials within the department in any case. The people that delivered programs before, by and large, are still delivering programs under a different auspices, under the auspices of the Department of Health, or education, or continuing ed, or whatever other receiving departments.

You ask what we will do as a government to ensure that there isn't a return to, you say, pre-1972 days, and I understand that. I want to assure the hon. member and people in northern Saskatchewan that I very much understand. The hon. member will also know that I have lived for a major portion of my life very close to that situation. I understand what you're talking about when you say pre-1972, where perhaps the conservation officer and the RCMP officer were everything in that community from doctor to taxi driver to whatever you want to name. So okay, I understand the situation.

Certainly we've come a long way past that in the last number of years. I will say to you that as far as our government is concerned what I've been responsible for, what my colleagues have been responsible for, is to make sure that there is a liaison there. That's the role that has been well stated of the new DNS, or the new department, that's much smaller, much more manageable, I might add, in a liaison role with other ministers.

You readily admitted and mentioned to my colleague, the Minister of Education, about his trip into the North, that about his feeling for the young people he has jurisdiction over. The Minister of Health has been into the North on several occasions — excellent feeling for the people of the North and for the needs and the health care in the North, as he has for the need of health care throughout the province. We feel from an administrative and a delivery of programs point of view health services can best be delivered by the Department of Health, education by the Department of Education, and so on. We just feel that the single agency concept didn't work. And I think, as mentioned before, your colleagues will search into their heart of hearts and realize that it didn't work for them either.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Minister, are you then satisfied with the process to date in terms of the

dismantling of DNS?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I had to ask if I should be satisfied. No, I very much am satisfied with the process of realignment to date. I suppose you take the hypothetical situation and say, if we could come in and decide that this is the way that the department should operate ideally, it would be in a realigned situation. Okay, we believe that.

As the hon. member will know, there were plans within the former administration for what was then called decanting. I never could understand that word. I never did understand why that word was used. Decanting to me is something you do with wine, and you leave the dregs behind. Well, that's not something we wanted to do with the people in the North or with the North. But we call it realignment, we call it with the rest of the province, so that people in northern Saskatchewan can feel very much a part of Saskatchewan, as they are very much a part of Saskatchewan and the future of this province.

So, when you ask if I'm satisfied, certainly if we could have carried out the process to date, what has been accomplished to date — and I call it an accomplishment — if we could have carried it out and kept it — oh, how can I best say it? — kept it as clean as we did and as decisive as we did in a shorter period of time, well, I would have been happier. Okay, anything that you do, you must say that it could be done better. And maybe we could have done it better; maybe we could have speeded the process up even more. I'm not sure if the hon. member would agree with that, but in any case it's been going on relatively well, and to this point we're relatively satisfied.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, with regard to the dismantling process, just one more question, briefly. Were the trappers' associations, fishermen's federated co-ops, and the two native organizations, FSI and AMNSIS, consulted in that process?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — As I mentioned to you before, they weren't consulted in the process of whether or not there would be realignment. That was a decision that we took as a government in the way in which we would administer government programs. So we took that decision, and we did not consult with the various organizations regarding realignment as such. There was consultation with the various groups as it related to the various activities they're involved in. You mentioned the fishermen's co-op; you mentioned the trappers' association. There have been consultations with all of the groups, I think, that you mentioned, as well as many others — local government groups when it dealt with their particular area of concern.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister in respect to economic development and job creation for northern Saskatchewan, what is your overall policy approach to economic development for the North?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, right at the present time we are now developing a list of what we would call feasible projects — and I want to emphasize the word “feasible” — viable projects that we think would work well in northern Saskatchewan to address a problem that I know the hon. member is extremely concerned about, and I think he is assured that I'm extremely concerned about too, and that's unemployment in northern Saskatchewan. Unemployment throughout the province and the country, we know, is certainly a problem, but we know it's an extreme problem in the North. As I have pointed out to you on several occasions before, it's not a new problem in northern Saskatchewan. It's an extreme problem; it's one we must address. And my colleague, the Minister of Continuing Education, mentioned some of the things today about

training and the things that are needed.

So we're developing a list of feasible projects in consultation with other departments, with the receiving departments. As a matter of fact, Mr. Bailey is meeting tomorrow with, I believe, about four deputies from other departments to go through these projects and to just come forward with a proposal. I would say to you that until now, as we just mentioned in our earlier discussion here a few moments ago, major attention in the department has been toward the realignment process. We're now ready to get under way with economic development —we know it is important.

I say feasible and viable projects, I'm talking about. I know the hon. member may say, "Well now, it's been eight or nine months, and where are your projects?" and so on. But, I would say to you, in the single agency department that was there, with an economic development branch that was quite large, in fact very large, there were projects there that made me shake my head when I go into northern Saskatchewan or my knowledge of it. Things like — and I'll just throw it out — market garden proposals and all of the kinds of things that people were coming forward with, that I don't think feasible or viable. I say that's not the kind of thing we are looking at. We're looking at something more long-term than that.

And, I just want to say that it took 10 or 12 years to come up with some big zingers like market gardens, and that's not the way we want to do it.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in terms of the economic development initiative that your government is planning to take, when do you expect to begin to produce results?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay, the question you have as far as results are concerned, I hope that as soon as possible once we can get under way. But, the specific question you asked is basically associated with the '83-'84 budget year, because the consultation that I just referred to earlier between the deputies of the various departments has to do with projects that could be, perhaps, included in the 1983-84 budget year, and certainly there will be announcements about each of them in due course. That's the best I can say to you at this point.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in terms of economic development loans and grants, could you advise the legislature how many loans and grants have been processed and approved since May 8th, for what reasons, and to whom?

Mr. Chairman, before the minister responds, could I mention "to whom". I didn't clarify that question. I must apologize to the House. By whom, I meant various organizations, such as the wild rice harvesters association, Saskatchewan Trappers Association, and Northern Contractors Association, the various local community development corporations that exist, etc. There are associations and co-operatives.

If you can provide this information, that would be tremendous. In terms of the individuals who did receive loans and grants, I'm sure that the individuals concerned would want to keep that quite confidential.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay, in terms of loans since '82-83, we had 10 of the

commercial variety — all, I believe, that were there as commitments, that were there from the former administration, and I'll be honest about that. As you know we put a freeze on the economic development loan and grant fund for a very good reason, and I could get into that if you like. Ten commercial, 1 trapping, 44 fishing, 4 grants, fish transportation subsidies — one of them Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation, ongoing — to these ones for Co-op conference, \$200. That's it. Okay?

MR. YEW: — A specific question. With respect to the Saskatchewan Trappers Association, I understand they received only 25,000 out of an average government support previously somewhere in the neighbourhood of 121,000 or 127,000 for various programs that the association ministers with respect to their zones — respective programs to trappers. Could you advise the legislature just how much has been approved to date to the trappers association and if in fact, you will approve any more moneys to the association?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, there has been nothing approved from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to the trappers association, but I would say to you: ask those questions under Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources where we deal with the fur industry and the trappers association, and we'll be pleased to answer them there.

MR. YEW: — I wonder if the minister might provide us with the names, titles and salaries of all the minister's personal staff since May 8, 1982.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I can provide you with a list. Would that be satisfactory?

MR. YEW: — I should maybe go on further there. In terms of that information, could you also provide the names and positions of all persons fired from DNS since May 8, 1982 and also the amount of severance pay paid to each individual?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Yes, we can provide that. It may take some time. I don't think it would take very long at all, really.

MR. YEW: — I wonder if you could provide us also, with regards to your expenses, entertainment expenses incurred by the minister, and as well, by each one of his personal staff members since May 8th.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I can provide that with no difficulty.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might provide us with the status report for two of your former, or should I say your present, staff members, namely Butch McDougall and Edward Charlette.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Neither are employed by the department.

MR. YEW: — With respect to the NEED program, Mr. Minister. How much of the moneys available to the province was actually allotted to the northern administration district?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Just a point of clarification. Was the hon. member referring to the program, the job creation program, ours that was dovetailed in with the federal NEED program? Okay. I indicated very clearly to the local governments in the North, during one of the several meetings I've had with them, while we were discussing the development of Bill 61, that they should individually get their applications in to the

government, and I know that a number of them did. I think they did, anyway. I stand to be corrected, but I believe that a number of them did.

I don't have that information for you — exactly how much was allotted to the northern administration district. As you will know, I think it's safe to say the line that once divided us is diminishing in importance in some areas, and that would be one of them. I would say that I believe my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, and I'm not sure who else is involved in that, I think maybe the Minister of Finance, but that information could probably be available; I don't have it with me tonight though.

MR. YEW: — I'm led to believe, then, that there is no specific amount allotted for the northern administration district. There's no specified amount allotted.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, what I would say to you is that there was an emphasis in the program as was announced by my colleagues; there was an emphasis for areas of high unemployment. And as we said earlier, certainly the northern administration district, or northern Saskatchewan in general, just communities of northern Saskatchewan and people in northern Saskatchewan, would certainly qualify there, and I'm sure that they did, if the applications were in. I think, as I said before, that there were a number in.

MR. YEW: — With respect to capital projects, Mr. Minister, do you plan to proceed with the special trades training and vocational centre for La Ronge?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I believe you asked my colleague that question in continuing education, not many hours ago, on this same day. I would say that whatever he told you would be what's going to happen there. Okay?

MR. YEW: — I recall a question that was put forth here a few days ago, with respect to industry and commerce —the minister responsible, Mr. Rousseau. I distinctly recall that question was placed before the minister regarding economic development in northern Saskatchewan, and the minister responded by saying that this was under your portfolio.

Am I to understand then, that anything pertaining to education has been transferred and is officially now the responsibility of education?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — That's right. It is transferred to education — continuing education. When you say economic development, although you may well have just only been referring to the particular incident with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but we don't . . . When I talk about economic development in northern Saskatchewan, we're not really talking about the capital projects that may or may not be built by government.

MR. YEW: — With respect to health services, Mr. Minister, my question with respect to health would be the proposed hospital for La Ronge and I'm not sure now whether the process of realignment has been completed. If it has, then I pass that question.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — It would be best asked to my colleague, the Minister of Health. His estimates are still coming, I understand.

MR. YEW: — With respect to reforestation, Mr. Minister, would that again have been realigned?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Under DTRR once again, although that would be one of the types of things that would be talked about between the deputies of the two departments in terms of economic development, something with some kind of future to it. But basically it's a tourism, renewable resources issue under the forestry branch.

MR. YEW: — With respect to economic development again, I just want to go back to that area once more, Mr. Minister, and it falls back to the realignment question again. I have a copy of a letter which you sent to all your department staff dated July 16, 1982. And in that memo, you emphasized . . . Well, I'll quote from the letter:

The government recognizes the valuable service that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (DNS) has provided to Northerners over the past 10 years. However, the government also recognizes the need for greater emphasis on local self-government and the development of economic self-sufficiency. It is therefore the policy of this government to develop and support responsible and effective municipal self-government in the North and to develop, in consultation with the residents of northern Saskatchewan, a long-term comprehensive economic strategy that will result in making residents of northern Saskatchewan self-sufficient partners in the economic, political and social development of Saskatchewan.

Now my question with respect to your letter is this: what again is the process that you have used or will use to try to establish this goal of economic self-sufficiency and self-government? What process are you proposing? If in fact there is a plan, would you give us some details of what that plan is?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay. I think I answered that question . . . By and large, I answered that question a little earlier when I said that we are looking at projects and the feasibility and viability of them right now. That certainly is the first step toward anything that could be honestly termed long-term. But we believe that that's the right step and it's a positive step, and certainly there will be opportunities for people in northern Saskatchewan in economic development to have their input into what's going on, as there has been an opportunity for them to have a considerable amount of input into the development of local government, which, as I mentioned in the letter that you read, is also a major priority of our new leaner department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, I'm just not sure what your colleagues are overly enthusiastic about. I just couldn't get the drift of the answer, really, honestly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll get back to the question. Maybe this time I'll be able to get the answer straight.

How do you link this process with local, say, in put, local consultation with various local governments, various special community interest organizations? How do you foresee that process linking community input, involvement, participation, consultation, the whole works?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, the role that we see ourselves taking on in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is one of a catalyst or a liaison between various other government departments. But more importantly in this new administration — certainly the departments can come forward with their ideas and proposals and so on — but more importantly we want to also be a catalyst with potential entrepreneurs, with

entrepreneurs that are now in northern Saskatchewan or potential entrepreneurs. With the private sector, we believe that there's a good deal that can be done in terms of economic development type of projects in northern Saskatchewan as well as in southern Saskatchewan. And you've heard my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, reiterate that on many occasions. I certainly concur with that idea, as we all do on this side of the House.

I believe that there's room (and I know the former administration made some attempts in this area) in northern Saskatchewan for some type of a banking outlet, especially on the west side, but I know there are other communities on the east side of the North as well. But especially on the west side where, I think, about two-thirds of the population live and there's no banking outlet, we think that's an important step toward any kind of economic development. The banking service is important for people who would aspire to be entrepreneurs or get into the private business world.

Now, in terms of the consultation process or the input that communities would have, certainly any project that is proposed in any part of Saskatchewan for a community — community X; it doesn't matter which community it is — certainly there is input from that community and its council and so on. That certainly would be the same process in northern Saskatchewan. I don't think it would be reasonable to suggest that if there's a project going into . . . I'll use the analogy again between a southern community of Davidson, for example, I don't think there's consultation that goes on with SUMA, because consultation will go on with the particular council of Davidson, and that's the kind of consultation that I would envisage for northern Saskatchewan. If there's a project suggested for Buffalo Narrows or La Loche or Green Lake, well, then certainly the consultation would go with the local elected people and the business people of Buffalo Narrows, La Loche or Green Lake, whichever community the project was being proposed in.

MR. YEW: — Now, Mr. Minister, I note then that you have no formal process other than to meet with the various committees or local governments in the communities with regard to specific policy matters or program matters, and that you haven't got a general overall approach as was the case with the former administration.

I then want to refer back to the meetings that we had in '71 and '72 to discuss the single agency concept. Again, the Northerners had once — the first time in history probably — an opportunity to meet with the Premier of Saskatchewan and seven cabinet ministers on June 4, 1974, at which time there were meetings held to discuss northern development in general, DNS and many of its programs and policies. This was the first time that the North was able to bring forth their concerns, their issues and their problems directly to the cabinet members of various portfolios, and bring them as well directly to the Premier of the province in those days.

This was a very interesting meeting. I wasn't affiliated in any way with any political party, and I was always a critic of DNS myself. And I, with my colleague, Mr. Thompson, the member for Athabasca, were members of the northern municipal council in those days. I distinctly recall that we met with 34 local governments, two native organizations and various special interest groups to discuss programs and policies with respect to DNS. That was the first time in history for people in northern Saskatchewan to have the

opportunity to present their views, to present their issues and concerns.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you, your colleagues, your government, envisages, sees itself, as following the same trend, or maybe initiating a meeting of this sort in the future, say in the short-term future, to discuss northern development in general.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — The particular type of meeting the member mentions . . . You know, I haven't got any plans and we haven't discussed anything in particular just like that. I will say, however, I've been suggesting, and I believe that suggestion has been heeded by several of my colleagues, as I've mentioned, that they do sincerely want to get into the northern part of the province and sincerely want to understand northern issues and northern people. The best way, as you and I both know, to do that is to spend some time there and get a feet-on-the-ground feel for the area and for the people. Certainly I would suggest that to anyone, but I would even go further than that., I have said that to many of our colleagues here, and you will see, and northern people will see, over the term of this administration, more elected people within the legislature of their province around in the various communities of northern Saskatchewan than they have ever seen before.

What they've seen before, basically, has been one agency and a minister who's responsible for all of those, and the situation that developed where the agency was much removed from the government — basically from the total government — and had their minister. What I would like to see better done, I think for the benefit of northern people in terms of laws that are made here in this Chamber on their behalf, is more people with some first-hand experience there. As I said, you'll see more of our people in northern Saskatchewan over the term of our term in office.

MR. YEW: — I have, Mr. Minister, just one more question, and we can probably give some of my colleagues an opportunity to raise some concerns with respect to the department.

The final question I have is in regard to The Planning and Development Act. This has been a growing concern with the Saskatchewan Association of Local governments. Have you in fact set up a planning commission or initiated some discussion with the Saskatchewan Association of Northern Local Governments, to establish a district planning commission? Prior to, or following that, has your department allotted any funds to the association, or to local governments in general in northern Saskatchewan, to assist the local government structures that we have up there to study, to review, and to give you recommendations with respect to their aspirations with regards to The Planning and Development Act?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, The Planning and Development Act that you refer to . . . I guess after the letters went out sometime just before Christmas, there was some concern, and I believe undue concern, among northern local governments, because this letter came out at about the same time as the process of consultation was going on regarding Bill 61, or the Northern Municipalities Act as we better know it.

The Planning and Development Act won't have any jurisdiction in northern Saskatchewan until after the implementation of that act. First of all the act must be passed in this House, and following that, boundaries, corporate boundaries for the various communities (I believe they number 36) must be negotiated and put into place in a legal way. Once that is done then The Planning and Development Act and the

district boundaries commission, those kinds of things could well be put. But there's no reason to talk about districts until corporate boundaries of communities are set up. And I know the hon. member understands that process well, having worked on Options 80 and so on.

I think if there is concern and I think . . . I don't recall it exactly now, but I believe I have responded to a couple of the concerns from some of the communities and associations. And I would say that if there is a concern there now, it may be from a lack of understanding of the process here and I think it's undue.

As for your specific question about money in this budget for a study of the commission and its possibilities — in this 82-83 budget there isn't, but there will be no need for it in this year either. We could talk about it in estimates in another year's budget.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I won't take too much time and I think we can maybe get this department finished. And if we've agreed to stop the clock, then we can. I know your officials from tourism have been here for a couple of days, and we'll get that one through as soon as possible.

I want to make a few comments about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and I want to say that I think that when you dismantled the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, I think you've done it too hastily. I always said and I always did agree with you that we had to dismantle DNS and put them back into the old line departments, but we had to make darn sure that we replaced the programs that were in Northern Saskatchewan with other programs before we completely dismantled it. And the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, as it stands right now, has done a tremendously poor job in the dismantling of DNS.

By your own admission, that of your executive assistant . . . I have a letter on file from your special assistant, Mr. Roy, who wrote to you a couple of months ago indicating that the situation was serious in northern Saskatchewan. The unemployment rate was serious. And I tell you, and I tell this House tonight, we are looking at 80, 85 and 90 per cent unemployment in just about every town in northern Saskatchewan.

We are back to the pre-1971 era, and I tell you it's a serious situation. Not only is it a serious situation in northern Saskatchewan, but go to Meadow Lake and talk to the business community in Meadow Lake, and you see the problems that they're having. And they tell me, "What's going on up north? The people are not coming down here and spending their money anymore," and they're not. And they are not for a reason — because they're not working. And you just take a look at the welfare roll that we have in northern Saskatchewan, and the amount of people that are on social assistance because their stamps have run out. And when you are dealing with 80 to 90 per cent unemployment in northern communities, let me tell you it's a serious situation.

I look forward to the budget, as you have indicated that you are going to be announcing worth-while projects in the new budget for northern Saskatchewan. I do get a little edgy, though, when you talk about feasible and worth-while projects. If they are not feasible or they're not viable, then you don't want to have any projects in northern Saskatchewan. And I say to the minister of northern Saskatchewan that northern Saskatchewan is a unique place. We realized that when we set up the department in 1971. And you have to subsidize projects. There's no way that you can develop northern Saskatchewan without subsidizing the projects that we have up there, or that you are going to announce, and I sincerely look forward to it and I hope that you're

sincere about these projects that are going to give people jobs and not set them back.

The people of northern Saskatchewan have come a long way in the last 12 years and I sincerely hope that they will continue that progress and I really look forward to your programs.

I'm not asking a question, I'm just making some comments. I want to say that I'm very pleased that you have retained the economic development branch within DNS and the municipal branch. I think these are two key departments that you had to retain and you have to utilize them to the best of your ability as a minister and your department officials. The economic development branch, as I have said, we have to pump a lot of money in there to projects, and the municipal branch I think is really key, because if you take a look at the municipal governments that we had in northern Saskatchewan in 1971 and in that era, and how the local governments have advanced over the years to where they are today, I think that there is now way that we can let them slip backwards. It's vitally important that they retain what they have and continue to progress, continue to go ahead the way they have in the last six, seven years.

With that, Mr. Minister, if you would like to respond to some of the comments I have made, I am through with my comments and we will push your department through as quickly as possible.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay, I'll be very brief in a response. The member for Athabasca (I know we're neighbours in a constituency sort of way), and I believe that he knows that I am serious when I say that I understand the serious unemployment situation in northern Saskatchewan. I don't think there's any question about that and I know you'll concede that to me.

When you say that you'll be looking forward to these viable projects, I would say to you, as you know well, my door has been open in fact to your former colleague, the former member for Cumberland who has been to see me a couple of times since. In fact he told me that I've been much more accessible to him as a Minister of Northern Saskatchewan than what he was able to find in the past when he was sitting here in these benches. You know, I take that as a great compliment because I had great respect for that man.

I would say to you, and a challenge to you and to your colleague that's sitting directly behind you, if you have viable projects that you can think about, our doors are open for them as well. If things were being stonewalled before, then certainly let's hear about them. Our doors are open from that point of view as well from elected members, and you have a responsibility there as MLAs and certainly let's talk about it.

When you say, "Don't set the people back. Don't set the people back," I believe your comment was in terms of back onto the unemployment rolls and so on. Well, certainly that's true. If people are on unemployment rolls, it's certainly a setback, and I can say that, not from my own experience of being unemployed, but having lived in a household as a kid where the breadwinner was unemployed. I know what it's all about. Okay. But you say, "Don't set them back."

I'll say that the people of northern Saskatchewan, and I've said this as a critic of the department before, were set back a good deal when the Department of Northern Saskatchewan came in with some of this planned sort of economy that they developed inside those boundaries — very artificial kind of a boundary — and said to people,

“Here, we are now going to pay you — give you subsidies and grants and so on to do things that you’ve done all your life,” and in a viable way in many cases. I don’t think the hon. member will disagree with me on some of those things — some of the ongoing commercial enterprises and some that you yourself have been involved in. So when you start to pay people to do some of the things that their families have done traditionally for an awfully long time, you start to pay people to cut wood for their own grandmother, because they’re just not doing it. Otherwise then I say that you’re setting people back by embedding into them a very dangerous philosophy, and that’s that socialist idea that Big Brother government is going to look after you. That’s bad stuff and we can lay it off at that, but I’d say that’s not the way to go. And that’s not the way we’re going in the department, and hopefully with help from the challenge that I put out to you and to people in northern Saskatchewan, many of whom I respect greatly, we can get down and talk about viability and feasibility of projects. Hopefully we can get some economic development that will mean some jobs for people, off the unemployment rolls, some pride, some dignity, all of the things that go with jobs. And let’s work at it together and go on. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we close off and go to item by item on the budget for the department, DNS, I wonder if the minister would provide us with information as to what type of personnel will be kept to continue the programs and program development in northern Saskatchewan. How many of those personnel will be retained in northern Saskatchewan and also what level or classification of personnel will remain in northern Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Just a quick answer. The department that now exists is about 10 per cent of what was DNS as you folks knew it, about 150 people remaining in this catalyst and liaison role. Senior staff, and I say senior staff within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, the new department, will continue to be located in northern Saskatchewan for the foreseeable future in any case.

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I wonder if you may be able to provide me with written information on this.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — What do you mean by written information? Was the answer that I just gave you satisfactory in terms of the type of answer that you wanted?

MR. YEW: — It wasn’t specific. You mentioned 10 per cent of the total work force at present may be retained, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 150.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — When I say 10 per cent, I say 10 per cent of what was DNS. There were in the order of something like 1300 employees at peak times in the DNS, the old DNS. Okay? The DNS that we now have after the realignment process that we talked about earlier is down to a staff of approximately 150 people. Okay? And like I say, that’s a round number, and I don’t know if you need any more than that.

MR. YEW: — Yes. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, we can go on with estimates seeing as how the money that is being discussed here has already been appropriated and that portion of the fiscal budget is actually yesterday’s budget. I suppose we can go ahead.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just have a couple of questions to the minister. He seems to have indicated that he has an economic policy being developed in the North, based on the

concept of feasible and viable economic projects. I believe those were his words: "I'd like certainly to put into place a concept based on projects which are feasible and viable." The minister surely can outline in a general way some of the areas in which he feels that feasible and viable projects will be developing in the North.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, I guess very briefly I could outline the ideas behind it. Certainly I think they're ideas that thinking people would say are reasonable and feasible and viable, and whatever other words you'd like to use. First of all, the projects would provide jobs, as has been suggested by your colleagues, those members who have been in northern Saskatchewan and understand it. It would provide jobs.

What I call feasible and viable projects that would not be a drain on the provincial treasury or on the taxpayers of the province. It would not be a continual drain. Certainly I believe that tax dollars can be used as an engine to start something; certainly that's fine I think that's the case of our economic development policies of our administration — but certainly not for a continual and ongoing drain on the provincial treasury. Projects that would make their own way, projects that would develop products that could be of some use into the markets of Saskatchewan and potentially outside of Saskatchewan, but certainly even just within northern Saskatchewan itself; projects that would develop products that could be of some use, and I say we can talk about processing some of those things that might relate to the traditional industries. All of those things relate to jobs that are ongoing, and I think that the hon. member will not disagree that that's the way to go.

MR. KOSKIE: — I really think that the minister is mouthing off some terminology in using feasible and viable economic projects. This is indeed what he is saying is the concept for the development of the North. When you ask him what are the projects that he is looking at that will be feasible and viable, he is unable to come forward with any concrete examples in respect to mining; they said in respect to trapping, you said in respect to timber, forestry.

What are the areas which you are going to be addressing? Certainly government has been dealing with this problem of employment in the North, and they have discussed it with northerners, as my colleague has indicated. All of a sudden you come forward, and you're going to have a great new economic program with feasible and viable projects, and you're unable to indicate to those members . . . They indicate that unemployment is increasing rapidly since you put a freeze on all of the current economic development that was going on; you come forward with no explanation. All you say is that you're going to provide jobs. You're not going to continue to put extra money of government into stimulating it. You tell us right here what you have in mind in respect to the North which in fact will produce the feasible and viable projects that you're mouthing off.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I'll tell you right here, first of all, that I believe and I think that everyone in the House tonight, in the galleries and everywhere else, would believe that you don't know, Mr. Member, as much about northern Saskatchewan as your two colleagues over there, who understand northern Saskatchewan and the problems that are ongoing and the way in which they carried it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — You asked me a question. That's right. And you'll get . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! Let the minister answer.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — As I indicated in a reasonable way to the reasonable member, when he was asking me the similar question before, those feasible and viable projects must be something that will create jobs and so on. You call that rhetoric, you can call that whatever you like, but I'll tell you that in eight months or nine months at least we're into the process of developing those kinds of projects and putting them together in consultation with private sector people — something that you never did in 10 years in there — to come up with feasible and viable projects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — And if you want to call developing a market garden a feasible and viable project where someone won't go and plant spuds without a \$30,000 grant, then you don't know much about northern Saskatchewan or gardening or anything else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — I see. I see, Mr. Chairman, that I have struck a sensitive nerve with the minister. He has been unable to put before this House any program other than phraseology. Let us . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let us have the minister name some of the feasible and viable projects which he is looking at. Go ahead. Stand up here and name any 10 projects; if you could name five I'd be satisfied and I would sit down. Name the five basic projects that you are looking at that are feasible and viable.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I know that you spent a month in Prince Albert-Duck Lake just recently and you call that northern Saskatchewan, but it's not. Now, Prince Albert-Duck Lake is not as far into northern Saskatchewan as you might think. I think you've been there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, forget it. Come on, get on and answer the question.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Never mind. You'll get your answer. You said something about being sensitive to northern Saskatchewan. You're not very sensitive to it, but I'll say to you this, and I will give you nothing more tonight in terms of the specifics of projects, because as I indicated they're just in the development process. You go into northern Saskatchewan in the next few months and study about northern Saskatchewan a little bit so that you know something of it, Mr. Member, and come back into the '83-84 estimates and we will have a good discussion about the projects.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the minister has indicated . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please! Order, order! Order! . . . (inaudible) . . . We'd like to carry on this business so that we could proceed with the estimates and get it over with. The member for Quill Lakes has a question. Let's hear it.

MR. KOSKIE: — I am very pleased. Mr. Chairman, that as a result of this discussion the minister indicated that he has no projects . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If he doesn't want to name specific projects then I ask him to name the particular areas. Is it in the

mining area? Is it in the forestry area? Where is the emphasis of these viable and feasible projects? Can you name the specific areas?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — We could get into more specifics, certainly, if we wanted to, if I wanted to tell the member. His colleagues asked me a while ago, about the communities nearest the projects or communities most affected by any project that might go ahead, if they could have some input. I indicated that, yes, they would have; if it's in that particular community's area they would have some input. This member now, who has some more seniority involved, and has been at the cabinet table of the former administration, with their dictatorial ways, is coming out now and saying that they want us to be like they were and say: "Here are the projects, and this is what's going to have to happen and you'll have no input."

Well, I'll tell you that you come into '83-84 estimates and we'll talk about projects.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We'll be here.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I'm sure you will. You may not be.

MR. YEW: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would . . . earlier in the discussion . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I must remind the members that we'd like to get on with the estimates. The questions are there. We'd like to finish this and wrap it up. Would you at least let the member ask the question?

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier in the process of the expenditures, the estimate questioning, you indicated to us that officials of your department, along with possibly four or five other related branches, were putting together an economic self-sufficiency type program. You're looking at viable, feasible projects that would be applicable for this economic package. Am I to understand correctly?

You indicated that your department is preparing a program of some economic development initiative that you are prepared to undertake for northern Saskatchewan. Now in the process you are studying feasible and viable possibilities.

Once you have determined what those viabilities are, what those possible programs will be, would you be kind enough to provide us with information regarding this economic self-sufficiency program or economic development initiative that your government is prepared to undertake in the near future?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — As I indicated to you before, and the reasonable way that you asked the question, I indicated to you that, yes, when these decisions are made certainly things are open. We'll be discussing with the local government of the community that's most affected by any particular project. Certainly it'll be open at that time, and sure it'll be open to hon. members opposite as it is to the general public.

MR. YEW: — Just one final comment, then we can follow on with item-by-item discussions on the DNS estimates.

I just want to confirm and agree with my colleagues, the member for Athabasca and the member for Quill Lakes, that the people in the communities throughout the northern administration district, as I've know it, and quite sincerely put that area of this

province does not want to be classified as the “Parti Quebecois of Canada,” if you understand what I mean. I use that phrase because I’ve heard it so much through the national news, when Levesque was getting to be quite a controversial figure in those days.

We don’t classify ourselves as special people, higher than any other ethnic group, so to speak. But in terms of our vast area, the area, if I may repeat myself, is isolated. It’s an area that is disadvantaged. There’s a lot of despair out there in some of the communities. I am almost certain that the majority of those communities face anywhere from 85 per cent unemployment, anywhere from 85 to 95 per cent unemployment. Ever since the realignment of DNS, particularly, a lot of capital projects have been put on hold, a lot of programs have been uncertain. A lot of projects have been uncertain. And that is a very serious issue.

Like I said before, we don’t want to class ourselves as a special organization or a special group of people, but the people in the northern administration district deserve the same amount of services and programs and emphasis and priority as the rest of this province.

The farmers in the South have been getting a lot of emphasis and a lot of priority and I don’t argue with that. The crow has been receiving a lot of attention lately, but what about the fishermen in northern Saskatchewan? The fishermen in northern Saskatchewan haven’t received any priority that I know of, and certainly we are justified — it is legitimate when we raise questions with respect to DNS, with respect to the high unemployment, with respect to the inadequacies, with regard to services and programs applicable for the people of northern Saskatchewan. So, sincerely from the bottom of my heart, I hope to heck we can try to work together and try to bring about the type of developments that are direly needed for the people in northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Just very short. I certainly concur with what the member says and I believe his concerns to be sincere. Certainly I know he believes mine to be sincere. And the challenge I laid out to him and to the member for Athabasca still sits there, and to any other members opposite who would care to learn something of northern Saskatchewan certainly it will be excellent.

MR. KOSKIE: — I have a comment. I don’t need the minister to start evaluating my knowledge of the North. And I don’t intend to accept it and I intend to be able to ask questions any time I feel like it.

The previous government had established the economic development foundation of Saskatchewan. It was under the Department of Industry and Commerce. Can the minister indicate what is the status of that foundation?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — It’s not in the budget this year.

MR. KOSKIE: — When I talked to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, he indicated it was not in his budget but the foundation had in fact been transferred under the jurisdiction of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Can I ask the minister a simple question? Have you in fact scrapped the idea that was developed in consultation with the Northerners — a policy of economic development through the foundation? Has that in fact been scrapped by this government?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I can say that the concept was developed in your government in terms of the way that you felt that you would address the extreme problem that the other members have been talking about here tonight, and that I've been attempting to address. We don't see it as the way to go. That foundation that was to be developed within industry and commerce had, as you will recall, a southern and a northern foundation. And it's not the way that we have decided to go with economic development either in the South or the North. And that's where it sits in this year's budget.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

Item 23

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Chairman, one short comment here. Mr. Minister, in your reply to my comments, you stated that when you were talking about viable projects you indicated that you didn't want to get involved in any projects that involved (and you specifically were speaking about) getting wood for their grandmothers. I think that you know what kind of a program that is in northern Saskatchewan. It's service to the elderly, the same as you have with meals on wheels and whatever you have in southern Saskatchewan. And I think it's unfair to say that when you bring in projects, that they're getting wood for their grandmothers because in northern Saskatchewan there are a lot of people, and especially senior citizens, elderly people, who still live in their older homes where they do use wood, and that's the programs that are being used to get wood for the grandmothers that you referred to.

I just wanted to make that comment.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, as the hon. member well knows, when I said that about somebody being paid to go and get wood for his own grandmother when he wasn't really doing . . . it's no reflection on the idea or the concept of home care and of that kind of thing that's needed by elderly people in any place in our society today. Certainly, there is some need for some of that, but it all comes down to a matter of degree and I know that you know inside your own community where you live or in many of the other communities in the North that under those programs there are people receiving payment for doing things that they really should be doing for their own grandmother in any case. And, you know, it's all a matter of degree — there's a difference between scratching your back and ripping the hide right off it and I'd say that giving that money to some of those folks for some of the things that they do is very nebulous, to say the least.

MR. THOMPSON: — I didn't want to get into any more discussions. I indicated that we would be through with this department and go onto tourism but I guess we've cancelled the tourism for the night. Just to go back to that, I most certainly would not agree. I most certainly would not agree that there are individuals in northern Saskatchewan who are getting paid to go out and cut wood and bring it home for their grandmothers and it shouldn't be done. I most certainly don't agree with that, and I don't think that you do. Maybe there is some abuse of programs in northern Saskatchewan, but let me tell you that there is also abuse of programs in southern Saskatchewan, many of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You call them pork barrels.

MR. THOMPSON: — Yes, pork barrels or the hog marketing commission — these farmers that get all these grants for raising pigs. I just want to make that very clear, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I most certainly don't agree that programs for getting wood for the grandmothers and grandfathers in northern Saskatchewan is being abused.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Okay, well, we've agreed to disagree on that particular thing and what you say about abuse, and I guess that's really what I was referring to, any program that is good can be abused, and some are, and certainly I was referring to examples of abuse that I know of and I know that you know of some cases as well. You did make reference to abuse of programs in southern Saskatchewan. Many of my colleagues have been addressing that throughout the departments that we inherited and we are trying to clean some of that up as well, and that goes on and we'll clean up abuse throughout government, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan included.

Item 23 agreed.

Items 24 to 28 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 26 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Capital Expenditure — Vote 27

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Item 4

MR. YEW: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister might give us some indication as to whether or not the department will proceed with an extension of sewer and water services (if that is the right category) for both Sandy Bay and Cumberland House.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — The specific question you asked is if we will proceed with Sandy Bay and Cumberland House? Certainly both those questions would relate to a budget that will be announced by my colleague, but I can say to you that both are under consideration for that next budget.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to express my appreciation to the minister for having confirmed the need for such, because I just want to reaffirm, with the minister in the legislature, that the water in Cumberland House is just as bad as it is in Esterhazy. It is just as bad as Esterhazy. The plumbing fixtures and everything that has to do with running water in Cumberland House is deteriorated really badly. And that's been going for a couple of years or so.

And the system in Sandy Bay, as the minister may realize, is just inadequate. That system was built for a population of somewhere around 450 to 500 people. And today there is an estimated population of 1,000, so I commend the minister for putting priority in those two areas.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, as I said, we are aware of both problems and I would say water issues as they relate to those communities and many others across the province. And, you will know and you will have heard that we are addressing that as a major problem in various areas of Saskatchewan. My colleagues, several of them, have been travelling the province and getting an extremely good reception in all areas of the province regarding that. And your particular concerns will also be forwarded to them on behalf of those communities.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to ask the minister whether he made representation to the cabinet committee looking into water supplies and water resources in the province, whether he made representation to have the committee go to the North and have a hearing to represent those people in the North.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — The LCA for the community of Cumberland House was here in the Legislative Building and gave us their water concerns in a very concise way. The Sandy Bay concern has been raised with the committee and I know that the hon. member for Cumberland raised it here one day in this House in question period, regarding the problem with my colleague, the minister of health. That problem in Sandy Bay — the committee is very much aware of it; and the Cumberland House question — we of the government are very much aware of it. The LCA made a good presentation, and we are aware of both problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Item 4 agreed to.

Items 5 and 6 agreed to.

Item 7

MR. YEW: — With respect to the educational facilities section, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might indicate to the House if you will proceed with the joint school facility at Wollaston Lake.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I might ask the member just to clarify that. Maybe would you just clarify that again; I'm just not sure what you are referring to. Are you referring to a proposal for a school jointly funded by the federal Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of Education provincially?

MR. YEW: — That's right.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, I could best say, and you'll notice in the estimate book, with the small asterisk, that section, acquisition and construction of educational facilities, is under the jurisdiction of education. That would be best asked in education, but certainly I know his estimates are gone. If you have a particular concern you want me to raise with him, you've raised it here and I'll draw it to his attention.

Item 7 agreed to.

Vote 27 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Vote 69 — Statutory

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Provincial Development Expenditure

Nil vote.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (No. 3)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 26

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 26 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 28

Items 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 26 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:48 p.m.