

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 18, 1983

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

ENVIRONMENT

Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 9

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Just a question here on the water review committee or whatever you called that committee that went around the province. Was that funded out of your department or was that Urban Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — It was out of the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, can you tell us whether or not there's a report coming out of that tour that you did around the province in the near future, and as well, will it be made public when it is compiled?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, I suppose there will be an in-house report done - a pretty comprehensive one 'cause there was about 200 to 300 briefs that were presented. There will also be a policy statement, or whatever policy we derive from that will be made public. There won't be a public report made as per se 'cause many of those there briefs were confidentially done. We had to take that as a confidence so a lot of it will not be made public, but certainly there were public hearings and anybody that wanted to come to them could have heard them. Our condensation of them or bringing them together will be probably for our own use, but the overall report basically will be released.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, what you're saying then, Mr. Minister, is the taxpayers paid for this tour around the province but they are not able to have access to the study that was done and completed. I find that a very interesting approach of a government that was elected on the theme of an open government. Can you give us an indication when this policy which will result from these hearings will be forthcoming from your department?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, just in regards to that, all the hearings were public. I mean anybody could get up and say publicly what they were. We're making a transcript of all of it and that will be made public. I don't know what else you could do to . . . It's been open to the public, they were invited; well-advertised; everybody come, bring your briefs, present them orally or verbally or written, whichever way you wanted. Anybody who'd ask the person for a brief, it would have been presented to him, I'm sure, at the time. We just said that how we package it together within department, that will probably be for a policy decision-making which is only fair. I'm sure that's the way it should be. But the rest is certainly all public.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, the main part of my question was, Mr. Minister, when do

you expect your policy statement to be forthcoming as a result of those hearings?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — As far as a policy statement, Mr. Chairman, as far as the policy statement . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Allow the minister to make his comments.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — So far as a policy statement, I wouldn't want to say when it was going to come out, because I really don't know. It would depend on . . . There's been a water utility crown announced. We're looking at an overall water management policy. But in regards to what was put in those briefs, that will be made public, I would think within the next short while.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I would hope that your policy statement on water would be forthcoming in the near future. I know that there was a great expectation raised during those hearings that were carried out around the province. I know that when the government was elected, there was a great anticipation that irrigation, in a major form, would be forthcoming from your government, and to date the farmers in the communities of Saskatchewan have seen, indeed, very little.

I would like to say, in closing my part of the questioning, at any rate, that yesterday or the last day we were doing your estimates on housing, I complimented you on the job you had done with the housing program. By the same token, I would like to let you know that as an opposition member, and on behalf of the opposition, that we are extremely disappointed in the Environment's difficulty in keeping staff and spending the money needed to keep the environment of Saskatchewan to the level that it had been in past years - the best in Canada. And I want to say in the strongest terms that this kind of eroding of the environmental department will lead to very grave consequences in the near future.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if that's closing, I would also like to say that I think the Department of the Environment has been doing everything possible and necessary to keep the environment safe, and that we will continue to do so. And as it regards to staff, I made that point earlier. It isn't the number of staff you have, it's what the staff does that counts. It isn't how many administration people you have at the top; it's what the fieldworkers and what the other people do. Administration - you don't need five administrative people at one spot. What we're saying is that let's streamline it to the point that it's effective for the people of Saskatchewan, and that it will give them service, at the same time not cost them too much. I think we've done a good job. I think we'll continue to protect the environment to all its necessary standards, and certainly we'll work towards any other goals that's necessary.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, before supper break at 5 o'clock I asked you to give us the salaries of your personal staff. That is Darryl Blinky, special assistant, Fay Brunning, EA, Nancy Martin, EA. And I would like to know whether the minister has that information available at this time. Surely the minister must know what he pays his staff.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I could assume what the staff's being paid. I wouldn't know exactly what they're being paid. Certainly I said earlier that we would get the information and send it to them. We will do that. I don't think it's that relevant today, whether it's . . . Whatever it is, to the point, because they'd be similar to whatever everybody else is getting paid, so I would think with that in mind, we'll certainly get the

information for the member. We'll certainly send the information to the member. And . . .

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I think it's up to the opposition to be able to ask pertinent questions of expenditures in the minister's office. And I am very shocked that the minister will stand up and say that those questions are not relevant. I want to say that on the basis of other information, special assistants are receiving about \$50,000, that executive assistants are receiving about \$35,000 from the other ministers that submitted it. I want to say, that besides that you have a Legislative Secretary . . . that the personal staff in your office, Mr. Minister, I'm indicating is somewhere between \$160,000 and \$200,000. And I want you to indicate, and I say that you have that information, and should make it available to the public. I say categorically that on an estimation, that it's \$160,000 to \$200,000, and you have had the audacity to cut the budget for administration and for the department by a million dollars, and to tack on to your personal office somewhere between \$160,000 to \$200,000. Why won't you in fact make that information available to the public?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in answer to the hon. member's question . . . First of all, I don't know how many staff any other departments have, but I would just like to draw his attention to what I do look after. Maybe that's the question . . . Maybe that'd answer the question. I have three staff. I have three staff, all right. And I'll tell you what we look after. We look after Parks and Renewable Resources; we look after the water supply board; we look after the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, which would be an identity in itself; we have the Saskatchewan forest board . . . Saskatchewan Forest Corporation and also the Department of Environment. Now I would think that three staff looking after five major departments is not too much, and as regards to the amount that you stated, I can say quite clearly that I know none of them reach that . . . I can say quite clearly that the special assistant does not reach, does not reach \$50,000, nor does assistants reach \$35,000. I don't know the exact amount. You asked me for the exact amount . . . I don't know the exact amount, and I'm not prepared to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right now, if you want to, if you want we'll go get the exact amount and give it to you, right to the penny. I don't know it.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it's absolutely impossible to believe that a minister would come into the House on estimates, and try to lead us to believe that he in fact, doesn't know the amount that he is paying to his personal staff. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the public of Saskatchewan is being stonewalled. I want to say that the information that we have been requesting from the Premier is now being copied by the other ministers. I want to say to ask the minister. I understand that your Legislative Secretary has the use of a pool car. I want to ask you whether the Legislative Secretary has, indeed, a secretary assigned to him, and whether the taxpayers of this province are paying for a permanent secretary.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I answered that earlier. In regards to a pool car - yes, he has a pool car assigned to him; has he got a secretary assigned to him - no.

Mr. Koskie: — I wonder if the minister could, in fact, present to us the total cost of expenses, vis-a-vis automobile, vis-a-vis office space, vis-a-vis all expenses in respect to the Legislative Secretary. Have you got that detail, or are you going to again tell the public it's not in their interest to hear this?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — In regards to what we're talking about, the 0'83-84 budget, all we're picking up is this CVA car, right, so that's all we're picking up, so that's only

expense you got. Now we haven't had a bill yet for the month of April, so I couldn't tell you.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask the minister, once again, final time: are you advising us, here in this House, that you in fact cannot turn to your official if you don't know yourself? Are you, in fact, saying to this House that you cannot provide to the opposition the salaries that you're paying to your special assistants and your two EAs? Is this the situation that you're putting forward to this House?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — What I said was, that I would supply you with the information in the next day or two, is exactly what I said, and that's exactly what I will do.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I want to ask the minister, why would he not have that information available?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I made it very clear - you asked me to be exact how much the salaries were. I don't know exactly to the penny how much they are. I said I would get it exactly to the penny and send it to you; that's exactly what I will do.

Mr. Koskie: — And, if you can't tell me the exact amount, do you know the approximate amount? I'll accept the approximate amount, and I'll wait for the exact amount.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — It would be approximately - it would be less than \$50,000 for the special assistant, and less than \$35,000 for the assistant.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, do you have any range of less? A definition of less? You say it's less than 50,000. I put a figure on of 50,000, because all I've got is the guidance of one other minister that's paying 54,000 for a special assistant. If you know that it's less than 50,000, tell me the amount.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I will give you an approximate figure if it will satisfy you. My assistants get approximately \$30,000 each a year, and my special assistant gets approximately 44-something a year.

Mr. Koskie: — In other words, without the exact figures, you're indicating that just with your three personal staff that's in excess of \$100,000? That's what you're indicating? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — That's correct. If you said approximately \$100,000 for the three, that is correct.

Mr. Koskie: — When will you provide the exact figures?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I don't know how many times I've got to tell you because I could count on my fingers, but I said in the next day or two, and when I say the next day or two, that's when I'll give it to you. That's what I've always done.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have here, Mr. Minister, an article by the *Star-Phoenix*, February the 3rd. One of your ministers stated:

Pollutants from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation coal-fired generators exceed federal government guide-lines, but probably not by much. The

minister for Labour, Lorne McLaren, stated that those guide-lines are exceeded, but perhaps not by much.

But also, I want to remind the members in government that they also stated when they were in opposition, and I'll read from the *Star-Phoenix*:

However, Progressive Conservative MLAs sitting in opposition, insisted that all coal-fired generators ought to be, should be equipped with scrubbers regardless of the cost.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, in terms of acid rain, what is your government's proposition: what is your government's status and what is your government's position with regards to scrubbers in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a very complex question in a sense because, as you well know, Saskatchewan emits very little acid rain. The only one that does emit any acid rain is the one in Coronach. We have in fact been in contact with the federal government. They want to set out regulations in regards to acid emission from . . . (inaudible) . . . coal-fired plants such as that. We are consulting with them; we are talking with them to see what they would think would be a safe standard. In regards to the area - the area down there can take some acid which has helped a little bit to delete some of the area. There is a problem.

But remember, one thing that you've got to remember is that problem was there long before we became government and at the same time, although we have the responsibility now of trying to make it better, we weren't the ones to create it. At the time . . . And maybe that goes back to some of the things I said earlier about a little bit of planning ahead of time so you don't come into these problems, because the problem is there and the problem was there when we took over, and it's tougher to fix a problem than it is to plan first. So, in answer to that, we're looking at it. I don't know what we are going to do right at the present time, but certainly it wasn't a problem that we created and one that we'll probably have to resolve down the road.

Mr. Yew: — In other words, Mr. Minister, then I take it at the grass roots level, whereas the provincial government ought to advocate and set the guide-lines and the controls and the guide-lines and the regulations for the people of this province. I take it that the provincial government of this province has in fact, in effect, abdicated, done away with that portion of responsibility that rests solely with the provincial government, that is solely supposed to rest with the provincial government and now you are in fact putting that onus, putting that responsibility on the federal government. Am I not correct?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, just in answer to the member's question, I think he's . . . You know, you must remember firstly, Mr. Member, that who built the plant to start with? Who were the ones that didn't plan for such things as acid rain? Who forgot to look into the future to say acid rain is a problem? It's been a problem down east for many years. And at the same time, if any others is built, you'll be sure that they're going to be put into the proper perspective. And in regards to the plant itself, I've said we looked at it, we've been looking at it for quite a while. But it is a very major problem because it wasn't designed properly in the first place.

You know, like it goes back to saying, 'All right. It's easy to design something. First set out the ground rules before you start.' But those ground rules were never set out. Now you have to go back and try to change them. And that's what we've been saying all

along. It's hard to change. It's not hard to set them out. Most companies, most industries don't mind ground rules if they know them first. It's hard and tough and expensive to bring them in afterwards, and as you well know, all the members over there were certainly much aware of it.

So in answer to that, certainly we're concerned about it; certainly we're going to do what we can about it. But it's a big major problem that isn't solved that easily. And you well know, when you were the government, you would have solved it.

Mr. Yew: — In a sense, Mr. Minister, then you state that you as an official opposition in years gone by have not done your job effectively. You had ideas prior to the time when you gained power in this province, prior to the time that you took unanimous . . . won a unanimous government in this province, you had ideas of your own. You had ideas such as the Magna Charta deal that was initiated by the Minister of Supply and Services. You had an idea and I ask the minister why you have not implemented that Magna Charta act.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I think it goes back to everything else. Remember full well that we've been here one year. And we've done a great deal in that one year. A lot of the guide-lines that we've brought in were never brought in before. We've brought in a lot of guide-lines. But if these guide-lines had've been set out first, you wouldn't have that problem, but they weren't set out first. And we've said that with water management. They were just talking a little while ago about going out and setting a committee here, as advisory council there, without knowing your whole magnitude of what you wanted to do. The same thing has happened here. It wasn't never planned from the start. We recognize, for a while, that it's a very expensive thing, that it's very expensive to do. At the same time, we recognize that we may have to, down the road, treat it and do something about it, but there may be other alternatives to it, and that's what we're looking into. We're going to continue to see what is available, what can be done, but at the present time, no, we haven't done anything. And at the present time there's nothing in the foreseeable future that we plan on doing with it.

Mr. Yew: — Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would then ask the minister to get down to basics. Let's start talking about the basics. What does your government intend to do with respect to . . . I'm going to use this article from the *Star-Phoenix* as starters, and I've got three basic questions, not all pertaining to the same article. I'm going to ask your government, your department, seeing as how the Progressive Conservative MLAs, when in opposition, requested and insisted that all coal-fired generators ought to be equipped with scrubbers, although they are a cost to the companies, to the businesses, in excess of \$80 million . . . I would just read word for word: 'One scrubber for a 300-megawatt unit costs about \$80 million.'

Okay, taking that into account, Mr. Minister, what is your government's position with respect to those scrubbers? In terms of acid rain, serious questions pertaining to acid rain in this province, pertaining to the seriousness of how the adverse effects are to our environment, what is your government's position on those?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in answer to the hon. member's question, you fully realize that Saskatchewan produces 10 per cent or less of the same amount of acid rain of any other province in Canada, and the only bit that is being produced is down in that one corner. The rest of the province has basically none. Now, we have a concern down there, and Environment Canada has initiated a study to determine the current cost of control equipment which would be required to meet a guide-line and the probable

impact on the utility rates. And a decision on the adoption of the federal guide-line will not be made until after the latest study is completed and reviewed. Now, that is the position I suppose that we're taking, knowing full well that it's very costly, but there may be other ways that we can in fact put equipment on there that will in fact reduce the acid rain that's coming out of it. And you know, to get down to basics, as you say, the basics is that it costs \$80 million to \$100 million for each set of scrubbers - and \$80 million to \$100 million is expensive to the people of Saskatchewan, so what we'd have to do is look to see if there's some way that we can possibly not cost us that much and still do the job.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, seeing as how you have eliminated altogether the environmental advisory council, seeing as how you have eliminated the environmental advisory council, Mr. Minister, I want to get on with my second line of questioning in terms of the administration as it exists today.

Now, administration as it exists today pertains, in terms of your cabinet, to Highways. I see the hon. member, Mr. Garner, looking at me with a profound expression at times when I'm . . .

An Hon. Member: — Questioning. Whatever it is, it's not profound.

Mr. Yew: — Not profound. And I see the member for Meadow Lake absent in his seat, always absent from his seat. When there are serious questions to be raised with respect to the people of the northern administration district it seems that the members opposite are never in their seats. They always seem to be absent from their seats, because the northern administration district is not important to them. That is the conclusion I arrive at.

When I asked questions about health services, the minister reiterated and reacted in such a way that it seemed to lead me to believe that those issues are not as important as the issues in southern Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

The member knows full well what I'm talking about. The initial visits into the northern administration district . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Order. Do you have a question? Order. Do you have a question on environmental estimates? You seem to be ranging quite a ways away from Environment.

Mr. Yew: — My apologies, Mr. Chairman, my apologies. I get very personal when it comes down to the effects of how those major projects will involve and affect the people in the northern administration district, Mr. Chairman. My apologies.

Now getting back to the basics. With respect to the environment advisory council and the abolishment of such, Mr. Minister, how do you expect to have local people involvement, participation in that Nipawin hydro project development that you have going at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — In regards to the Nipawin project, I thought we had been over it two or three times, but I can explain to you again. In 1979, the EIA was done by the former administration. I would assume that they did it properly and that it was done right. It was completed. It's all done. The dam is already under way. The people of

northern Saskatchewan, of which we both have a concern, had an opportunity. They were contacted, I am told, to take part in the EIA. Cumberland House was the only one that I am aware of that put any kind of a presentation together at all. The other communities, although they were asked, I am told, did not take part. Now, that is three years ago, almost four. I'm not sure what the member wants from us because it was done by the previous administration - unless he is saying to us, unless he is saying to me that it wasn't done well and we should go back and do it again, because I don't know how much more you could have done. But maybe there's a lot more we can do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yew: — I'm very reassured to see some members clapping in respect of that response, Mr. Minister. If in fact the former administration had ideas as positive as they were, how come today you have, in a sense, abdicated yourself from those former ideas and former policies?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, that's sort of a nice question to answer. First of all, we certainly abdicated ourselves of the policies that weren't good. I go back to administration within the Department of the Environment and I think I explained that a couple of times to you - maybe three, four times. Information - you couldn't get information out of there; it would take a 10-foot pole to get an answer out of there. We have made information for the public available. You can get information from the Department of the Environment now and if you can't, contact me and I'll see that you get that information. If there's a problem there now, I'll see that it's corrected.

In regards to the Nipawin hydro dam, if that's what you're talking about, if you're talking about advisory councils, advisory councils under the recommendation of the chairman of the advisory council . . . he said, 'I would advise you don't reappoint it until you decide and give it a new mandate completely.' That is what we're going to do. That is under the advisement of the chairman of the advisory council - the former chairman. You know, you take the advice of those that have the knowledge on it. I didn't really understand the whole policy. I took his advice. I continue to take it. And when we have a mandate for them to do, we will reappoint, whether it be advisory council, whether it be advisory committee. I don't know what it's going to be called, but certainly there will be a representation for the people of Saskatchewan to the Department of the Environment. But it will be where they can put their full impact into it.

An example would be again that we went around the province this year on water concerns. That is an example where they can come directly to us and tell us. We pulled it all together using that to help us form a policy. There is input from the people of Saskatchewan. They've had opportunities and they will have a lot more.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, I want to refer you back then to full public participation in terms of the provincial impact on the seven major projects that you quoted here just prior to our break. How do you perceive the communities becoming fully involved and becoming fully informed of those projects, if in fact you have dismantled the environmental advisory council? How do you see those groups, and the communities themselves, the people at the local level - how do you foresee getting them involved?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I think the hon. member is sort of got a few things confused. First of all, the advisory council has nothing to do with the board of enquiry. The board of enquiry is one that's appointed when you have an EIA, so therefore they're two different things, and there were seven appointed, seven boards of enquiry appointed since

1972. Now that's quite a few years; that's 11 years. So, only in the last 11 years has there been seven of those board of enquiries appointed. So I think maybe you got the two of them confused there.

Mr. Yew: — With respect to future major developments in the province, Mr. Minister, how many major developments do you foresee in the next, say three years?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, that's a nice question. I would sincerely hope that there's many of them. Because many of them would mean many jobs, many jobs for all the people of Saskatchewan. We perceive, and rightfully so I think, there is going to be a lot of them. And when they come up, we will in fact do whatever is necessary to protect the environment. But at the same time we will create jobs in this province - jobs that's needed. And it will create jobs for agriculture and for all the other stuff. So I just think, I hope, sincerely hope there's many, many of them come out our province. It'll create jobs for our young people and will keep them at home.

Mr. Yew: — Okay then, Mr. Minister, if in fact you, your aspirations are, and I share with you in that aspiration, are to see as many major developments happening within the next three years, over any certain area. I share my sympathies with you in that. I would like to see as many major developments happening in this area so as to alleviate the major high unemployment ratings that we have in this province to date, after the Devine government took over office. And also to add the high social assistance rate that has accumulated after your people took office in this province. It has jumped in northern Saskatchewan, and let me remind members opposite, it has jumped 30 per cent. That is a significant portion of what has happened in the northern administration district over the last 10 years. In the last 10 years it has never jumped, accumulated 30 per cent. Not once, not one fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Order! Does the member have a question on environment?

Mr. Yew: — Yes, I'm getting to it. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. I do admit that I get carried away once in a while. When it comes to questions such as unemployment and welfare, I do get carried away. I'll admit that.

Getting back to the basics of the question, Mr. Minister. In the next three years you envisage major, major developments happening in the area, major industrial developments in the area. How do you perceive having the public involved in a social, cultural and economic input, participation and involvement of the people at the local level, when you have done away, in fact, with the public participation and information aspect of your department?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in answer to the member's question, it'll be the same as it was before through the environment impact assessment. If it's a major one, that's how it'll be - same as it was before.

Mr. Yew: — Can you specify what this initiative will be?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I can when I know the project. I wouldn't know the projects. I couldn't specify until I would know it. But if you have a project then I would certainly . . . (inaudible) . . . to specify.

Mr. Yew: — Okay. Certainly I have specifics, Mr. Minister. I have already, in my

environmental estimates questioning, stated some projects. Now maybe I'll reiterate those projects. With respect to the five-span expansion of the uranium industry submitted by Cluff Lake and also with respect to the Nipawin hydro project, with respect to the Qu'Appelle Valley agreement, can you specify for this Assembly how you perceive to see public involvement, public participation, public monitoring in those projects?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, it was previously done again by the former administration. I don't know what year it was done in, but considerable time ago. It was a complete EIA done. Since then they had monitored it as an extension to the EIA. That has been presented to us, each and every thing. The regulations were drafted. They were tightened up. And there hasn't been much change from before, only it's a little tighter. I don't know what else could be done. There were five pits in one mine. I mean, you're talking about one mine, one area. The regulations are the most stringent in the country. I don't know what else any department could do to protect the environment better than that.

Mr. Yew: — I'm glad that the minister has confirmed that those regulations and those policies were as stringent as they could possibly be. My next question, and it may not pertain to your portfolio: why, then, does the minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan insist that we have a change of policy in the service lease agreements?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I couldn't answer for the minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I really couldn't say what he's done on surface lease agreements. So I would have to say that, you know, his estimates will be up very shortly and I'm sure that he'll be able to answer you very adequately.

Mr. Yew: — It is really unfortunate that one department transfers certain responsibilities to another department to the point where people at the local level become so confused, become so disenchanted with the administration of this province, as well as the administration of Canada, shuffling around certain responsibilities and things that you should be aware of and responsible for, Mr. Minister. It is really too bad because that leads me to believe that people at the local level, although I wish that those people at the community level, many of them, particularly in my area, would see government - not only the provincial government, but as well, the federal government - see administration as a tool for their aspirations, for their outlook in life, as a means of some help, some help.

It really distresses me to see that major people at your position, Mr. Minister, people that hold a cabinet post, and the minister (that goes for the Minister of DNS) seem to shuffle your responsibilities as it suits your need, as it suits your need. This is what is happening.

I take myself, when I was at the local level, trapping for a living - when I had a grievance in respecting to hunting or trapping or fishing - I see myself - now clearly, quite clearly, that your people, your government, and the people at the federal level, transferring responsibility to another department to the effect that really confuses. It puts a smoke-screen to the way that people at the local level ought to see the government.

The way the people at the local level ought to see their government is: they are supposed to advocate on our behalf. I ask the minister: what is your perception of provincial and federal governments? What is your perception of them? Do you see them as advocating on my behalf - on the behalf of a trapper?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question: the surface lease was put under DNS by the former administration. It's still there. It hasn't been changed.

In regards to smoke-screens, I'd just like to mention, the smoke-screen was maybe the DNS as it was before. They buried everything up there under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, with no accountability for expenditures. They actually put the northern people at a disadvantage by doing it, because the perception was then, the northern people could spend whatever they want. And it was a false perception, but it was there. If they had've kept it as one part of Saskatchewan - Saskatchewan as we've got it now; we're bringing it back to that - they'd have been part of Saskatchewan, felt part of it. But they tried to isolate those people off all by themselves and say, 'Hey, you're not part of Saskatchewan. You're a group up there. Stay up there by yourself. We'll give you some money; stay there.' The role that we see them playing is all Saskatchewan being the same - each and everyone equal. And I think that's the new role that it's got to be played, and the role that we are going to see that is done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yew: — A final supplementary, Mr. Chairman. In respect to the major thrust that your government is prepared to take in terms of industrial development, Mr. Minister, and in terms of the major thrust that your private sector is prepared to take for this province, I ask the minister responsible for Environment: do you or do you not have any major initiatives to involve the local advisory councils, the local community authorities, the three incorporated centres, the native organizations in northern Saskatchewan - the Metis, the association of Metis and non-status Indians of this province, and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians - into account, with respect to your major initiatives?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, seeing that's his final supplementary, I would say that certainly those native people have the opportunity. I think we just got to relate back to what we've done in northern housing. We have given them those opportunities now to put their input into it. We went to them, to the council, to all the advisory people, to the people - the residents there - to see what is needed. And that's what we'll do. If there's a development coming in, we will consult them. We will talk to them. We'll see how they can become involved in maybe spin-off type of developments. There's lots can be done. We can do a lot up there. But we got to do it together.

Mr. Yew: — But, Mr. Minister, I see and from experience I have seen that in order for members of this Assembly, in order for this province, and in order for Canada to be a full participant in those major initiatives that you have to have something concrete, something concrete in terms of paper, in terms of legal initiatives, in terms of formal initiatives, by any government, regardless whether or not it's Saskatchewan, regardless whether or not it's Canada. There has to be some major initiative in writing - legal - provincially or federally. And I ask the minister: are those initiatives in the future . . . Are they being contemplated that they will be serious initiatives? And will they involve the people at the local level - at the community level - as major initiatives that will be printed in writing?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, certainly the people will be involved in any projects we do, I'm sure.

Mr. Yew: — They will be involved, Mr. Co-chairman. But how will they be involved? My question is: will they be involved in black and white? This is what your administration, this is what the typical administration has always advocated - being involved in writing. When will my people be involved in writing?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I think we're away from Environment, Mr. Chairman, but certainly we'll give them that opportunity.

Mr. Yew: — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get the response to that question.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I just said, Mr. Chairman, I think we've got a long ways from the Environment estimates, but certainly I'm sure the government will give the native people that opportunity.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Item 9

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to raise, and I hope that the minister can give me some concrete information with respect to item 9. I note that you have transferred that portion of the traditional budgetary allowance to another line department, Mr. Minister. Is that correct, or not, for starters?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — If you're talking about the treaty Indian land entitlements, yes, it will be over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Yew: — Then, is that portion of the budget - the transfer itself - was that done in consultation with the native people?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, it's just a transfer of responsibility from one minister to another, that's all. No, there'd be no consultation on that, because I'm sure that the native people wouldn't really care if myself was looking after it, or the Attorney-General, or the minister responsible for Justice, or so on. That was just an in-house one. That's done regular, the transfer of ministerial duties.

Mr. Yew: — I take it then, Mr. Minister, with respect to your response to the question, that you have not consulted with the people of native ancestry?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, it isn't in my estimates this year, but I could honestly say I'm not aware of any consultation with regard to the transfer of ministerial duties from one department to another. That's been done over the ages by every government, so I don't think that it's . . .

Mr. Yew: — Just for the record, Mr. Minister, then I take it that you have not consulted with any major political party; in terms of native politics, you have not consulted with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, you have not consulted with the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan. You have, in fact, decided to transfer this form of area to another department within your government - the intergovernmental affairs. You have not actually consulted with anybody.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, certainly not myself, because it wasn't my department, as you are well aware. When the estimates were on last year I told you that they had been transferred very early when we became government, almost immediately afterwards, and they're not in there this year. They're only there so you can see what the amount was. We didn't want to try to hide anything; we left it there. Basically, it's been transferred over to the Attorney-General's office, which will be the Department of Justice in a short time. I understand that he's probably had ongoing consultations with a lot of native people, and in regards to consultation with native people - I lost the slip here - but I have a chief coming in to talk to me just in a couple of days - I think May 2nd - he's coming in to talk to me in regards to housing and some environment issues on the reservation up here. My door is always open for that kind of conversation, and it will continue to be.

Mr. Yew: — Just a small supplementary, Mr. Chairman. If your door is actually always open, Mr. Minister, then, am I to believe that if there is a major issue, such as what exists today, not relevant to your portfolio, am I to understand that you will advocate on my behalf and on behalf of the people that I represent? Am I to understand that you will fight strenuously to stand up for my rights in your critic area?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — To be honest with you, I will stand up for the rights of everybody in Saskatchewan, 'cause that's what we're elected to do. If it is in your constituency, whether it be you, or whatever, you can rest assured, and my door has been open if you want to come in; it's always been open; it will continue to be; and I'm sure that that's the way it should be. If it's something in your seat or in anybody else's, regardless of who is doing it, certainly, we'll sit and talk, we'll do what we can to help them - and always have done.

Mr. Yew: — Okay then, Mr. Minister, I'll take your word on it. I'll accept your word, because there exists today something pertaining to your portfolio, something that pertains to your cabinet post. We have then, people that are direly concerned about their environment, Mr. Minister. How far, my question is, how far do you see yourself advocating on the people that I am particularly referring to in terms of a major adverse affect - and I'm referring to the Nipawin hydro development project - how far do you see the people of Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing, leading in that way of input, involvement, and public participation? Do you see them as actual participants of the monitoring committee that you speak about?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I'll answer to the hon. member, certainly if they want to be part of it, they certainly could be. I haven't said what kind of committee, monitoring committee or anything else that's going to be set up there. I've said that we've had an open door, that if they want to come and talk to me about it, we'll listen and whatever else. In regards to one little comment, you were saying that I was the critic for the Department of Environment. I was the critic for tourism and renewable resources before April 26th. Now we're the government, so it does change there a bit, but certainly we'll have an open-door policy. If they want to come, if we set up a commission, we'll certainly welcome them to join it.

Mr. Yew: — One final supplementary, and pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I keep referring to it as supplementary. How far does the Minister of Environment see the people of the west side being involved in that Primrose bombing range agreement?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, my understanding is that it's not our department. The agreement is in place; it's under the Department of National Defence of which they

have total authority on there. The best we can hope for (as I told you earlier) that they allow us to come on and do some monitoring, that they'd tell us before it happens; that they'll let us put our input into it. But that don't mean to say they got to listen. They didn't listen last time we found out they were going to do it. We asked them not to; that don't mean to say that they will listen the next time either. We hope they will. I talked to Mr. Roberts about it personally; I phoned him; he assured me that it wouldn't happen again without consultation. I hope that that's the way it would be.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, the time that the agreement was arrived at, the time the agreement was arrived at, and I don't want to lead the House too far away from its deliberations tonight, but at the same time, I see that our responsibilities are pertaining to people, pertaining to people and their concerns. And I just hope that I can relate to you, Mr. Minister, my question, my dire concern that is, at the same time, felt quite intensely by the people that I know at the local level.

Back in 1953 an agreement was arrived at with respect to the Primrose bombing range agreement. People were told that they had to accept of cheque of \$246 in payment for the transfer of this portion of land to the military, Department of National Defence. And at the time people were led to believe that this agreement was temporary. They did not understand that this agreement was perpetual. In fact, people in the area had no representative such as what we have today. They did not have the local advisory councils; they did not have the local community authorities; they did not have the Metis Society of Saskatchewan; they did not have the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians; they did not have the national native organizations that we have today. In fact they did not have a member of the Legislative Assembly to advocate in a strenuous basis for them . . . (inaudible) . . . What happened was an agreement was arrived at between the province and the federal government. Certainly I don't hold you responsible for that. But certainly I hold governments responsible for that act. And today and in the future, you will be hearing from the people at the local level and certainly you will be hearing from me.

My question then is: how do you foresee people in communities such as Waterhen, Big Head Reserve, Michel village, Dillon, Canoe Lake, Beauval, Jans Bay and Cole Bay? How do you see those people being equal beneficiaries of the Primrose bombing range agreement? How do you see them being equal benefactors of that agreement?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I certainly share the concerns of the hon. member but a lot of that falls under different departments and I don't have all the officials here to answer that kind of question. Certainly, as I said, we'll take it in . . . We have a concern about it. We're going to do everything we can to be sure that we protect the environment there. Our hands are very tied, as the member knows. Really and truly, there is not much you can do if the national defence wants to override you. So at that point, there's not much else I can say. The benefits - I know there might be some benefits there for trapping. But it would have to come under Parks and Renewable Resources of which I don't have any officials here. So it is another department.

Mr. Yew: — Do you propose then, Mr. Minister, that you will answer in detail with respect to my question at a later date?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, under Parks and Renewable Resources, I don't know exactly - I can answer whatever comes under that. I'll certainly do it at that time when I have some officials here.

Mr. Yew: — I guess I didn't get myself that clear in terms of the question, Mr. Minister. If I were sitting on your side of the House and if I was responsible for that particular critic's role . . .

An Hon. Member: — Get that idea out of your head. You'll never sit over here.

Mr. Yew: — The member for Moosomin . . . I think I've hit a very sensitive spot over there. I think maybe in three years time I'll be sitting on that side of the fence.

No, no. I sincerely believe that because it really hits some sensitive spots whenever I mention that.

But anyway, getting back to the question, I'd like to ask the Minister of Environment, seeing as how you cannot come out with a specific mandate of that government opposite with respect to the people that I have mentioned from Dillon, Jan Lake, Cole Lake, Beauval, Waterhen, and so on, from Big Head reserve, Ile-a-la-Crosse, as to the way that your government foresees them being involved as major benefits of that agreement, Mr. Minister, can you advise then as to how you would work it, at this point in time, so that those people are being involved?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Just recently we had a cabinet committee on water concerns within Prince Albert. We listened to whatever concerns they had at that time. It was open. I had groups come into my office, and certainly letters continuously, in regards to certain things. We address them on a one-to-one basis. In the summer-time, the minister responsible for DNS and myself plan to make a tour through the North to see what the concerns are. I don't know what more a government could do to be in touch with the people. We intend to stay in touch with the people. One thing that I would hope that would come out of it is that the northern people stay in touch with us. We'd like that. And we say, back to coming in and making their points known: the door is open. In regards to any environmental concerns, certainly we'll do whatever we can to make them aware of, and let them be part of, whatever is going on. I think that's your concern: jobs, and what it does to the environment, what it does to fishing, trapping, hunting. I could go on and on, but that's certainly what I hope your concern is, 'cause it is mine.

Mr. Yew: — Now I don't want to nit and pick with the minister responsible for this particular cabinet post, but I certainly want to question the members in government as to whether or not they are committed towards involving people at the community level. I want to question that, and I believe that is my right, and I believe that is what people elected me for, and I believe that that is what people want to know.

Now, in terms of the agreement, Mr. Minister, you stated, in terms of the provincial-federal agreement on the Primrose bombing range, you stated in our last review of estimates that you would look into the matter. Now I want to ask the minister responsible for Environment whether or not you have looked into the matter and whether or not you know that the agreement is up for review.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, in regards to that, we did look into it and found out it wasn't in the Department of Environment at all, that it doesn't come under our agreements at all. Therefore, you know, it didn't relate directly to us, so we never pursued it any further, because it wasn't part of our estimates. I'm sure that I don't know whose estimates it would fall under - with DNS or Energy and Mines, or whoever signs those lease agreements - but certainly it wasn't with Department of Environment. We

did look into it; it wasn't part of our department, and that's why we didn't report back to you, because there was nothing to report.

Mr. Yew: — If in fact it was not part of your responsibility, Mr. Minister, then why did you look into the spraying incident last year? The dangerous chemical that was sprayed in that particular area - you acted on that responsibility, and I commended you for it. Then why do you tell me today that that is not part of your responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Just to answer that. I said that the lease agreement as per se, between the federal and provincial government, was not part of the Department of Environment's responsibility. The spraying - anything to do with the environment, spraying wherever - we feel we have a responsibility there, although, on Department of National Defence territory, we really don't have a responsibility directly. But because we had a responsibility for the people of Saskatchewan, we looked into it and tried to stop it. We had a concern it may get into the lake, it may do something to the fish, it may do something to the wildlife. We had a concern that it could affect outside of the Department of National Defence territory. So that's why we looked into that.

But the lease itself - the lease agreement in itself - we don't have nothing to do with that in the Department of Environment. It comes under a different department, as the member well knows.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, then I ask you, and as seriously as possible: do you see us being involved in the next interim agreement regarding the Primrose bombing range? Do you see us being involved in terms of outlining what the stats ought to be in terms of the forestry; in terms of the royalties; in terms of the fishing; in terms of the hunting; in terms of the trapping; and in terms of everything that pertains to that agreement - do you see us being involved in that agreement, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I'm not sure about the interim agreement that you're talking about. If it comes under Parks and Renewable Resources, at that time I'll answer your question. I don't know nothing about the agreement that you're talking about, and I can't answer directly, for sure, the questions related to hunting and trapping. I'm very much aware - I've hunted and trapped in my life lots too - so I know what you're talking about. But I don't know specifically the answer for that area without having some officials here, and that would fall under a different department.

Mr. Yew: — You keep telling the members on this side of the House that you don't know nothing about a major, a major agreement that affects the livelihood of a dozen, a dozen communities in the north-west side of this province, Mr. Minister. And I want to ask you why you don't do anything about that particular agreement.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I think I've answered that question a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, I thought that our estimates would go well today. They certainly went well Friday afternoon. They certainly went well Friday afternoon. I raised questions with respect to the delivery of the housing program in northern Saskatchewan and you answered them quite honestly. But this time around, I cannot comprehend what your response is, what your responsibility is with respect to environment. And I would like to know what your position is with respect to the Primrose bombing range agreement.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — When the agreement is renegotiated, we will, hon. member, put our concerns in and we'll certainly be part of it. We'll voice our concerns very strongly. And I have, as you know, just recently done that. We have a concern up there, and I think we've done everything possible, and whatever. If you have any ideas, or anything, I'm free to listen to them. My door is open if you want to come in and discuss them with me. We can argue back and forth here all night, but the point is that we have done everything possible to date. The agreements were signed previously. When the new one comes up, certainly we'll have a concern and we'll voice it then.

Mr. Yew: — Now, Mr. Minister, you state to me that agreements were signed previously. Okay. We have a majority government today, we have a majority government today that has new policies, new programs for this province. One of them is open for business, open for business. Okay, let me ask the minister opposite then: what is your policy with respect to that agreement? Will you be taking a new position with respect to that agreement or not?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in regards to an agreement that doesn't fall under our department, when that agreement comes up - and it was signed previously with the previous administration - when it comes up again we'll certainly voice our concerns and voice them very strongly. At that time I'll even contact the hon. member for his input into it, so he can tell us what he thinks. So I don't know what else could be done.

Mr. Yew: — I hope that the . . . Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the members in this Assembly heard the commitment by the member of, the member responsible for Environment, that he has, in fact, invited the member for Cumberland to be a participant in the evolution of the next agreement. I hope that the members, all the members of this Assembly have heard that invitation and I just want to say for the record I accept that invitation. Thank you very much. I accept that invitation. I want to be a full participant of the next federal-provincial talks of the federal-provincial agreement regarding the Department of National Defence. I would like to be a full participant in that agreement in those talks that pertain to the Department of National Defence.

My next - I don't want to belabour that point of the estimates, Mr. Chairman. I'll go on to your department, Mr. Minister. Could your department provide us with the full particulars with respect to your staff in terms of the number of people in your staff, the number of Cadillacs that you have in your staff and advise the members on this side of the House as to what your department has with respect to staff and people at your disposal?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Yes, agreed. We'll send it over to you.

Mr. Yew: — Also (I think I've raised the question prior to the supper break), you will inform this side of the House as to grants to organizations . . . (inaudible) . . .

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Yes, we did.

Mr. Koskie: — I note that there is a very substantial decrease in the amount from 1982 to '82-83 as compared to the estimated amount to be expended in '83-84. What I would like to know is what accounts for the very substantial decrease in the grants to organizations for the purpose of advising the Minister of Environment on environmental concerns? I'd like to know the reason for the substantial decrease.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — In answer to the member's question: one of the decreases was due to the Outdoors Unlittered grant. We brought our own program in as you are well aware. You got a brochure the other day. Another one is \$25,000. That was the Saskatchewan Labour share of the toxicology centre - they are going to do it themselves instead of us doing it through us - it's the same amount of money. In fact, there was a . . . In fact, there as a few other additional grants of \$6,000 that would be added in. So, actually, we took those two out. One is coming through Labour, which is funded just through a different department. And the other ones, we brought our own program in, which in fact is even a bit more than what this one here was. So in fact, it's a new . . . Basically, it's about the same, only through different votes.

Item 9 agreed to.

Item 10 agreed to.

Vote 9 agreed to.

Mr. Yew: — Yes, I'd like to, at this time, thank the Minister for the Department of Environment and his officials for taking time and taking the seriousness and the attitude that they did in responding to our questions of the opposition. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I, too, would like to thank the officials for the information they've given me. Certainly, the hon. member over there has a concern for his people in the North, which we recognize. I'd like to thank him for his concern for the people of the North, although some of the times I think we got a lot of questions that didn't relate to Environment. But, certainly, because of the concern you showed, I'm sure your people up there recognize that you have a deep concern as well as the rest of us do.

I'd like to thank you for your questions, and I'd like to thank my officials. Thank you.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 16

Item 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Sitting directly to my right, the deputy minister, Mr. Jack Sutherland; behind him, Myron Herasymuik; beside him, Mr. Al Schwartz. On my immediate left is the chairman of the highway traffic board, was, still is, Mr. Bill Sheard, and . . . (inaudible) . . . personnel, and any other support staff that we may need here tonight, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to say a few words before I ask the minister his questions. I have noticed in the last short while, the minister bragging about how much money he's going to spend on highways. But when you look at the budget, I have some difficulty in trying to find where all that money is that he's going to spend, because it doesn't appear to be in there.

One of the other things that I have noticed, and that was on the back of the minister's

map, was the comment that he made regarding our highway systems in Saskatchewan. He stated that it was one of the finest highway systems on this continent and, Mr. Chairman, I would have to agree with the minister, that is true.

An Hon. Member: — It was true.

Mr. Lusney: — At least, as my colleague says, it was true. We would like to think that that will continue. However, when you look at this year's Highway estimate, I think we can only say that what we'll be looking forward to in the next year or two or three will be a lot more pot-holes. And the minister's nickname will be well known throughout this province, I think.

Mr. Minister, you said in one of your speeches in this House that you were going to disband some highway crews. Could you at this time indicate just which highway crews you are going to disband and where they are; whether they're grading crews, surfacing crews?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments too, before we get into the question period. The hon. member was stating the fact that we have one of the finest highway networks in Canada. I have to agree with him, Mr. Chairman, we have. And it's going to get better, Mr. Chairman, as the years go by. Mr. Chairman, no longer are the priorities, the political priorities of the NDP going to set the highway program for the people of Saskatchewan. It is going to be set by the people themselves. People's priority, where people want roads, Mr. Chairman, and that's why I have to agree with the member opposite by stating that, yes, we have the finest road network in Canada, and it's going to get better.

Regarding the crews - three grading crews disbanded, three surfacing crews, two sealing crews, and one mixing crew.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, could you indicate just how many crews, government crews, are going to continue in operation in 1983-84?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, there will be left: two grading crews, two surfacing crews, five sealing crews, and two mixing crews.

Mr. Lusney: — Could the minister indicate where these remaining crews are going to be stationed?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, two grading crews: one will be working and located from Michel and Dillon, the other one south of La Loche on No. 155. The two surfacing crews will be located throughout the province because of the types of work that they do. The five sealing crews: they will be in every district. One will be located in every district except Saskatoon. And the two mixing crews: one will be located in Regina and one will be located in Yorkton.

Mr. Lusney: — The grading crews, the surfacing, and the mixing crews that you have disbanded, Mr. Minister, could you say where those crews were at the time that you had done away with them?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, the grading and surfacing crews are located throughout the entire province, like, some employees live in one town, some

employees in another. When they go on a job, they go to one specified . . .

An Hon. Member: — Town by town I'd like them.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — You want where every employee lived, town by town?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Okay. Well, could we maybe provide that to you a little later on? Or we can wait here for ten minutes while we give them all, list them all out - it's up to you - or we could move on to something else. Would you like the information provided later? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Okay. We'll provide you with that information. We'll go on to another line of questioning. Fine.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, if I understood you right, your staff is now getting out that information of where the crews are and where the people are that are going to remain employed, and we'll go on to other questions in the meantime.

One of the other questions, Mr. Minister, is the Open Roads 2 program. How many miles or how many kilometres have you surfaced under the Open Roads 2 program? How many kilometres in total and the location of where they would . . .

An Hon. Member: — For this year?

Mr. Lusney: — For '82.

An Hon. Member: — For '82 or '83?

Mr. Lusney: — For '82. Do you have the '82 ones?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, while we're looking up the other information we could give you tonight, we have the information tonight of the breakdown per district where these people come from, or we can get it from the office tomorrow as to the separate towns, whichever you want them from.

Mr. Lusney: — Give us the names and the districts of them, if you have tonight. You can provide the other information tomorrow then.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Okay. Swift Current district, there is 5 in total; Regina district, 29; Yorkton district, 8; Saskatoon district, 33; Prince Albert district, 52; North Battleford district, 12; for a total of 139.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, you said you'll be providing the names tomorrow and positions that were deleted?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — We have to get that information from head office. We don't have that magnitude of information here tonight, but we can get that for you.

Mr. Lusney: — While your staff is doing that, could you include the years of service that some of the people that have been laid off have had? All of them.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Yes, we can also provide that.

Mr. Chairman, we don't have the kilometres here; we have the total dollars and the total number of communities for '82 - 30 communities and total dollars, \$1,898,031.

Mr. Lusney: — Could the minister indicate how much of this work was done by private contractors and how much of it was done by government crews?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, of the thirty projects, one was done. That's the Lacadena and White Bear and that was for almost a quarter of the total price of \$573,000. That was tendered out to the private sector.

Mr. Lusney: — Could the minister indicate what the cost per kilometre was on the private sector and the government crews?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, we can give you - and I think it's fairly pointed on this matter . . . With the private sector one, we knew exactly what the tender was. Now we can provide the members opposite with the direct cost to the Department of Highways of the works branch on the projects that they did. But, I mean, it is not broke down, I don't believe, explicit enough for to take the indirect costs in as well - I mean a percentage of salaries, light costs, heat costs, rent on a building, insurance on vehicles. I mean we have a clear, definite indicator of what the costs were in the private sector but I don't believe that we have a total picture including direct and indirect costs on the works branch.

Mr. Koskie: — I am absolutely astounded by the confession of this minister because what he has indicated here to the people of Saskatchewan that without even an analysis of the costs of government crews building a kilometre of highway versus the private, he has turned it over to the private. That is precisely what he is saying. He has made no analysis of the comparative costs, and, that I want to say, Mr. Minister, is a revelation which we never expected that you would be making.

I want to say to all of those crew members who have been dismissed, fired, laid off, that the message that has to go out to them is that you respected neither the job they were doing nor their employment record, and you have cast them aside to your allegiance to the private sector without even a cost analysis.

And what I want to go on to ask, in respect to the individuals that have been laid off: you're providing certain information there; I would like also to indicate what steps you are taking for reallocation of that 139 that you have cut adrift. What steps are you taking?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I think . . . I believe there's two points have to be made here, and something will have to be clarified for the gang of eight over there, because they don't realize that last April the 26th, 1982, the people of Saskatchewan decided that they no longer wanted the NDP. They no longer wanted the NDP to govern this province. When that took place, Mr. Chairman, there was a change in philosophy, which I believe is from socialism to freedom, and that's what happened in this province. It's definitely what's happened in this province.

Mr. Chairman, the cost saving to the people of Saskatchewan, we believe, is going to be in a lot of dollars. We're going to end up with a better road network in the province of Saskatchewan by allowing the contractors to doing some of the sealing coat on new construction work. Now the member on the opposite side said, 'Well, what guarantees, what guarantees have these people got for a job?' The guarantees are there.

Two points, Mr. Chairman: number one, they have their bumping rights within the union that can be exercised. We have a four-man employment team at Department of Highways that is ensuring that whenever they're contracted they're working and doing their utmost to assist these employees. Number two, and I could read the letter from the Saskatchewan road builders' association where they have stated that they need 100 or more employees to do the construction in the province of Saskatchewan this summer.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have to explain this. We can take 100 miles of road here, and if 100 miles of road is to be built, whether it's built by the Department of Highways and Transportation or whether it's built by the private road builders in the province of Saskatchewan, it's going to take X number of people. These lay-offs mean nothing more than the people of Saskatchewan that were working for the Department of Highways and Transportation now can have a new boss. They can now go to work for the private sector. That's an opportunity. It's called freedom - freedom of choice - something that escapes the members opposite.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that he has turned over the grading, or some of the grading, the sealing, and so on, to private companies. And he indicated that he was going to get better quality of work. I want to ask him: is he stating in this legislature that the quality of the employees in the Department of Highways was inferior, and that you were unsatisfied with their performance?

An Hon. Member: — You're saying that.

Mr. Koskie: — Stand up and say it. You said that you're going to get better quality of grading, sealing, and so on. Are you in fact then alleging that you're dissatisfied with all of the workers with the Department of Highways, your whole staff?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can see why there's only the gang of eight left and the others have gone. It's amazing that there's still eight left, because they don't understand anything, number one, about government, and number two, about building roads in Saskatchewan. When I'm talking about a sealing crew, and I'll try and give them an education course . . . When we take big scrapers, we take dirt from point A over the point B and we compact it . . .

An Hon. Member: — Where you need a road.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Where it had been done before. There were sealing crews that travelled throughout the province sealing this road. Sometimes one, two or three miles of this new grade did not have the seal coat on it. We are now allowing the contractors - the private road builders in the province of Saskatchewan - to put (maybe I can put it in a simpler term for him) an umbrella that prevents rain from getting through to the subgrade. It will prevent the pot-holes which we inherited, Mr. Chairman, from the former administration.

So, what we're doing . . . I have no problem, no qualms whatsoever, with the employees and the type of work they did. It was because of the philosophy of the NDP party that enabled us to have bad roads in the province of Saskatchewan, because they didn't know anything about road building or construction in the province of Saskatchewan. We're simply going to end up by people working for someone else, Mr. Chairman. We're going to get the umbrella over the roads sooner to prevent that

subsurface from deteriorating. And the end result is, we're going to have better roads for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Koskie: — The inconsistency of the minister is almost unbelievable. In the one hand, the critic for the Department of Highways stood up and indicated in respect to the good highway system that we have in this province; the Minister of Highways stood up and said, 'Yes, I agree with the critic. We have the best highway system in Canada.' Now he stands up and says that the previous government, all of the highway crews, all of the private firms that contracted and tendered during our administration, were doing inferior work. That is what he's saying. And I want to say I want the minister to clarify, because I think he's making allegations which is a direct attack on the employees of the highway department, of all of the private companies that have built roads during the past 11 years.

You have indicated that by going to the private, that you are going to, in fact, improve the quality of the roads. That is a direct attack on the crews in the Department of Highways. And I think that it's only fitting that you stand up here and withdraw those slanderous attack on the workers of the Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I will try once again to explain to the members opposite. I am not and never have condemned the employees working for the Department of Highways. I, along with the majority of voters in the province of Saskatchewan, disagree, oppose the philosophy of the socialist government that was in here before. It was their policy directive, their ministers that told them what to do. It wasn't the members.

But now, the members seem to have a hard time understanding this - not the members on this side of the House, the government side of the House, but the members opposite. So we'll try and explain it once more, Mr. Chairman. We are taking 100 miles of road here, 100 miles of road here. It takes X number of employees to build this road, and X number of employees to build this road. We are moving road A over to road B, and we have to move the employees over here - nothing to do with the quality of them. I mean, I have read on, rode on chip spreaders in the province of Saskatchewan. And this isn't a fish and chip spreader I'm talking about; this is a chip spreader for spreading the aggregate seal before it goes on the new grade. And those employees have done a fantastic job. Where the problem has been, has been because of the philosophy and the policies of the socialist government previously.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — What you have done is to basically change a policy. Work which was previously being done by highways crews, you have now tendered it over to the private sector; that's what you've done. All right, number one, you stood up in this House, and you indicated clearly that you have not made a cost comparison between the two. You could not in fact indicate that it was cheaper or saving taxpayers money because you hadn't done a cost analysis. Therefore I ask you: what is the reason then that you made the transfer, fired 139 competent employees, and turned it over to the privates? You have no answer in respect to that because you didn't do a cost analysis. The only other thing is which you said, and that is you're going to get better highways. So therefore, in fact, what you are doing is accusing all of those employees of doing inferior work. That's the only other conceivable reason.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, now we have a lesson in government, Mr.

Chairman, we have the private sector. They know what their direct and indirect costs are. When they tender on a section of road, the tender is for X number of dollars. I know you understand it, Mr. Chairman, but I'm doing this for the members opposite.

Now, we have the government works branch where there is the direct cost of gas, oil, and salaries, but taken into that is not the power for Humford House, as one example, for the district offices, example number two; depreciation on equipment, number three, Mr. Chairman. I could go on and on. The costs are clear. When the private sector tenders on a section of road in the province of Saskatchewan, I, as the minister, know what that's going to cost us to build that section of road. When works branch is doing this road, we know what the direct costs are, but we don't know what the indirect costs are in total.

Now, you understand that, Mr. Chairman. I'm hopeful the members opposite will or we can explain it again.

Mr. Koskie: — All right. I want to ask the minister: are you specifically indicating to this House that a cost comparison cannot reasonably, accurately be ascertained? Because I want to tell you that under the former premier, Ross Thatcher, there was no doubt we got cost comparisons in respect to it. And I want to tell you that in the cost comparisons that were made and submitted by the then premier that he indicated the cost per kilometre built under the highways crews was cheaper than the private. And I just will not accept that you cannot in fact put a cost comparison. And I think what you're doing is fudging it, and what you have done, without even attempting to do a cost analysis, in respect to the taxpayers of this province, you have handed it over to the allegiance of private enterprise without even consideration of the taxpayer. And there can be no other explanation, and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Well, two points, Mr. Chairman. We can estimate - and only estimate - the indirect costs when it's done by government, but I'm going to try and explain to the members opposite. We talk about costs. We'll take a sealing crew, for example, the crew that I was explaining to you, Mr. Chairman, that goes around and puts, shall we say, the umbrella over the road. They could be down in Swift Current district doing a section of Highway 13, putting a seal coat on a couple of miles of road. There could be a contract working up by P.A. or over by Yorkton, that has two or three miles of road that has to be sealed. By the time the crew picks up, loads the trailers, loads the cats, loads up the distributor, moves their fleet to either Yorkton or P.A., the contractor, who is on site, has the equipment, has the technology, can do the job right away. Now, those are what I'll talking about, direct, indirect costs. It can be done, I believe very firmly, can be done cheaper by the private sector and it can be done immediately, so as to prevent that new grade of road.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, what the minister just said, is a total contradiction of what he said before. He indicated that he had not, in fact, made a cost comparison. He said, he couldn't, in fact, find the indirect costs, and I want to say that he can not, unless he comes forward with the calculation of the cost, stand up in this House and make the loose statements that he's making. His statement is on record, that he made a transfer to the private sector without a cost analysis, and there's no other interpretation of what he has indicated.

And, I want again to say, Mr. Minister, don't you think that you have some obligation to people, 139 citizens of this province, who were trained, who had job security, who had

pension benefits, and that you have now cast adrift with no opportunity of jobs, because there are no jobs under this administration? What justification have you, for cutting adrift 139 men without even any explanation to this House?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, we have not set anyone adrift in the province of Saskatchewan. The only members that were sent adrift, were the former NDP members that used to be sitting on this side of the House. They're the ones that are adrift, and still are, and always will be adrift. Mr. Chairman, as I had stated before, the facts are there . . . It's a matter of changing bosses - working for Department of Highways, or working for the private sector. That's basically it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, the minister talks about this great new freedom that has been found by these 139 workers, but in talking to several of them, they don't think in quite the same terms as he does, as being free. What they're free of is a monthly pay cheque which they used to keep the food on the table. In his mind that may be a new found freedom, but, for the workers, I can tell you it's a fairly major problem. What I'd like to find out from the minister, is whether or not you are guaranteeing that these 139 will be first hired by the contractors this summer. Are they given preference, or did you get a guarantee from the road builders that that would be the case?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — A couple of points, Mr. Chairman. First of all, for those 139 employees, 104 have responded to our employment team; 88 have elected to bump; nine choose to resign, seven choose to go on to re-employment, to the re-employment list.

But now, Mr. Chairman, we were talking about philosophy before, and maybe we should touch it again tonight. I don't intend to tell the road builders association of Saskatchewan, or anyone else of Saskatchewan, that you have to hire so and so. This is the difference in philosophy; the previous government did that. We don't intend to get into that, Mr. Chairman, the opportunity is provided there and I could read you the letter from the Saskatchewan road builders association, where they need 100 or more employees. But I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Chairman, Jim Garner sure isn't going to force anyone to hire anybody if they don't want to. That's the difference between them and us, and it's called freedom.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take the minister on one more time on this freedom issue. In travelling around the province a bit over the weekend, I was in Wakaw and Maple Creek and Saskatoon, and everyone I talked to I asked them their opinion on whether or not they consider these 139 to be free, and they laughed at the minister's statement that he had freed these people to go look for work in the private sector. Mr. Minister, people are laughing at your attitude towards workers of this province, and suddenly people who work for crown corporations or governments, are somehow inferior to this government. And I want to say to you that that is a slur on every man and woman in this province. The 30,000 - the 15,000 who work in the government in the line departments, and the 15,000 who work for crown corporations - Mr. Minister, you have slurred each and every one of those men and women and their families by your attitude in this House last Friday.

Mr. Chairman, this minister has gone the length of embarrassing all of the families of the province, and not only here but across Canada, who work for governments and in crown corporations, whether that be federal or provincial. And, Mr. Minister, are you telling me that you believe that these individuals who have been fired from union positions - many of them who earned, I don't know, 8, or 10, or \$12 an hour - now

have the freedom to go to work possibly at minimum wage. Are you saying that that is a decided advantage for them to have that opportunity?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Well, Mr. Chairman, this time we have three points to discuss. The first point is to who the member opposite talked to this last weekend while he was out, and I imagine when you're out campaigning for the leadership of a political party, you only talk to the faithful. I mean, I'm not doing that, Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to run the Department of Highways and Transportation in the province of Saskatchewan and have the thing flow.

The second point, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite talks about families. Now let me just tell you about the real families of Saskatchewan, not the NDP family of crown corporations that they built up, the real families, the pioneers of Saskatchewan. Those are the people that we are concerned about. Those are the people that we're interested in, not the NDP family of crown corporations that they just went completely overboard with, Mr. Chairman.

Third point: we talk about slander, Mr. Chairman. I didn't want to have to bring this up, I really didn't, but I think we have to discuss it once more. In an article, Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, sometimes an excellent paper - in fact, most of the time, my colleague from Moosomin states, and I have to agree with him. 'Dismissed highway crews expected to get private jobs.' We go down a few paragraphs here, and rather than reading the whole thing - I may have to read it later, Mr. Chairman - but hopefully we can put this to rest now:

Garner said the department has a four-man employment team working extended hours to find jobs. He also held up a letter from the Road Builders and Heavy Construction Association of Saskatchewan, dated February the 24th, as a guarantee there will be enough work for more than 100 people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a point that really concerns me, and this happened in the Legislative Chamber:

This prompted heckles from Shaunavon NDP MLA, Dwain Lingenfelter, of (and I quote from the paper), a little bit of graft going on here.

Mr. Chairman, that is just a typical example why the NDP are over there, the Conservatives are the government of the province of Saskatchewan, because once again, they were only concerned about the family of crown corporations, not the real families that go out there. And I give you an example of Morsky Construction, a family-owned business in the province of Saskatchewan. Father and sons working on it, the mother works there too, and the daughter does the books. Now that's a real family, a family of Saskatchewan, not an NDP family.

Mr. Chairman, I'm disappointed to have heard the member state that the other day and I am just as disappointed to read it here tonight. Hopefully, we can let this lie and it won't have to be raised again.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that even after the Speaker ruled on this very issue this afternoon saying that it wasn't in the record, that not only the Minister of Finance, but now the Minister of Highways insists on saying that what Mr. Speaker ruled in this House is not accurate. I find that a very interesting position for a minister of the Crown to get up in this House, after Mr. Speaker has ruled that it wasn't

part of the record, to now come in and repeat it, and to challenge the Chair of this Assembly, to challenge the Chair in this Assembly after he had made a decision. And I find that despicable that the Minister of Highways would speak against Mr. Speaker of the Assembly, even after a ruling had been brought down.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to the case in point . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have some order?

Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that the Minister of Highways has taken the low road in Mr. Speaker's absence to speak against a decision that he made earlier on today. Mr. Speaker, in his ruling, ruled that the member from Shaunavon said no such thing as he is being accused of, first by the Minister of Finance, and now the member from Wilkie. I find the low road that this member has chosen to travel is not new, because I say that a minister who fires 39 individuals who have worked very hard for this province, have built roads, have kept the roads in good repair, in fact built up the most excellent highway system in this province, are being paid off and paid off in a bad way by this minister who chooses to fire them out of hand, without a thank-you, without a goodbye - simply, 'You're fired' and given a slip and down the road.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all the people of the province know that this minister is not doing his job. The fact that his nickname has very quickly become 'Pot-hole Jim' throughout the province is an indication that this minister can be very pompous in this Assembly, can be very pompous and make accusations which are not accurate, but cannot defend his department in keeping the funding coming to it.

Mr. Chairman, the minister has talked about the employees - 139 - who have been fired in his department, and has bragged about the private sector and what a great job they're doing, but is not able to substantiate whether or not the cost of building a road in the private sector is cheaper than in the public sector. And I'll tell you why he can't do that. Because when he did the numbers on it, he found out a different story. I say to the people here and to the people of the province that he found that the good people who worked for the highway department were building roads and doing seal coat cheaper than what the private sector was doing.

So why then, Mr. Chairman, has he made this move to the private sector? Well, I say we will watch very closely to see who gets the contract and to see who these people are that this Minister of Highways is supporting in his attempt to gain re-election in the province of Saskatchewan, and he's doing this at the expense of many, many workers in the government and the crown corporations.

And he talks about the pioneers who built this province as if they were people who did not believe in co-operation and in crown corporations. But I'd like to tell the member that Saskatchewan developed one of the finest systems of co-operatives and crown corporations based on these very pioneers, who did not come here, as you seem to indicate, as self-made people who were very anxious to stomp on one another to get ahead, the way members on that side of the House appear to be. They were individuals who got together to develop co-ops and crown corporations. And you, Mr. Minister, are slurring them today and last Friday by firing and talking about individuals who work for the government as if they are a lesser class of people.

Mr. Minister, what I would like to know from you on a different area is the Red Coat Trail:

whether or not the recommendations of the sections of roads, their sections of roads that were being built down in that area, whether or not you accepted their recommendations or whether you are going against them - the recommendations that they gave to you of building certain sections of that road.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Okay, Mr. Chairman, two or three points. Well, Mr. Chairman, it's quite evident that the members opposite - the gang of eight, I guess, for a better word - they don't believe in the families of Saskatchewan; they don't believe in these real people. They believe in their own little crown; their own little family; their own little bureaucracy. That's what they believe in. I believe in the Morskys of the world, 'cause those are real families, real people that I can shake hands with and deal with and look in the eye - to look in the eye with them could never work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it comes right back down to, he said the people don't believe in this. Well, where was he on April 26th, 1982? Where was he on February 21st, 1983, when the people from Prince Albert spoke? I mean, I think that points out, Mr. Chairman, as to who's really running the government. I mean, that's basically it.

Regarding the Red Coat Trail, I met with their executive I believe two, three, maybe four times as I meet with all the people in Saskatchewan. The people from Kamsack were in to see me as to their priorities of the road, because the member from there never gave me his priorities, and now the people have to do the job.

The main section that the Red Coat Trail - their number one priority was from Govenlock to the Alberta border and that, and having it being oil treatment. This was their highest priority. It's being done.

An Hon. Member: — What's the second priority?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Second priority was paving, Redvers to the Manitoba border. I'm glad you asked - the worst section in Saskatchewan, neglected by the NDP, being done by this government listening to the people from the Red Coat Trail Association. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what more anyone can ask. We're an open government, putting the roads where the people of Saskatchewan want them.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I want to come back to the minister's comments and his slanderous attack against the crown corporations of this province. and he has put it on the record that he is against the crown corporations. And I'm going to answer that allegation. I agree that the minister and his colleagues are against crown corporations, because all that one has to do is to look at the record of the crown corporations that were making millions of dollars for the people of Saskatchewan, and suddenly take a look at Sedco - \$9 million in the red. Take a look at the potash corporation - in the red, in the hole, didn't make a cent, if they haven't cooked the books. And I want to say that every crown corporation has been run down by this government in their holy allegiance to the private enterprise.

And I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan will ask you boys across there to account for your misdeeds to the people of this province. You know, the member says 'the family of crown corporations,' and we weren't concerned with the families of the province. Do you know what he has done here in one sweep: 139 employees, 139 families affected. Multiply it by four; it affects 560 people that he turned loose and took a livelihood from. You know what he says in answer for their potential of getting jobs is to go to the road builders; they're looking for 100 people.

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that you had no activity in the Department of Highways last year. The established contractors in this province couldn't even employ their own crews. And if you look at the record of the capital expenditures and budgets here, which we will be coming to, I want to say that the reason that you had to go into maintenance is that you're cutting back so drastically on the construction of new highways. And there was no room to provide sufficient work for the private contractors who were constructing most of the highways.

I want to ask the minister where this four-man employment team is located? I want to know where this four-man employment team is located. And I'd like to know who's on it.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very happy to tell the member opposite that we have a four-man employment team. We'll have the names here for you in a minute. They are located at Humford House; you'll have the names here in a minute. Be patient.

Mr. Chairman, okay, here we are: George Cossette, Ian Louttit, Gordon May and Orest Chuey. Those are the four members located at Humford House. But just a little additional information for the member opposite; we'll read you a little bit of this letter from the Saskatchewan road builders, dated February the 24th, 1983 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Chairman, they asked about employment, so I'm going to give them the information. I won't read the whole letter at this time, but I can read them the whole letter later on. A couple of paragraphs:

A substantial shift from the private to the public sector would require that contractors in the province employ an additional 100 or more equipment operators, labourers, flagpersons, etc., experienced in these types of work. To assist our contractor members in locating experienced employees, our association would be prepared to make its office available to provide lists of names with occupational experience to our members of people who may be displaced from the public sector. This is a service we now provide our members, with respect to students graduating from technical schools in the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that points out there is a commitment - a commitment from the Saskatchewan road builders association that they need 100 or more experienced, and I emphasize the word 'experienced', employees to help them construct this work that has been now shifted to the private sector.

The members opposite are trying to say that I'm condemning these men that we have laid off, that are going to change bosses. That's not true. It's another falsehood. But I'm not surprised, Mr. Chairman, because I have heard falsehoods, many misleading statements, coming from the members opposite for the past four or five years. It's no surprise to me; it's no surprise to the general public out there. These are facts, black and white proof, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I'd like to ask the minister . . . Since he is reading the road builders' letter, apparently the gospel to him, I would like to ask the minister: did you in fact, as the minister, commission a study to determine the impact of firing 139 people and the likelihood of them being rehired during the course of the summer? Have you commissioned a study of your own, rather than taking the words of the road builders, which I am not doubting, but I'm asking you as minister? You made a definite policy of

firing 139 people, destroying their livelihood, and I'm asking you, did you commission a study to determine the impact of such action?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, no, we didn't do a study, and then another study and another study. I sat down with the deputy minister and his very competent officials. We looked at the whole program, the entire program - costs for tendering, costs for having done in the public sector. I believe very firmly, Mr. Chairman, there will be not only a cost saving to the people of Saskatchewan but, number two, they're going to end up with better roads.

Mr. Koskie: — You have assured us, one, that there is going to be a cost saving. I think we're entitled to know the details of the cost savings.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, we will have to do an estimate of a certain section of road. We can do that and provide that information to the members opposite later on. We can't do it here tonight.

Mr. Koskie: — You haven't in fact done it; you're going to do it. That's what you're saying. Therefore, you cannot stand up in this House and indicate that there's going to be a cost saving, because in your initial statement you said you were impossible to make a cost comparison. You indicated that you could know how much it would cost per kilometre by the private sector, but because of indirect costs, you are unable to calculate from the public sector. You are reversing your answer, and I think it's understandable, and I think the people of Saskatchewan will certainly take at faith that you did no calculations - that all you did was to make a decision that you were going to turn it over to the private sector, and automatically the crews for the Department of Highways had to be released, and you fired them without even any consideration for their future, their family, or their livelihood. That, Mr. Minister, is the truth in a capsule form, from all of the answers that you have given.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, they were not fired; they were laid off. I am not going back on any previous statement I made, and I will try once again. I will try once again - and I think maybe my little five-year-old daughter might be able to explain it to the member. She would understand it, but the members opposite . . . It's a little difficult, so I'll be patient, Mr. Chairman; we'll try once again.

We won't use too large a number for them, we'll just use two miles - two miles. We'll take two miles of road that has to be sealed, say, Yorkton, Saskatchewan. The sealing crew is in Swift Current. The contractor that is building the grades is right on the job. His distributor is there; his chip sealer is there - and I hope I don't have to explain all of this technology to members opposite; we'll be here for a week, Mr. Chairman - anyways, the contractor can take the equipment, put the seal coat right on the road. He's right in camp; he's on the site - instead of a crew coming all the way from Swift Current, Saskatchewan, driving to Yorkton. I mean, there's a saving right there, Mr. Chairman. Now I mean, there's two miles of road; there could be 100 miles of road. I think I've pointed out beyond a shadow of a doubt, Mr. Chairman, that it is going to save the people of Saskatchewan tax dollars.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the member is talking about if you're building some road in the Yorkton area and you have to move a crew from Swift Current to do the work. Well, you will have to do that now, because you just fired the crew in Yorkton. But what I would like to know is how you can imagine that a private sector firm can move

their crew cheaper to the road site to do the building than can the Department of Highways. You make it sound like the Department of Highways would have to move there with their equipment, but the private contractor doesn't have to. There's a leap in logic there that I don't quite understand - how it costs more for the Highway department to move to the site than it does for the private sector. And can you just explain that to me?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Okay, Mr. Chairman, we'll try one more time. Every road builder - the majority of the road builders in the province of Saskatchewan - have what we call a distributor truck. Now that is used, and was used previously under the NDP philosophy, to put a flush coat of oil on, put a flush coat on. But that same distributor truck can be used to put the sealing coat on, so that the truck is there, the man is there, and they're in place, right on the job. Now, that's one example. I could give you many more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Are you saying, Mr. Minister, that the private sector has an inside track on these type of trucks, or why can't you buy one of them, instead of firing the people? Why don't you buy one of them there fancy trucks, like the private sector has, rather than fire all the people?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, we don't have to buy any of these distributor trucks. We have, according to the deputy minister tells me, we have over 100 already. Mr. Chairman, how can I explain it to the members opposite? I mean, the road builders take a distributor truck, they put on a flush coat; they were not allowed to put on the seal coat because it was not the NDP philosophy. They wanted to move crews from all over the province. We're simply enabling the Saskatchewan road builders, the contractors, private enterprise - I know it's a dirty word for the member's opposite; it doesn't happen to be for this government.

We talk about tendering, Mr. Chairman. Tenders are opened in public - lowest tender taken. I mean, democracy, there it is, Mr. Chairman. the members opposite, it's quite evident, don't know anything about building roads in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, the minister just explained to me twice, earlier on, that if he needed one of these trucks, he would have to move it from Swift Current to Yorkton. Now he says he has 100 of them. Where are these 100 trucks that you would have to move one from Swift Current to Yorkton? Why don't you leave one of the 100 at Yorkton? And then you wouldn't have to move it from Swift Current. It seems to me that you're creating some sort of a smoke-screen, when in fact what you've done is fired 139 people who have families. And you're now trying to explain it by some sort of nonsense about moving trucks from hither and yon, when in fact what you're doing is shifting responsibility from the public sector to the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, the minister talks about profits and the abhorrence that this group of people in the opposition has for profits. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Minister, that we appreciate profits as much as anyone else. But, Mr. Chairman, if this government is saying that they are going to put profits ahead of the needs of families in this province, if he's saying that the profits of the private sector construction companies go ahead of the 139 that he has just fired, then I say those profits are immoral. And I want to ask you one more time, Mr. Minister, why is it that these 100 trucks, these sealcoat trucks, cannot be used throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, these 100 or more trucks are with the

maintenance crews, not the sealing crews. Now, there is a difference between maintenance crews and sealing crews; that's what I'm trying to explain to the members opposite. Now, if I pulled the distributor trucks away from the maintenance employees, the members opposite would be the first ones to condemn it for not getting their maintenance work done on the road.

Now, you can't have it both ways. You can't have one truck doing two jobs at the same time. We have these distributor trucks right now, work for maintenance, that fix up the pot-holes in the road, that I inherited, that I inherited and that . . . The distributor trucks that we're talking about are the ones that are with the sealing crews that have now gone to the private sector, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister again: then is it a problem of not having enough seal coat trucks in the Department of Highways? The 100 aren't enough to do both jobs; is that what you're saying, in that you need more trucks?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — No, Mr. Chairman, we don't need more trucks because it's being turned over to the private sector. We're not like the members opposite. If you need a truck to drive from here to Saskatoon, you don't go out and buy one.

We're trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, the distributor trucks that are in service today are on the maintenance operation, not on the sealing operation any more.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to indicate to the hon. minister, that the . . . In Yorkton, the unemployment rate there was the second highest in Saskatchewan. Number two, it was. And by you laying off the crews, I think that what you will be able to achieve for the Minister of Labour is to probably make him number one in unemployment. And I want to say, I want to say that the group of individuals that you have fired . . . I want to know exactly what role this four-man employment team is endeavouring to perform.

An Hon. Member: — He told you.

Mr. Koskie: — No, he didn't.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, the employment team will be: number one, informing them of their union rights, which are their bumping privileges, and their seniority from within the department and within government.

Mr. Koskie: — And is that the full extent of this committee? Is that the actual full extent of the performance of this committee?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, of the 139 employees, 104 have responded; 88 have elected to bump; 9 choose to resign; 7 choose to remain on the re-employment list. Now, Mr. Chairman, here we have the members opposite complaining on one hand about laying off some employees. Now, if we didn't have anyone in there to assist these employees, they'd be hollering at us again.

Now, we hear them stating, 'What are they doing? Is that all they're doing?' What they're doing, Mr. Chairman, is trying to assist the employees that were laid off. I think it points out who has compassion for people. It's this side of the House, not them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I want to say that the further the minister answers, the worse his

answers become. And I think that the truth of this matter is as one of the members commented: that they have been fired and now they're going to be out and do some real work, because I think it's the contention of the members opposite that all of these people that they have fired were not performing the task up to the level that they wanted. And I want to categorically defend all of the members of the crews of the Department of Highways, and indicate to you, Mr. Minister, that their performance was good; it was excellent and they did good quality work. And I want to say that the quality of the highways in this province were second to none, and many of them were built, in fact, constructed by highway crews, maintained by highway crews. And I want to say what has happened here is just your blind allegiance and commitment to the private sector at the cost of families in this province.

And I want to say that compassion - compassion towards people - is not even a word that's known to the government opposite, because it has happened throughout crown corporation after crown corporation. Employees at SGI, highway crews have been cut. Sask Tel, Sask Power. And what it is here is a direct policy of the members opposite that they are going to sell out to the privates regardless of the cost, and that's what you have said tonight.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I'll try and re-emphasize the point once more. I had no problems, no disagreement, no dissatisfaction with the jobs that these employees were doing, nor the maintenance employees that we have in the province of Saskatchewan. They are a very excellent group of people.

The members opposite keep stating: why did we fire them? We didn't fire them; we laid them off. And once again, I'm going to try and tell the gang of eight, they now don't have to work for the Department of Highways any more; they can now go and work for the private sector - their choice. We have the four-man employment team at Humford House that is willing to help them out and co-operate in working on a personal basis with them. We have the commitment from the Saskatchewan road builders association of needing 100 or more employees.

Mr. Chairman, it's a joke when the members opposite get up and start talking about defending individuals' rights. That's why they're sitting over there and we're here.

Mr. Koskie: — All right, Mr. Minister. You clearly indicated here, Mr. Minister, that they weren't fired; they were laid off. I want to ask you: is it the policy of this government to re-institute these crews to perform that work in the Department of Highways? Are you going to be re-instituting them?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, to give a very simple short answer - and it may shoot over their heads, but we'll try it - no.

Mr. Koskie: — All right. If an individual which had a job to perform and if, in fact, you discontinue the work which he was doing in the past, what conceivable right have you to say that he was laid off, and not fired, if there's no job to come back, and you don't intend to create the job? How can you stand up here with a straight face and indicate to 560 people approximately that are affected, or 139 people that have been fired . . . how can you stand up here and say they're laid off, when there is no prospect in the future of them retaining or getting back their jobs, because the function, and the jobs they were doing, you indicated that you will not, in fact, be carrying out in the future? Answer that.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of confidence in not only this government, the private sector, but the people of Saskatchewan. I'd like to share one little point with the members opposite.

Saskatchewan's employment rate (this is April 11th, Mr. Chairman) dropped two-tenths of a per cent last month while the national rate rose one-tenth of a per cent. Saskatchewan's 7.4 per cent is the lowest in the nation. The Regina rate is 8.5 per cent, down from 8.9 per cent. Saskatoon is 11.1 per cent, down from 13.5 per cent. Nationally, the unemployment rate was 12.6.

Now, Mr. Speaker, two very important figures there. Nationally, the unemployment rate was 12.6. In the province of Saskatchewan it was 7.4. Mr. Chairman, this points out that the policies and the directions of the Devine administration are working in this province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the dismal performance of the minister here today, I suspected that it's necessary that he be given some support from his members who are clapping, because I know deep in their heart they are, in fact, ashamed of the performance of this minister. I want to say here that this minister stands up in this House and starts talking about Saskatchewan having the lowest unemployment. I want to say that when he took office in this province, unemployment was the lowest in Canada - around 5 per cent, 4 or 5 per cent - 4.5 per cent when you took office. Unemployment has risen faster percentage-wise in this province under your administration than anywhere else in the same given period of time.

And I want to say, and I also want to add, Mr. Minister, that the record of abuse to citizens of this province is unequalled by any government in the history of this province, other than going back to 1929 or 30 with the last Conservative government 50 years ago.

Other than that, I want to say that one of the basic policies was to design programs, and to provide employment to the people of this province. The efforts of this government has been directly opposite to that direction. In fact, they have been cutting people from jobs which they have been trained for, careers which they have developed over many years, and I want to say that we want the list of those names of individuals, because I can see that this here four-man employment committee for these poor people that have been fired is going to do absolutely nothing. And we want that list, Mr. Minister, because we want to be able to help those people find jobs and employment, because you have fired them and thrown them off, perhaps onto the welfare rolls. Your record in employment: there were 7,000 unemployed employables a year ago. That rose to 14,000 under your administration. The welfare roll in 1981-82 was 91 million, in 1982-83 . . . 1980-81, 1982-83, it rose to 141, and this year you're budgeting for welfare \$171 million. Your answer to employment is to place them on welfare and to cut them out of meaningful jobs that they have been performing for the people of this province. And I think that you should be ashamed of yourself, that without even doing an analysis, without doing a study, that you have cast adrift 139 citizens of this province. And I want to say, Mr. Minister, you'll rue the day for that ruthless, uncompassionate effort that you have done here in firing 139 employees. And you should be ashamed of yourself.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out to the member opposite, we have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. We have kept it at that. Because after April 26th, when that change in philosophy took place, the people, the real families that the socialists chased out of Saskatchewan, have come back home. And since January 1 of this year, we've employed 10,000 more people in this province. Mr. Chairman, that points out where people are coming to, where the lowest unemployment rate is in Canada, is here in the province of Saskatchewan. And thank you to the people of Saskatchewan for the change in administration.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I find it interesting, this great job the government is doing in raising the unemployment rate from 4.5 to 7.4 per cent. And government is saying what a great job they're doing. The fact that there are now 60,000 people on welfare in the province . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . 60,000 people now on welfare is equal in relative terms to the number of farmers, each farmer in Saskatchewan. There's 67,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan. We now have approximately one person on welfare for every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, and for that the minister applauds himself and says what a great job he's doing.

But the point that I want to make here is that this minister is assisting in that problem by firing 139 heads of families in the province of Saskatchewan. And he says that there's no problem, that these people are now free to go look for work. Well, I'll tell you, what the people of the province should do is make that minister go look for work, and find out how tough it is to find a job under the conditions that this government has created. Because finding jobs in Yorkton for those eight or 10 families is not going to be an easy task. And the member for Yorkton can say that it's because of the machinery slow-down and I agree. To an extent that's part of the problem, but the minister is adding to that by putting four families out of work, or eight families out of work in that city, and saying that there's no problem, they can go look for work in the private sector. Well, we want a list of those names because we want to do a report card on you, Mr. Minister, six months later, to find out how many of those 139 families were able to benefit from your great freedom program. I want assurances from you now, that you will supply the names and positions of those 139 people before we get off your estimates here.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I had given that assurance earlier in the evening. I give it again now. That information will be supplied for the members opposite. I will just point out once more that he is not happy with the four-man employment team. They have talked to 104 people have responded . . .

An Hon. Member: — Talking doesn't help.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Eighty-eight . . . Well, the member opposite, Mr. Chairman, says the talking doesn't help. No, I guess under the NDP system, the NDP philosophy, talking didn't help; talking didn't work. We believe that in order to provide good government to people you have to talk to them; you have to communicate with them. That's what we're doing. That's why we have a four-man employment team. That's why the Saskatchewan road-building industry wants to find them jobs. The opportunities are there. On top of the 104, Mr. Chairman, 88 have elected to bump; 9 have chosen to resign of their own free will - no one is forcing them; 7 of them have choose to go on the re-employment list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest deal of confidence in that re-employment team over at Humford House. I also, without a doubt, Mr. Chairman, know that the opportunities are here for anyone in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I find it hard to believe that the employment team is going to have much choice or advantage in finding employment for the eight families in Yorkton. And I don't say that against the four individuals that you named who are on that committee, but you are giving them an impossible task, Mr. Minister, and you're attempting to put the blame on someone else, the same as other ministers have done in this House, for the fact that you are putting people out of work, you are taking the paycheques away from a great number of families.

You, Mr. Minister, are not interested in the families of Saskatchewan the way you attempt to pretend you are here in this Assembly. And what I want to know is, of these people who are being fired, how many of them are going to be using their bumping rights, by the numbers that you have there?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, if the member opposite would have been listening, I have stated 88 have elected to use their bumping rights.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, the 88 people who bump someone - what do you suppose, Mr. Minister, happens to the 88 people that they bump?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — They can, in turn, bump someone else.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, on the last day that the individual bumps someone, where do they go - the 88 who are bumping throughout the department? The way you have planned this great scheme of allowing people to now go cut-throat through the department and bump individuals and other families, how do you think the people who are eligible to be bumped, that you have given this freedom to, how do you think those people will feel over the next few months until this thing is sorted out?

It's not only the 139 who are affected here; it's all the new employees who have the possibility of being bumped and put out of employment will not sleep well until you get this thing straightened out, Mr. Minister. And I say you have opened up a can of worms here that you are going to have to bear the responsibility for, because you can't blame that on your officials. This is your decision, and you are going to have to bear the brunt.

Can you tell me how many people will be affected indirectly by this bumping procedure that will go on throughout the department as a result of this ill-conceived and mad plan that you have? It's almost as if you have a vendetta against the people of the province to see whether you can make them suffer or not, the way you go about doing things.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I'm going to repeat that one little very important paragraph in the letter from the road builders of Saskatchewan, just to clarify it for members opposite. I know it's a new direction that's different than what they used to do. I do accept full responsibility. I will not pass the buck; I will not run away from it. I guarantee you that.

Now one paragraph, Mr. Chairman:

A substantial shift from the public to the private sector would require that contractors in the province employ an additional 100 or more equipment operators, labourers, flagpersons, etc. (now here's a very important part, Mr. Chairman) experienced in these types of work.

Now who do you think those contractors are going to go to, looking for men to run, whether it's their road graders, their compaction units or their scrapers? They're not going to go out there and take a schoolteacher without any expertise. They're going to go to these individuals that have the expertise, have the experience and have the knowledge, to offer them a job. The jobs are there. We've pointed it out. Lowest unemployment rate in Canada - 10,000 additional jobs since January 1. This government is working and the policies of this government is working and that's why the gang of eight is over there.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, there is absolutely no way that you can smoke-screen the issue. When you delineate 139 positions, when you indicate that in fact they will not be reinstituted, when you have delineated 139 positions - that's what you've done - when you have done away with them, there is absolutely no other word for it, other than that they had been fired. Now you go on to say that they have bumping rights. The inevitable result, Mr. Minister, is that if you have eliminated 139 positions, 88 you indicate are going to take bumping rights, but automatically what happens unless there's more positions created, that 88 on the bottom of the pole are going to be cast out. So not only have you sent notifications to 139 people, but what you have done, is in fact to all of the employees, you have said, 'You have no job security until all of this bumping rights are put into place.' And 88 people somewhere down the line are going to lose their jobs and there's no way of denying it.

And I want also to say, Mr. Minister, that my information is that in the various districts the initial position by the Minister of Highways was that some time in July . . . that these people would be employed until July, that was the initial information that was passed to these employees, and then recently without consultation, without any discussion, what happened is that registered letters were sent out saying, 'You are fired.' Is that not in fact the system that was followed by your department?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, these positions were abolished. If these employees would have been fired, they wouldn't have any bumping rights. So let's get some clarification here for the members opposite. These positions have been abolished. No one has been fired in these positions. If they would have been fired, there wouldn't have been any bumping rights. We wouldn't have 88 people bumping in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Koskie: — Just a moment, Mr. Minister. If 88 have bumping rights, they have to bump somebody out. Who gets bumped? You have decreased the number of positions and you're saying you're maintaining the same number of staff. That can't possibly, can't possibly exist because you have eliminated a number of jobs, 139 jobs you have eliminated. And if 88 go forward and bump, there are going to be 88 people on the street looking for jobs. And what is worse is that it is going to continue throughout the year and all of these people in the various positions who are susceptible to bumping rights, they too and their families are affected. And what you have done is totally, totally put into motion the most vicious insecurity package that any minister has come forward with in this province. And don't try to indicate that there won't be people losing their jobs because of bumping rights. There has to be jobs lost and as a consequence, you know it and I know it, that people are losing their jobs. Isn't that a fact?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, I'll try and explain it to the members opposite once more. The employment team is corresponding with 104 individuals: 139

positions in essence. The key to this whole discussion is about three points, Mr. Chairman.

Number one - the Saskatchewan road-building industry has stated that they need 100 or more employees for the road program in 1983. Number two - which is very important - we have created 10,000 new jobs since January 1 of this year and there's more to come. People are building homes. Mr. Chairman, the members opposite are trying to make a mockery of those employees. They will be transferring their bosses, that's all they're trying to do; instead of working for the Department of Highways and Transportation, they now have the opportunity to work for the private sector.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you continue to talk about the bumping rights of these 139 people or 88 people. As my colleagues have mentioned, when they bump somebody that means that someone else is going to be out there looking for a job. So it doesn't matter how often they bump, you're still going to have 139 people out of work, simply because you do not have the work for them. You have cut back on the amount of work that you are going to be doing in Department of Highways. So those people are definitely laid off permanently, and they will not have the jobs. Well, I think you mentioned that they will somehow be able to find jobs with the private contractors. Well, Mr. Minister, how can you guarantee that these private contractors in the province of Saskatchewan are going to hire 100 or more than 100 people in this province when the work begins?

Number one - there is no guarantee that the contractors that are going to be doing some of this work are going to be necessarily from the province of Saskatchewan, unless you are operating a closed province at this time. If you get a contractor that's from close to the border in Alberta that might be doing some work along that side, or one from Alberta - Manitoba or Alberta, either side of Saskatchewan - these people have their own regular heavy equipment operators. They will be bringing in their own operators with their equipment. They will not be hiring the people from Department of Highways that have been laid off by you - laid off permanently, I might add.

How can you say that these people are going to find that work with the private contractors? Do you have some method of letting out contracts that's going to specify that certain contractors in the province are going to get the work? Or how are you going to tender out some of this work?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we'll try once more. A letter dated February the 24th, 1983:

Such a shift of work from the public to the private sector would require contractors to engage additional staff over that which would normally be required. It is anticipated that contractors would prefer to hire employees experienced in this type of work. The most likely source of these employees would be those displaced from the public sector by reduction of work undertaken by the department crews. A substantial shift from the public to the private sector would require that contractors in the province employ an additional 100 or more equipment operators, labourers, flag-persons, etc., experienced in these types of work.

To assist our contractor members in locating experienced employees, our association would be prepared to make its office available to provide lists of names with occupational experience to our members of people who may be

displaced from the public sector. This is a service we now provide our members, with respect to students graduating from technical schools in the province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can continue this debate all night, all next day, all next week, and the bottom line is, Mr. Chairman, that the private sector is looking for more than 100 employees for the road program in 1983 in the province of Saskatchewan. The members opposite can play smoke and mirrors all they want - all they want. Talk about bumping and everything else.

The individuals whose positions have been abolished - not fired, Mr. Chairman - have two or three options. They can bump; they can work for the private sector; they can go and work for someone else - their opportunity. The employment opportunities are here in this case, outside of the fact that since January 1 we have created 10,000 additional employees, employment positions in the province of Saskatchewan, and there will be more to come.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you have stated that the private sector assures you . . . somehow the private contractors are assuring you that they are going to be hiring a good number of these people, with a substantial shift from the government or the public sector to the private sector.

Mr. Minister, one thing I can say is that I think the private sector is being overly optimistic in the amount of work that they're going to have, because if you look at the estimates, you are going to find that there is a substantial decrease in the amount of work that's going to be out there this year. So the private sector is hoping that there is going to be work, and if they had the same amount of work that was provided in the past, then possibly they would be able to hire some of these people.

But when you look at what's estimated in road-work from 1981 to '82, which was 488 kilometres of grading, in 1983-84 you're down to 320 - 320. The private contractors are not going to have that work. So they won't be hiring that 100 people or more. That, Mr. Minister, is what's going to be happening. The 139 people that you laid off in highways, along with the large number of people that have been laid off from other departments, are going to be out there competing for a few jobs. And very few, I might add, because that work is not there.

So, we're going to have another 139 people on unemployment and on welfare eventually, because they won't be able to find jobs. They're going to be competing with students coming out of university shortly. And, as I mentioned before, and you didn't answer, how can you guarantee the private contractors of this province that they are going to be able to get every tender that's let out there, and that some other contractor from another province won't underbid them, and bring in his own crew? That, Mr. Speaker, is another question that's there, and you haven't been answering.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, they're talking about . . . The members opposite are concerned that the private sector is not going to be employing these people. They are going to be doing in the neighbourhood, in the area, of \$4 million work of work. Now, they're not going to hire robots to do this. They need real people, real families to do this job.

Mr. Chairman, the member opposite was stating about the road program as a comparison to when they were government. Well, it's quite obvious it's different. And

you know how it's different, Mr. Chairman? Because this road program that I announced in the Assembly in my budget address, the roads that are going to be built in the province of Saskatchewan - going to be constructed this year, not, as when the NDP were in power, where seven out of every 10 roads that they announced, there was not funding for it.

On top of that, they announced 28 projects. The previous minister announced 28 projects. And these, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, were nothing more than political election-bait promises. There was no funding there for them. What the people of Saskatchewan got in the budget address from this government, was the truth. Real dollars for real roads that are going to be constructed by real people and no more misleading the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, the figures that I was quoting you were figures of works to be done in a given year. It did not include the carry-over. It did not include any carry-over from the figures that I was giving you. I was giving you figures of actual work in a given year.

The work that we had done in 1981-82 was 488 kilometres. That was within that one year. You have estimated for 1983-84, 320 kilometres, to be done without that year, leaving out the carry-over that you have on your project array. That is the decrease, Mr. Minister. And that is why I am saying that these 139 people are not going to have a job, because the private contractors are not going to have the work that they expect, either.

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Chairman, the member is quite welcome to come up to my office. I have kept the project array from the previous minister. We're going to frame it and keep it in my office, because it did point out that the seven out of the 10 roads, there was no funding there. There were roads on there that were marked '0 per cent completion.' I mean, they announced it one year; they didn't build it that year. They announced it the next year and maybe started a little bit. And the following year, they announced it again.

So, in essence, the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, were promised a road three years before they finally got it, Mr. Chairman.

The difference is, the road program that I announced in this Assembly in my budget reply were roads that there is real dollars, and roads that are going to be built this year. Mr. Chairman, I see it's near 10 o'clock. I'd better, as Acting House Leader, call it 10 o'clock.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:04 p.m.