

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 22, 1983**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Garner:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the other members of the Assembly, 11 grade 12 students from the town of Luseland, their teacher and chaperon, Bernie Etcheverry. I would like all members of this Assembly to join with me in welcoming them on their long journey to Regina here today. I have to apologize to you. I will not be able to meet you for pictures and refreshments afterwards, but my friend and colleague, the Minister of Finance from Kindersley, will be trying to take my place. He will do his best, but when you can't have number one you can take number two, so thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I wish everyone would give them a warm welcome to this Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Katzman:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have the Assembly members welcome 45 students from Waldheim High School. They are in the Speaker's gallery. They're here with us today. They come regular, their school, and we welcome them all. Have a good trip home. And I'll meet with them later.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Executive Council Names and Salaries**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. This concerns the proceedings in this House back on March 8th or 9th on the consideration of the Executive Council estimates, that at that time, Mr. Premier, you were unable to provide me with some pretty elementary information about your agency, including who worked for you and how much they were paid, and what their duties were. And you undertook to provide me with extensive information. It is now six weeks later. I have not received it. And I ask you when I may expect to receive the information you undertook to give me on March 8th and 9th.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker the information will be coming forth in due course. When we've put it all together we'll be providing the hon. member with it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Premier, do I understand that it takes you six weeks to find out what the salary of some of your senior officials is?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — We are putting together, as I mentioned at that time, the complete package of everybody that's been involved during a period of transition. People were coming in, people were going out, some were in for shorter periods, some were in for longer, and we're documenting all that, and it'll be provided.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — One further supplementary, Mr. Premier. Do you think that six weeks is a reasonable time to prepare information on who has worked for your agency in the last year, or do you think it's an unreasonably long time?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — I believe it's been a standard tradition, Mr. Speaker, in this House, that when they ask for information the government would take the time to put it together so it is in a complete package and that it is accurate. And I believe members opposite, when they were in government, took a fair amount of time - sometimes it was even over a year - to provide information that had been requested. So the time that has elapsed since my estimates is relatively short.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Further supplementary. Will the Premier concede that in the Executive Council estimates, when similar information was asked for during the year in which you were quoting, the information was back within 15 hours?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if we went back and looked at the information that was asked for after the former government won an election in '71, I imagine it took some time to provide that kind of information. After you've been in power for three years or five years or 10 years, probably in our case, for 25 years . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — . . . we will be able to provide the information much more quickly. This is a year of transition. You don't go through a year of transition every year. We just won the election, so it takes a little bit of time to put that together and provide it. After we've had experience for a year - in another year and so forth - it's that much easier.

### **Legislation in House**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Government House Leader. In light of the statements made by the Premier in terms of getting information out of this government, I would just like to say that some information does come much quicker.

My question to the House Leader is: today is day 25 of the session and to date we have seen no substantive amount of legislation - none of the legislation which was talked about in the throne speech, none of the legislation which has been talked about in the press, concerning The Trade Union Act, The Labour Standards Act, Workers' Compensation Act, The Highways Act, Vehicle Act, co-op act, amendments to The Liquor Act - none of that is before the House.

This being day 25, I'm wondering when you will get around to having the ministers get the legislation in the House, so the people of the province know whether or not you are serious about it, and to give as well the opportunity to the opposition to prepare themselves to review the legislation, so that we're not forcing it through the House in the last week of the session.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I was afraid the member was going to ask that question so in anticipation of the question, I filed notice for several pieces of legislation today.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. I know in asking

the House Leader or the Acting House Leader the other day, we had a similar answer and what we got were more reorganizing bills on the order paper that day. I'm wondering if you can assure us that the bills mentioned, affecting the various acts, will be introduced in the House today.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The notice that was filed today, Mr. Speaker, will show up on the blues on Monday and I'm sure that the member, in his wisdom, will be able to make his own determination at that time. And in answer to the second part of your first question - when will the information be provided as asked for by the opposition? - I would say probably quicker than the exercise we witnessed a couple of years ago when on the last day of the session, a very long and lengthy session, three or four cabinet ministers came in with armfuls of returns - they had to have a wheelbarrow to get it down to the door of the Chamber, I'm sure - and sat it on that table, I think near the end of the session.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. I would ask the minister again if he will give a guarantee that the amendments to the acts mentioned will be introduced today or given notice of today. Of course they can't be introduced today because it takes 48 hours in the process and he will well know that.

As to his comment about information from a previous government, getting it on the last day when you're asking for motions for returns I suppose is somewhat better than the action of this government who doesn't give any information at all.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I'm sure that when you get the information you will wish you hadn't asked for it because it's going to be very, very positive in nature and very, very complimentary of the new administration . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And we will. We will. Mr. Speaker, it's not our intention to in any way hide it or delay it. We just want to have it packaged very neatly for the hon. members opposite, and as soon as the package is ready, it will be forthcoming.

As it relates to the guarantee as to what may or may not be on the blues come Monday, I would urge the hon. member to read the blues come Monday.

### **Custom Combiners and U.S. Immigration**

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. The Premier will be aware that United States Department of Immigration has effectively closed the door to custom combiners and their crews. And as you should know, that will affect about 700 Canadians, most of them young Saskatchewan farmers. My question is: what representation have you made, or your government made, to the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa to convince the Canadian government to officially protest this unfriendly act on the part of the Reagan administration?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that combines are backed up to some degree in the province of Manitoba because of actions by certain people in the province of Manitoba that have upset many Americans. And, Mr. Speaker, when there are certain debates going on in the legislature in neighbouring states about the performance of certain activities in the province of Manitoba, it does tend probably to have some impact on their decision whether they're going to invite certain people from Manitoba down into the United States. In our province, the minister has been dealing with it directly, and very successfully, in terms of dealing with it in Ottawa and dealing with it in terms of Washington, and we have a higher success rate than I think

you will find in the province of Manitoba.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the Premier. He didn't answer the first question. My question was: the U.S. Department of Immigration is effectively closing the U.S.-Canada border in the first major battle since the Second World War over who will harvest North American grain - 700 workers, and I suggest most of those are Saskatchewan combiners. Most of them . . . I'd say 80 per cent of them are young farmers from Saskatchewan. This press release says nothing about Canada-U.S. relations. It says the U.S., and they named the states, are closing the border to Canadian customers because of their cut-back in seeded acreage. Are you taking this information to Ottawa and asking the Department of External Affairs to have the Americans reconsider this action? It doesn't say anything about Manitoba. Those are Saskatchewan combiners.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, maybe I have to be a little bit more specific. When cabinet members . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — NDP.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — . . . NDP cabinet members in the province of Manitoba are involved in burning the American flag, it makes Americans upset. I've talked to American politicians in the province of Saskatchewan recently. I've talked to Manitoba farmers and council men in the riding of Estevan recently - terribly, terribly upset about that incident. So it wouldn't surprise me, or anybody else across this country, if Americans are having some second thoughts about inviting Manitoba farmers into the United States to custom combine or, frankly, anything else.

In our province, we are working very hard to have very positive relationships, in a relationship with our neighbours, the Governor of North Dakota who has been invited to speak on the floor of the legislature next month. I was the first Premier in the history of Saskatchewan to speak in the legislature in North Dakota. We're doing . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — So what I would suggest is that you write and you talk to your colleagues in Manitoba if you want better relationships between Canada and the United States.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. Let me say the question one more time. Several combiners have called me already. One young fellow had one combine down in the States. Last year he traded it in on two new combines. He spent \$250,000 to prepare to go combining in United States next week. He can't go to United States because they've effectively closed the border in Saskatchewan. They are not allowing Saskatchewan combiners into North Dakota.

If you have this good of relationship with North Dakota, and if you're saying it's the Manitoba combiners that are excluded, will you make representation that the Saskatchewan combiners can go through North Dakota and go down to the States to start combining - next week? It's now that they want to go. And they've effectively been

closed. Yes, the Canadian director of U.S. immigration, Gerald Coyle, says, 'It is not a total surprise because we've held back American combiners in the past. U.S. combine operators were exempt,' he said, 'and they don't have to have any application to come to Saskatchewan.' Are you either going to take reciprocal action, or are you going to ask that our boys can go down there combining? This . . . 700 are affected. 700 Saskatchewan farmers.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, this government is very much aware of the value of the United States to our livelihood. Our biggest customer for potash is the United States. Our biggest customer for oil is the United States. A major customer for cattle is the United States. A major customer in terms of tourism is the United States. We are actively involved in dealing with Washington, in dealing with Ottawa. Representative Orlin Hanson from North Dakota is working on our behalf lobbying people in Ottawa and in Washington to make sure that the relationship between this province and the United States stays first-class and world-class.

What I want to remind the member, when we have so much at stake in trading with the United States, it's a little bit difficult for this side of the House to understand why they don't thinking burning the American flag is important. Even in terms of debating it here, you question whether it was relevant. Our biggest trader, our biggest neighbour, and will be for decades and years to come, and you question whether it's relevant.

I'll say it once more: if there's a problem, it's originating with your colleagues out of Manitoba and certainly not in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the premier. Mr. Premier, this article indicates that the American government has effectively closed the door to Canadian combiners because of cut-backs in seeded acreage and because of pressure from American combiners saying that they want to keep their combines busy. Are you planning to use your good influence and your friendship with the Governor of North Dakota, and with the Department of External Affairs, to allow these 700 people . . . or are you going to avoid the issue completely? You haven't answered and addressed the issue of combiners in your answers this morning yet. People are watching you. They want to know if their combiners are going to have a change to go combining. And if not, are you going to reciprocate by not allowing American combiners into Saskatchewan? That's the alternative.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, we have been, and the minister has been, actively involved in pursuing the issue in Washington, in Ottawa, on that issue. Our counterparts in the United States and North Dakota are actively working for us and combiners here in Ottawa and in Washington, as a result of what the minister's doing. And I can only reiterate again: their attitude about the Minister of Agriculture here, and the Deputy Premier here in Saskatchewan is head and shoulders over the same counterpart in Manitoba. And that's what's causing so much of the problem and the difficult relations, because the NDP like to burn the American flag, and we like to hold it up as being good neighbours.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — The Premier has alluded to actions you've taken with your American

counterparts, and with Ottawa. Can you suggest what you've done since this announcement has been made? Just name two or three things, or one thing - specific action that you've taken to give our young fellows a chance to combine down in the States. What action have you taken?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Specific actions. I will ask the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, who's dealing with it hourly on that issue. I'll ask him to respond in specifics, please.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a phone call from a constituent of mine who was having problems getting into, Mr. Speaker, United States through the Port of Antler, which is in Manitoba. And once it was realized that he was my constituent and from Saskatchewan, the problem seemed to be alleviated somewhat. But aside from that fact, Mr. Speaker, I immediately called Ottawa through my member of parliament's office, Alvin Hamilton, got in touch with the immigration people, explained the problem to them, and they, in turn, got in touch with Washington. We got in touch with Senator Mark Andrews' office in Washington, who's one of the senators from North Dakota, and he represented our cause in Washington. We got in touch with the office of the state representative, Orlin Hanson, representing district 3 in North Dakota. He is lobbying for us in Washington. And we also got in touch with the Department of Labour in Denver, Colorado, where the applications have to be made to get custom combiners. And this has been a long-standing procedure, by the way, Mr. Speaker - to make applications through the Department of Labour. It just happens that it wasn't enforced before because there was a great demand for custom combiners in the United States. Now, as a result of the deteriorating relationship between Canada and the United States, for reasons that have already been explained, the Department of Labour is, in my view at least, enforcing these things that weren't enforced before.

Those are some of the things that we've done yesterday and today, Mr. Speaker, and I think the situation will improve over the next day or so. I would urge members opposite to call their counterparts in Manitoba as I have done. I've got a message off to the opposition in Manitoba asking them to ask the Premier in Manitoba if he wouldn't make similar representations and perhaps find it in his heart to apologize for past actions.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### **Closure of Souris Valley Mine**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier, and this concerns the announced closure of the Souris Valley mine by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation; and it refers to the April 20th edition of the *Estevan Mercury* where the Premier is quoted as having advised a union representative representing the employees of the Souris Valley mine, and I quote:

We will do all we can to ensure that you and your fellow workers continue to hold your jobs and are able to live in the community that you wish to live in.

My question is: is that position still the position of the government?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Yes it is, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I'm going to be meeting with those individuals that are involved. There are several positions right in Sask Power as I understand it - I think the minister could comment on it in more detail - Sask Power itself. There are new positions and openings in Coronach, but to the extent

possible I'm going to be looking for all alternatives to keep those people and their families employed in or around the area of Estevan; and certainly, if there are any alternatives I'm going to be exploring them in detail.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, as a follow-up of my question to the Premier and his answer. My understanding, Mr. Minister, is that there are some 26 to 30 positions where employees will lose their jobs because of the closure of the Souris Valley mine. My understanding is that there are perhaps as many as 24 vacant positions at the Boundary Dam power station - positions which might well be filled by the persons who are being displaced at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Souris Valley mine. I am asking the minister whether or not the corporation has looked into the possibility of some of the miners being able to take some of the vacant positions at the power station, so that they would not be forced to move, and so that their families would not be uprooted. As you know, the mine has been operated for many years by the corporation, and as a result thereof people have long-standing, some 20-25 years, connections with the corporation.

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can do is confirm what the Premier has said. And our personnel department and human relations department in SPC is monitoring it. The people are meeting with the families to see what we can do. No one is going to lose their jobs, as was our announcement in the first place that there would be no loss of jobs in the closure. There will be jobs available at Coronach for those that wish to move, and we'll do everything we possibly can to accommodate the employees in the Estevan area.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister in charge of the power corporation. It is my understanding that the power corporation offered employment to the displaced miners in the power corporation's operations at Coronach. And some of the miners who were approaching me suggested that they would very much prefer to have some of the vacant utility positions or welding positions or other positions which are vacant at the Boundary Dam, understandably, since they have spent their life in Estevan. The question which I specifically direct to you is whether or not you will ask the corporation to review its previous decision to make offers of employment at Coronach, and instead at least consider the possibility of making offers of employment at the Boundary Dam power station for these people who have worked in Estevan for many years.

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are already doing that and we're looking at all avenues to accommodate the workers and not cause any more upheaval than we possibly can. We are not going to guarantee that we can do it totally, but the options will be there for them to maintain a job, whether it's Estevan or Coronach.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. It is my understanding that the employees have been advised of the options of employment at Coronach. Would you now ask the power corporation officials to advise those employees individually of the possible options of employment at Boundary Dam? I know it would ease their minds.

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have already said that we'll follow all avenues, and I'm sure my SPC officials in the human relations department will be talking to everyone concerned.

## **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Tusa:** — It is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the House, on behalf of my good friend and colleague, the MLA for Kinistino, Mr. Ben Boutin, a group of students from Crystal Springs School in Crystal Springs. They are a group of 18 grade 10, 11 and 12 students who are here today, along with their teachers, Garnet Elason and Bryon Wiley, and their bus drivers, Joey and George Weber. I would like to ask the House to welcome them here this morning, and I would like to inform them that I will be meeting with them at 11 o'clock for pictures and for a short discussion. I wish them a very enjoyable day in Regina. I'd like to ask all members to please welcome them at this time.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## **TABLING OF REPORTS**

### **Annual Report of Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation**

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I'd like to table the 1982 annual report of SaskComp.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

#### **Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure**

#### **Department of Northern Saskatchewan**

#### **Item 1 (continued)**

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say at the outset that the understanding that we had on this side of the House was to resume initially this morning with the Department of Highways estimates, and somewhat or other it's quite confusing. There's just no consistent planning on that side of the House, it seems.

With respect, Mr. Chairman, to northern organizations, I'd like to ask the minister at this point in time: what is expected in terms of grants to organizations, particularly the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association, at this point in time? I'll just begin with the questioning in that line.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I would suggest to you, you ask the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources because that comes under his department - trapping and wildlife and so on.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Does that include, then, fundings reported from government to the fishermen's federated co-operative?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Yes.



**Mr. Yew:** — With respect to the various other organizations then, Mr. Minister, such as the existing parent organizations of, say, the Northern Contractors Association, for one, the Northern Outfitters Association, for another, and various other organizations in northern Saskatchewan . . . if in fact you have any support and encouragement from your department to such northern organizations. Can you list me, you know, the number of organizations that you will be supporting?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, you mentioned some specific organizations. They would come under the . . . You mentioned the outfitters; they come under other departments. What I would say to you, under DNS in the estimates that we're considering here today, we have the economic development grant fund. Organizations are able to come forward to us with proposals for certain funding, but if they're funded by other departments they certainly wouldn't be considered by us. But most of the ones that you refer to are covered by the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources or by Tourism and Small Business and other departments.

**Mr. Yew:** — With respect to the North East Community College, Mr. Minister, what is the status of your proposed facility for the North East Community College? Is it still the intent of the department to establish this community college facility in Sandy Bay, or has it been now transferred to another area on the east side?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we went through this last night. And we talked about the various departments that are . . . You know, and I was, I believe, rather patient with the whole thing, and, you know, I will continue to be. But I would say that I answered this specific question about community college, and the jurisdiction for community colleges in the North are with the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. That's well understood by everyone here and, in fact, well understood by people in the North who are involved with the east side community college. So I don't see why those questions are being advanced to us in DNS estimates. I don't understand it, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Yew:** — I just want to reiterate to the minister again that you are responsible for the northern administration district, and surely communities in northern Saskatchewan recognize the fact that they have now a new minister responsible for social, cultural, and economic conditions up north. I made that special, specific question to you, realizing the fact that you, as the minister for that department, certainly must be informed about the progress being made with respect to various programs and proposals in northern Saskatchewan. I thought that you would have a spirit of co-operation, like the phrase you used in Prince Albert the other day, and an open mind to discuss openly with this Assembly what the plans are for such projects.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I say once again the exercise that we're in, the committee of finance, dealing with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan . . . Our responsibility is to answer questions dealing with the budget of this government. It is the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, from page 59 to 63 of this blue estimates book, and I would ask the hon. member to refer himself to that. I will be willing - as I have been and as I was last night for some three hours in answering questions pertaining to the responsibility of this department - I'm more than willing to do that.

In fact, I don't mind referring to, and I understand as well that in this transition year that there can be some confusion where there are some grey areas, but some of these areas are very clear that the questions are under other departments. So I am just asking you,

where it's very, very clear, like community colleges under Advanced Education and Manpower, then I would ask that you reserve those questions for that minister.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I only have a few questions regarding the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, as my colleague has covered pretty well all aspects of the department quite thoroughly last night. And I will just take a short while.

My first question, Mr. Minister, would be regarding the surface lease and the agreements of the surface leases. Do I understand that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan still has jurisdiction of the surface leases in northern Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Yes, we do still have that jurisdiction.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Okay then, a couple of questions on the surface leases. At this time, are you negotiating, or renegotiating the surface lease at Key Lake, or are you anticipating renegotiating the lease at Key Lake?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — No, we are at the present time not renegotiating the surface lease, and as I said last night to your colleague regarding the Amok lease at Cluff Lake, there may be a possibility that we would reopen those surface leases, but we'll wait until a request comes forward from the companies and I will give you the assurance that we won't rush into it with any kind of, you know, major changes. But, certainly, there could well be some changes, and I make reference to the Eldor Resources lease that we signed just recently. We believe it breaks some new ground in terms of protecting the communities, and of the employment of people in local areas, and so on. It breaks some new ground in the method with which we would attempt to accomplish the goals that I think we all have, and we would perhaps use that as a bit of a benchmark. But other than that, at the present time we are not negotiating with either Amok at Cluff Lake, or Key Lake mines.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. The second phase of the Cluff Lake mine is now going ahead, and my understanding is that when that second phase is in operation that it will provide probably 400 to 500 more permanent jobs. And I think that the original Cluff Lake mine, and the original surface lease that is in Cluff Lake right now, has been a real success story in northern Saskatchewan where the 50 per cent of the labour force is from the North, and 50 per cent from the South.

I would just urge the minister, due to the fact that you have that under your jurisdiction, to continue with that surface lease as it is. I would not want to see that surface lease renegotiated for the second phase of Cluff Lake. I really see no reason why we would want to renegotiate that lease. It's been a success story, and I want to say at this time, also, that I fully support that expansion at Cluff Lake - the second phase of it - and I would sincerely hope that your department, and under your jurisdiction that the surface lease would continue the same as it was at Cluff Lake.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, I'd say to the hon. member, we have had contact from Amok regarding the second phase, and regarding the surface lease that would be in effect for that second phase should it take place, and we believe it will, and I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member about the number of jobs that this kind of project will create in the North, and we're excited about that as well.

And I would just give you the assurance as I have done before, and to your colleague as

well, that, yes, we're interested in - very much interested in preserving benefits to local and northern communities from some of the projects that are going on in there, and then certainly from these major projects. So, I would say you can rest assured that we are very cognizant of the benefits that must derive for local people, but I won't go so far as to say that the same terms that are under the present agreements will remain in effect for ever and ever, amen.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Another question, Mr. Minister, regarding the possible development of a limestone deposit and mine in the Pinehouse area. Do I understand that if that development goes ahead . . . And I want to also say that I sincerely hope that that development does go ahead for citizens of the Pinehouse area. I think it's a very important development and I fully support that development, regardless of what has been said in the press. Would the limestone mine at Pinehouse, if that goes ahead, would that also fall under your jurisdiction and would a surface lease be negotiated regarding that development, possible development?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, the mine itself would be under Energy and Mines but we may well be looking at some type of surface lease, that kind of thing. Those kind of negotiations are under our jurisdiction. I'm pleased to hear the hon. member say . . . and I know that this mine that he's talking about, a potential mine, is in his constituency. As the hon. member also knows, there have been some problems with what I would call a couple of radicals in the community there that have caused some extreme troubles for the mining company in getting on with the surveys that they needed to do last winter while frost was in the ground and it may well now have been delayed for some time. But we appreciate the . . . You know, I say we, but I think the people of Pinehouse as well will appreciate the support from, certainly from our government and also from their own MLA in this.

Just like I say, I appreciate your support there because there has been some bit of confrontation with a bit of a radical element there. But I'm sure that can be solved as well.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you. Just a couple of questions. I want to touch just shortly here on the new municipal bill that you'll be taking in, the new municipal act. You have indicated that once that act has been brought into the House and passed, then we will proceed. Is it my understanding that we will then proceed with some of the planned development that you have planned projects to solve some of the high unemployment that we have, and indicated by your executive assistant in this last report? Do I understand that that municipal act will have to come into the House and passed before you will be starting on any of the economic development projects in northern Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — No, the economic development activities aren't contingent upon the bill. The bill is to do with the development of local government. Economic development is something different. So the bill will not hold up economic development initiatives and we will see the results of some of those soon.

But one of the things the bill will do is open the gates for the flow of capital grants, of the revenue-sharing capital grant funds and so on, which will allow the communities, the individual communities, to get on with their own economic development projects or the various projects that they're doing within the community. So to that extent some activity in the North, a good deal of activity in the North, is contingent upon the passage

of that bill.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, in closing I want to say to the minister that I urge him to take immediate steps into solving the serious problems that we have in northern Saskatchewan. They are most certainly severe at this time and I think that we're heading into the summer months. And I know that with the projects such as the expansion at Cluff Lake, and what's going on in Key Lake right now, and hopefully the limestone deposit at Pinehouse. All these developments are going to help solve our problems, but we do have to make some major steps in putting capital into projects. I think that forestry is important. We have the resources up there in forestry. We also have the human resources to handle these types of projects. I sincerely hope that you will take immediate steps to solve these problems, and I look forward to this summer to see some of these projects that will lessen the burden on the citizens of northern Saskatchewan who were hit severely hard this last winter. And this is the type of a situation that, you know, we just cannot tolerate in this province.

With them few remarks, Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues have no more questions on the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and if you would like, we could just take these by number and finish it off, and the officials could then proceed back to La Ronge.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I have a considerable concern in respect to the cost to the taxpayers in respect to the personal staff that each minister is building up. The other day, in an estimate, I went through, and the minister was unable to provide the actual salaries of his personal staff. And I estimated that it was somewhere between \$150,000 to \$200,000 over and above all the staff and the deputies in the department. And I look at your personal staff, and I see that you have a Mr. Pat Jarrett as an EA; you have Mr. Gordon Sonmore, EA; you have a Mr. Dan Stephens, special assistant; and you have a Jerry White, EA. And I would like to know: can you provide us with the salaries of each of those individuals on your personal staff?

I want to say that the size of the personal staff of this government is of a major concern to the taxpayers of the province. As we look across and see the number of EAs and assistants and special assistants and Legislative Secretaries, I am indicating to the people of Saskatchewan that there's somewhere around \$150,000 to \$200,000 for sustaining political activities of individual cabinet ministers. And I think that it's only fair that this minister, and all ministers, be prepared to stand up in this legislature and provide that information as to their personal staff. And what I'm asking you is to provide me with the names if there's any additions, and I want the particular salaries paid to all of these individuals - this large network of political hacks that you are paying with the taxpayers' money. I'd ask you to detail to us . . . Can the minister provide us with that information?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, I concur with my colleague, the Attorney-General, who was saying to me, you know, we could take that from almost any other member over there, considering the record of that member, and his association with the former government and the party of the former government, and all of the relatives that he had that came into the service of the former government, and so on. And I know he had a brother in SGI, and a sister that he brought back from B.C. for Social Services. I'm not sure if he was the minister at that time, but somebody was. On and on. And now he's saying that it's justifiable to bring his whole family in. He had a sister in the Attorney-General's department, a sister in Sask Tel. You know. And here's the same old . . . (inaudible) . . . standing up and telling us the whole family was in the service of the government.

But certainly I'd be more than pleased to answer the specific question as it relates to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, because my predecessor, the minister of northern Saskatchewan, had three assistants and two secretaries. And I have, I believe, three assistants and one secretary. So we have less than the former minister had, and we've been going through it, and I must say we've been going through the transitional period of DNS and one of the reasons that we have been able to make that as smoothly as what was agreed to by your colleague last night . . . He agreed right here in the House that it was a smooth transition, and it's gone well, and I would just say that it really doesn't hold any water.

You argue about this proliferation of staff over here, and in fact if you look at the global numbers in terms of the number of assistants and the numbers of family members and all of those things that you people used to hire, and then the people that we have are far less. Far less. Far less. So, Mr. Chairman. But I'm certainly willing to supply the information because we in this government have nothing to hide in that area. Are there some other family members that I missed? Oh, I have maybe a question just in return. I'm not sure if this is the format, but I would ask the hon. member who is asking that question: did he have any family members who did not work for the former government?

**Mr. Koskie:** — Very funny, Mr. Chairman. I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that you can laugh all you want about the extraordinary expenditures of personal staff in your office. I want to say that you have no less than four people, or four political hacks in your office: a Mr. Pat Jarrett which you haven't provided the salary of; a Gordon Sonmore is in your office as an EA. You have a Dan Stephens as a special assistant, and you have a Jerry White. What are you trying to hide from the people of Saskatchewan? Why don't you in fact have that information? Why don't you give us the qualifications of those individuals and their salaries? Do you have that information here today?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, I'll certainly provide that. And I heard the hon. member say he wants to peek to hear this information. Now, I can tell him, what I did in coming into the cabinet and the service of the province is: when I had the department of tourism and renewable resources which replaced your former colleague, Mr. Gross, who is no longer with us, and your former colleague, Mr. Hammersmith, who's also no longer with us . . . Those two departments, one minister replacing two - that's a saving to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. I should say to you - and especially when you look at those two ministers and a staff, a proliferation of staff that they had around them.

I believe, and I'm not exactly sure, but I believe the former minister of tourism and renewable resources had four, five, six people in total in his office - six, well, possibly seven, I'm told, in his office. And the minister of Northern Saskatchewan had in his office a total of five people. Now, that makes 11, I believe. And I believe in my office I have six. So six replacing eleven doesn't appear to me - and at least with the arithmetic that I've grown up with, and I know I'm from northern Saskatchewan and so on, and I know the hon. member thinks something less of those of us from the North and people from the North and so on - but I can tell you that six staff, six staff to replace eleven staff is a very good bargain for the people of Saskatchewan and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well, I want to make a comment in respect to that. I want to say that the

people of Saskatchewan are readily becoming aware that the deal they got on April the 26th was not a very good deal. In fact they are coming to the conclusion that they were misled. What I have asked you specifically, Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you want to get into the debate? Yeah. What I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: do you or do you not have the salaries of the individuals on your personal staff? Can you provide that to us here today and read it off?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — For the department of DNS, I certainly can. And I take pleasure in providing that because, in all of these cases, I believe they're less money than what was paid to the 11, I make that point. You say it was a bad deal for the people of Saskatchewan on April 26th of 1982, and I say to you that six staff members to replace eleven staff members in two departments is a good deal for the people of Saskatchewan, and any of the people of Saskatchewan. It's a good deal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — And I would say that the people that work in my office under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan . . . I have Dan Stephens; Pat Jarrett, who you've mentioned; Tom Roy; Ruth Schindel. And their stats are as follows: Dan Stephens, \$42,000; Pat Jarrett, \$29,148; Tom Roy, \$24,768; Ruth Schindel, the minister's secretary, \$27,684.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I note in your resume of assistants that you have a Mr. Pat Jarrett . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I know you did. And I'm asking you specifically what is his assignment? Because it's designated as constituency. Is that . . .

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — He's an executive assistant to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. He handles inquiries, research at the request of the minister, liaison between the minister and the deputy minister. He has a Bachelor of Commerce degree in marketing from the University of Saskatchewan. He's a very bright young fellow, and I must say, he, himself could replace three or four of the people that were in the other two ministers' offices that I mentioned earlier.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to say, Mr. Chairman, really a wonderful revelation that the minister puts forward with totally misleading the people of Saskatchewan, trying to compare the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, which they have destroyed, literally destroyed and wiped out of existence, comparing that with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan under the New Democratic Party. I want to say that is misleading the people of Saskatchewan, and you know it is, because precisely now you have none of the services to the North because it's put out into the line departments. And accordingly, what you're doing is trying to compare apples and oranges. You know it, and I'm telling you the people of Saskatchewan are getting sick and tired of your misrepresentations.

I want to say in conclusion here, with a reduced-down Department of Northern Saskatchewan, with a reduced-down activity of this government, when we take a look at the personal staff of this here minister, it's costing the taxpayers an exorbitant amount of money, in the neighbourhood of \$150,000 to \$200,000. And that is the case throughout this government. Go to minister after minister, and I say that it's cost the taxpayers money for political hacks in the offices, that the work is not being done by a professional civil service. Decisions are being made by political hacks in the offices of

the minister, and this is no different here. I want to say that under the previous administration, under the previous administration, I'll tell you individuals that were hired went through the civil service and they were qualified for the position or they were not hired. That is the situation. Today we have office after office of minister after minister costing the taxpayers money to build their political machine. And I want to say that this message is going out to the people. And I want to say that they are concerned with the waste and the expenditures made by this government at the taxpayers' expense. And I think that it's a regrettable fact that this situation is allowed to exist. And I can tell each and every minister that I want an accountability of the political machinery that they have put in their office - minister after minister getting a press communication officer to try to shore up their public image. And I know after a year in government they'll need more than a press communication officer to shore up their bad public image.

So I want to say that we're very concerned that what is happening here is that there's a shift from the decision-making process of this government from a professional civil service into the political hackery of all the appointments that they have made in their departments. And what they have is a group of people that have been hired and expanded, not to just communicate with the public but to carry on the campaign for the Tory party at taxpayers' expense. And I think this is unprecedented in the history of this province. It is; it's unprecedented. And you can laugh, but I'm telling you there's a concern when the public is looking at minister after minister's office costing between \$150,000 to \$200,000 for individuals doing nothing but carrying out political messages on behalf of ministers.

We have cut professional staff. We have decimated a wonderful civil service in this province. We have cut qualified people out of the civil service and crown corporations and what have we done? We have displaced them with political hacks to try to keep this inept group of people in power. That is the extent of the direction of this government. And I want to say that 150,000 to 200,000 an office is a very high price that the taxpayers of this province is committed to maintain that government in office.

And certainly, I say in conclusion of my remarks, that this practice, I'm telling you . . . You can laugh, Mr. Minister, laugh all you want - laugh at the taxpayers of Saskatchewan; certainly laugh at them, because that's precisely what you do. And I want to say that the direction that they have taken is one of total arrogance and disregard for the public and the public purse.

And that is a concern, Mr. Minister. You have a reduced-down department, reduced to the extent that when you are asked questions you have no jurisdiction any more, and you still have a large staff doing political work for you. And you have cut key people throughout your departments - cut them adrift - and have substituted a large array of political staff. And I think that performance needs to be addressed and I think that the people of Saskatchewan have to be notified of the extravagance, of the arrogance and the cost of this government for a short 11 months for their political benefit, rather than designing programs for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that many of the remarks of the hon. member . . . I notice that he was having a great deal of difficulty keeping a straight face while he was presenting his remarks and his arguments.

I have made the argument and pointed out to the member, as well as to the committee, that if I had filled the positions that were there when we took office on May the 8th, in the offices that I inherited or that I was appointed to . . . if I had filled the positions that were there that were filled by order in council by the former administration, I would have filled 11 positions, Mr. Chairman - 11. And because we came into this government and the people of Saskatchewan had confidence in us that we would exercise cost efficiencies, as we have done in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, we said, 'Well, what do we need?' And it was determined that we needed six people to replace those eleven.

What more do we need than those kinds of hard facts to point out the absolute ludicrous nature of the comments that were just made by the member from Quill Lakes/

As far as him saying that we were comparing the Department of Northern Saskatchewan that we have now to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan under the New Democratic Party, and he says there is no comparison: I certainly concur with that. And so does everybody out in Saskatchewan concur with that, Mr. Chairman.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — There is no comparison between the Department of Northern Saskatchewan that was administered by that former government, that all-encompassing, large, unmanageable department, to the department that we have now, that is manageable, that is targeted at the real concerns of northern people, as his colleague who was serious about this estimate was suggesting last night - his two colleagues from the North, who understand the North. They were serious about it, and they were serious in expressing concerns about these social problems that exist there. I was serious in my replies to them last night, as I was today, in that we all have a concern for those various problems. And those particular areas that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (the much-reduced Department of Northern Saskatchewan) is targeted to deal with, we can now deal with those problems in a much more realistic way, as I pointed out in some specific questioning last night to your colleague.

So, I don't know what more can be said, Mr. Chairman, except to say that we have seen through some of the other estimates that member from Quill Lakes . . . I don't know what he thinks his role is there as whip of that party: that he should whip people up to some kind of fervour and bail out some of his other members, or whatever he sees as his role there. But I would say he doesn't do service to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to misrepresent the staff in this office, when, in fact, there's six people replacing eleven.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to make one closing remark to set the record clear. The minister tries to allude to the fact that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan today is the same size, and therefore he has a reduced staff. If you want to take a look at the expenditures alone, the expenditures in the 1982 budget, the last budget brought in by



the New Democratic Party, was over \$100 million for Northern Saskatchewan. That has been reduced down to \$14 million this year - \$14 million under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan as compared to \$100 million when all the programs were in there. And still he tries to mislead the people of Saskatchewan that he is still running the large department. I think that that is totally misleading the people. And to make comparisons with the previous is ludicrous, and he knows it. It's the same type of thing that they're doing here: is cutting major and important civil servants, long-time and skilled individuals.

Positions are being lost throughout this government at an unprecedented level. But I'll tell you, the number of political hacks in their offices are not decreasing, it's increasing. That's being paid by taxpayers' money and you know it - and you know it. It's being paid. Individuals that were hired before were hired through the civil service and the Public Service Commission. I want to say that I am concerned, and I don't want the minister to think lightly of it, because I am concerned and so are the people of Saskatchewan, and well should they be.

I want to ask one other further question and that is: you indicated that you had a particular economic development policy for northern Saskatchewan, the general framework of your economic policy. What I would like to do is to ask you once more to outline the basic premises of your economic policy for northern Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't believe what I hear from this member, when last night we went through that in a great deal of detail with the member from Cumberland. That member from Quill Lakes, Mr. Chairman, was not here. We went through for three solid hours the estimates of this Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The member for Cumberland asked specific questions regarding the economic development strategy and we gave some very specific answers. We talked in very broad generalizations, as well as some specific detail about the department with the economic development strategy of the North.

That member that was representing your caucus last night, and the critic for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, understands the people of the North, understands communities of the North, as I do, and I take his remarks seriously. For you to say, repeat exactly what I said here last night, over and over and over again - now I would say with respect, Mr. Chairman, with respect, the member should have been in his chair last night to hear it. He may well have been detained elsewhere for some other very unforeseen reason. If that's the case, I would urge him to read *Hansard*.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have asked for the broad, general policy statement in respect to the economic development of northern Saskatchewan. And if the minister is saying that he is afraid to set forth that economic policy because I want to be able to compare with what he gave me the previous year . . . And certainly I think we're entitled to ask that question - the broad statement of principle of economic development for northern Saskatchewan. I'm asking the minister what his broad economic policy for the North is.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know. We had a three-hour session, as I said, last night. We've gone through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan estimates in a very great deal of detail last night and earlier this morning with your colleagues who understand that department, and understand that part of the province, I would say in respect. And for you to say . . . We've brought our officials from La Ronge, we've brought them down here, and they're here. We're ready to answer

questions. Went through it last night. And for you to say, repeat everything we went through last night, and do another three hours and hold it up again as . . . to me makes no sense. You stand there is a very sanctimonious way of 10 minutes ago or 15 minutes ago, whatever it was, and talk about the taxpayers of the province, and the serving of the taxpayers of the province. I say you don't serve the taxpayers of the province by asking us to repeat everything that went on in here last night.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, you are not going to tell me what questions I'm going to ask for the taxpayers and the citizens of Saskatchewan. And you're not going to tell me how long we're going to stay here either. And I'm going to tell you if I ask a question, you're not going to tell me that I have no right because I don't understand the North, because I understand the North. And I want to tell you I'm going to ask you questions, and I'm not going to take no for an answer.

I'm going to ask you what is your . . . In a broad principles I'm asking you: what are your broad economic policies for the development of the North, the broad principles of economic development? How do you intend to bring to the northern Saskatchewan . . . an area of our province, as my colleagues have indicated, where there are up to 85 per cent unemployment? And I stand in this legislature and ask you, and you say, 'Well, I'm not going to keep my department officials here to answer these questions.' I'm asking you today: what are your basic economic philosophy, your economic principles, that you are espousing for northern Saskatchewan? And I ask you, I want to know what your basic overall economic policy . . .

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, the member says that I'm not going to tell him what he's going to ask, and so on. I was very respectful in my comments to him. I say that it's a . . . I can't believe that if the member is as interested as he tries to show the committee this morning, as he tries to show whatever TV camera he's smiling at this morning . . . If he's trying to show them his concern and interest, then why wasn't he here last night to ask the questions, or at least to listen to his colleague who was going at it? And I would say that's fine. That's fine . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order! Order! Allow the minister to make his comment.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — And just in a broad type of way, Mr. Chairman, I say that on behalf of the northern part of the province, and the part of this province and the people that live there that this department has some jurisdiction over and for, it's unfortunate that the estimates of the department have deteriorated now into this. But I would say that sure, while I will not get into all of the detail and answering the same various questions that came up last night, I will give him the broad sort of outline of the way that we see developing the North. And if that's the question that he wants answered, I'll say we see a role for our government and our department in business development in the North. We see a role for us in employment opportunities. I talked to your colleague from Athabasca this morning about the surface lease agreements and how those will impact on northern communities, and the benefits to northern communities, and the way in which we will negotiate those. So we see that as a positive role for our department. We have a loan fund; we have a grant fund - economic development - geared towards economic development, loan fund and a grant fund as well, and we see our department having a role there in dealing with the people of the North for feasible and viable projects.

We as a department see a role for ourselves, for our officials, to give management

support to fledgling businesses in the North. We don't see business and profit and those kinds of things as any kind of an alien type of an idea in the North any more than we do in the South. And that's where we get into some philosophical differences with the gang of eight. But I've said that before, and here we are. So I've given the member the broad outline of the kinds of things that we see our department having a role in in northern Saskatchewan.

And like I say before, I really think that the committee deteriorates . . . In the estimates under consideration, this department deteriorates substantially. We go through every single detail that we went through last night once again. That doesn't make any sense to me.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Again, it doesn't matter to this in carrying on the business of the government, whether you think it makes sense to you. And I want to make that perfectly clear, Mr. Minister. I want to say that there is a great deal of concern for the people of northern Saskatchewan, as I said, where unemployment is rampant and welfare is increasing. And I ask you that you have outlined in a general way what you are intending to do, and certainly employment and employment opportunities is indeed the major concern for Northerners.

I want to ask you: what are the specific actions that you took during the past year to create employment in northern Saskatchewan - the specific items that you have developed which created employment? And I want you to indicate the number per the project that you initiated.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, here we go with the things that the hon. member for Cumberland . . . I would say those specific things are in *Hansard* from last night's proceedings. They are, but I will just give it without going into the details of them: the extension of a hydro project, the major extension of a hydro project in the communities of Patuanak, Dillon, Michel, St. George's Hill, Pinehouse, at a \$3.5 million cost, through SPC, and SPC with cost-shared money and the federal government - 50 jobs.

We've negotiated a new surface lease, as I talked to your colleague from Athabasca this morning while you were in the House, dealing with the Eldor Resources, the mine expansion, formerly Gulf Minerals mine up near Wollaston Lake. And we are in the process and very, very near an agreement, and the development of a wild rice processing plant that was talked about for a long time by your administration - nothing ever happened. It's happening under this government.

And all of these things are positive steps. And all of these things are the positive steps that I talked about last night in these estimates with the members who were asking specific questions for specific communities and specific economic development activity. And I take exception to you coming in here and trying to raise a big tirade and changing the tenor of the estimates, because really, as I've said before, I don't understand why you would do this when *Hansard* is there for you to read.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well, I want to take the opportunity of finally getting some information from the minister. And I want to say that what the details of all the projects which he was able to put forward here in helping employment opportunity in the North . . . was the SPC hydro project, which created, he says, 50 jobs, and they're doing something with a

surface lease in respect to Gulf Mineral mines. And, of course, that is our concern, Mr. Minister, that you are in fact doing nothing for northern Saskatchewan - nothing. And that's why we have 85 per cent and 90 per cent unemployment in community after community.

You dismantled northern Saskatchewan, and you had no economic and no design for the North to help the people of the North help themselves. And this is very obvious. And I thank you for taking time to at least indicate that you are doing nothing for the North, that there is total inactivity.

I want to say that the North, during the 11 years under the New Democratic Party . . . As your Minister of Education indicated, that when he visited them that there was a spark in the eyes of the northerners when he visited the schools. They had some hope, and I tell you that that spark in the eye of the northerner is growing dim, because community after community . . . And talk to my two colleagues, there is no hope left. Hope is drawing to a close for Northerners.

And I tell you that it has been a scandal, a scandal, as to the inactivity of this government in addressing people in northern Saskatchewan which we felt needed special assistance. We gave \$100 million to northern Saskatchewan under our administration. You have reduced it to \$14 million. You have no economic development for northern Saskatchewan. This government has taken the hope that the people of northern Saskatchewan were developing during the program, initiated through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and you have left them a vacuum.

And, of course, it's very clear, Mr. Minister, that you don't want to get into your economic strategy. Of course you don't want to get into the specifics because you don't have a plan. You have deserted the people of northern half of Saskatchewan. I mean, we certainly have money to give to the oil companies. First thing, \$130 million to the oil companies right off the bat; they needed help. But I'll tell you, for the thousands and thousands of people unemployed in northern Saskatchewan, this government doesn't have money. And I want to say that this is a despicable direction that this government is taking.

And I'll tell you, the people of Saskatchewan were proud that northern development was going on in a planned and organized manner: the participation of the crowns and the private sector; the participation of northern people which the member from Cumberland talks about. This was the direction that we were going in the past. And today, today the north lies in the shambles, in the shambles, under this Tory administration, and it took them less than a year to do it - less than a year to do it. And I want to say, Mr. Minister, whether you can add, or whether I am to take that this is your total project alignment . . . And can you indicate whether you have any other major projects which will help employment in northern Saskatchewan, or am I to take it and believe that this is the extent of the development of programs and job opportunities for northern Saskatchewan? Do you want to add to the list, or do you want us to distribute . . . The question I asked you is: outline your economic strategy. And then I indicated to you, secondly, that employment is a big problem. And I ask you to outline to this House, and to the people of Saskatchewan, and northern Saskatchewan, a list of projects, and the name of the project and the number of jobs you created. A whole list of them, and you gave me two. So I think we can send to the people of the North your answer, unless you want to add to it.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member I believe said a mouthful when

he used the term, 'We gave.' And he's talking there of his former administration - 'We gave northern Saskatchewan \$100 million. We gave' . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . You said you gave.

Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member reads *Hansard*, which I have urged him to do already this morning, when he reads *Hansard* from yesterday, I would urge him to also read *Hansard* from today. And in his comments, he said, 'We gave \$100 million.' And also when he reads last night's *Hansard*, he will know that I had indicated to the member from Cumberland that the expenditures of this government, the investment of this government - we will be investing in northern Saskatchewan \$102 million. The difference there, Mr. Chairman, is that they gave: here's the money; no plan; no investment in future or long-term development. And our 102 million is there from the point of view of an investment in the North and the people that live there and the communities that are there.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — And I mentioned to the hon. member the power grid. I mentioned the Eldor Resources lease. I mentioned support for the wild rice plant which is going to be a reality because we also looked at another end of the wild rice equation, as I indicated last night as well, marketing, which is something which hadn't been looked at.

I indicated last night as well about the operation of sawmills and of the northern farms and sewer and water construction and revenue sharing and northern capital grants that will be there under the new northern municipalities act. All of those things - investments in northern Saskatchewan and the development of northern people.

What more can we say? I just would say - and I think it's obvious to anyone who had observed the proceedings here this morning - I would ask the committee, Mr. Chairman, to make their own judgement on terms of watching the proceedings here this morning, to say just who really has an understanding of what's necessary in northern Saskatchewan, what people need, and who is being responsible in terms of addressing the problems that are there. We don't deny the problems, and I've said that as well before. We don't deny the extreme unemployment problem and various social problems that go along with unemployment.

But then I would say also that those are not new problems. The department that he mentioned before, that large former DNS, those problems were there as well then. So I don't know what more can be said except to say that, yes, we are addressing the economic development of the northern part of this province and we have welcomed them to full citizenship in Saskatchewan. What I hear from people in the North whom I know personally and very, very many of them, as those two members, who represent that area do as well, they are not unhappy with the developments that have taken place in this last year.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I listened with interest to the minister try to explain how these people welcomed the 85 per cent unemployment. It's reminiscent of the Minister of Highways who tried to tell us how happy the 139 people that he fired were with his administration.

I find it difficult to understand how this government is expecting people of the province, who are being asked to suffer the consequences of ill-management and bad decisions,

to be happy with the new government. 85 per cent of the people in the North are now unemployed. What we need is an emergency plan to go into the North to help create jobs, rather than welfare for the people of the north, and that's what they're receiving now.

And what I would like to ask the minister is how many people he will employ with the projects he has announced, and what he expects to happen with the unemployment rate and the number of people on welfare over the next six months, as a result of this program.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, as well, the member from Shaunavon should be reminded . . . We talked about in terms of the numbers of jobs that are projected in some of those projects we're talking about. The unemployment rate - and I know you keep talking about 85 and all these kinds of percentages - the unemployment rate across the northern Saskatchewan, for everyone in the committee's edification, is about 36 per cent. It's extremely high. It's extremely high . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not proud of it and I don't say that we are proud of it.

The unemployment rate, Mr. Chairman, in northern Saskatchewan, before this government took over, when the former . . . was also in that range. It's a long-standing problem, certainly. We know that. It's a long-standing problem in northern Saskatchewan. We are addressing it.

The hon. member comes with a typical NDP answer or suggestion: 'An emergency plan,' he says. An emergency plan that's going to run in with a whole army of bureaucrats and say, 'Here's an emergency plan to alleviate a long-term and long-standing problem for a short term.' On a short term. You can't operate like that and we don't believe that it's responsible or reasonable to operate with that kind of a time frame.

So what we're saying is it's a long-term plan and it will need some long-term solutions. And those solutions must have a foundation and that foundation has to be on something solid that people can build on, where jobs can be there and created over a long term.

I indicated to his colleague last night: economic development to a socialist is a government taking some money that comes from somewhere else and regenerating tax money around and handing it here. Well, that's not economic development. That's just moving the money around. And in times of recession and so on, there's less and less of that, as we all know.

So what I would say is in order for jobs to be created in northern communities, somebody must build something; and in order for somebody to build something, they must have ownership of the property on which they build it; and in order for that to take place there has to be a coming-to-terms in northern Saskatchewan by a number of people and many, many people, as was indicated by the member from Athabasca today - people of Pinehouse, a community in his constituency. The average people of Pinehouse, not the radical element - and I mentioned them this morning - but the average people of Pinehouse are very concerned about the jobs that were lost because of some problems at the potential limestone mine.

What the people in northern Saskatchewan are realizing and know, is that they need

those jobs. Something has to be built in order for those jobs to be there. They see that at Cluff Lake, they see that at Key Lake, they see that at Rabbit Lake, and at Midwest Lake, and so on - the various large projects that are going on. So it's not reasonable that these members should paint an absolutely black picture about what's happening in northern Saskatchewan because there are many very large projects going on, and there are many people within the communities that see some light at the end of the tunnel.

The hon. member from Quill Lakes talked about my colleague, the Minister of Education, going to the North and reporting about how he saw some hope because he saw some light in the children's eyes in the schools. That's true. That's true. One of the things that that light was about and that many of the teachers in the schools were saying to us, and I happened to be with the Minister of Education on that particular tour, was that when there was one minister of Northern Saskatchewan to cover all the whole gamut of government in that large area, when did schools, that are strictly dealing with education and the training of young people, see the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan when he had all of this all-encompassing to do? But now that schools are under the Department of Education, where there's expertise to deal with education and training, and caring people who care about schools, the Minister of Education goes to their schools. That was something of what the light in the children's eyes was about. And that's what the light in people's eyes across Saskatchewan - north and south - has been all about since April 26, 1982.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to challenge the minister on some of his figures even though he goes on at length to say that the unemployment rate is only 36 per cent in the North. I would challenge the minister to tell me that that is not one of the highest areas of unemployment, not in Saskatchewan, but in fact in Canada, and you're saying that it's not a problem. But even that number, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe is accurate. I have here a letter from his executive assistant, one by the name of Thomas T.J. Roy, executive assistant to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan - a recent letter. And I would like to quote from it:

(a) Unemployment. Unemployment is running rampant in the North. It is unemployment which is the root of many northern's other problems. Northern Saskatchewan is unique and special case where it comes to provision of government services, and chartering future developments. The majority of the west side communities are faced with soaring unemployment, and statistics indicate that at least 85 per cent of every individual community in the west side is crippled with unemployment. The social service department out of Buffalo Narrows have doubled their case-load since January of this year, and more applications are expected and anticipated for the remainder of this year. North Sask Native Outreach is an autonomous incorporated body established to assist native Northerners in seeking employment and training.

Mr. Chairman, when the minister talks about the development and the projects which he has developed, and talks about how terrible it was under the previous administration, I would challenge him to say that he is doing a better job, whether it's through the private sector . . . And if that's what he believes is the tool to use to develop the North, that's fine. But to do nothing, which is what you have done since you took over that department, in fact take away from the North, is morally irresponsible for you

as a minister, and morally irresponsible for your government and the Premier of this province. When even your own people, your own EAs, are writing to you, telling you that unemployment is 85 per cent, I think it is irresponsible of you to come here and attempt to explain to us that it's only 36 per cent, when in fact documents of your own people - your hired political people - are telling you what a terrible state northern Saskatchewan is in, and even since January the 1st of this year. This has nothing to do with the previous administration. This has to do with inactivity in tourism, inactivity in housing development by your department and Sask Housing.

It's my understanding that in 1982, the summer of 1982, not one house was built in the North by Sask Housing. And if you're saying that the private sector is going to move in and do the job for you, that's fine. But tell me the private sector developers who are in the North doing the job where you have pulled your operation out? And I'm not fighting against free enterprise; if that's what you believe in, then get it up there and get it to work. But don't condemn us for the job that we were doing in creating houses, because you have two options: one is to do it through the public sector, through Sask Housing, and the other is the road you have chosen and that is to do nothing. And that's an option; and you have chosen it.

But I'm saying the attempt that we'd had to build houses . . . And there were problems, and I'll readily admit there were problems. But the choice that we made was to do something, even given the mistakes that were involved. Your choice, Mr. Minister, is to do nothing. And I say that a government's choice of doing nothing is irresponsible and will not be accepted by the people of the province.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that the comments about doing nothing . . . In all of our discussions here last night and earlier today we've talked about some of the things that we are doing, and they are substantial. They are substantial. So for the hon. member to say we're doing nothing, well, I guess we really . . . For the sake of the time of the committee and so on, there's no reason to get into a debate about that. Because we are doing something, and we are doing substantial work in the North.

As far as the housing starts go in northern Saskatchewan, you talk about 11 years of having your stamp on the things that you did, and that when we've gone a different direction . . . You have even now agreed that it's fine to do that. And that's wonderful. But I would say that . . . And my colleague, the minister who's in charge of Sask Housing, Mr. Hardy, had a tremendous problem with cleaning up a good deal of what went on with the housing branch and all of that sort of thing. That's one year ago. But we've taken over the administration there, and I can tell you, it goes back to what I said earlier to your colleague from Quill Lakes when he said, 'We gave, we gave.'

I would say that the philosophy of the former department and the former administration was: where there's a problem and there's some heat involved you just go and pour money on and try to put the fire out. And that's exactly what you did in northern Saskatchewan, and you can't deny that. And we do not believe in throwing money at problems in order to try to solve them, because you don't solve problems by throwing money on them; you don't throw any money. There's no development, Mr. Chairman, no long-term development can take place . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Vice-Chairman:** — Excuse me, the minister is trying to answer the question and make comments. With the noise it's very difficult to hear him.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — So there's no long-term development, Mr. Chairman, in our



view, that can take place with that type of a philosophy of just throwing the money on the problem without identifying the long-term methods upon which you can solve them.

In answer to some of your specifics, I would say: I don't deny, and nobody that's being honest with themselves or with the people of the province or with their colleagues, would deny that unemployment is a serious problem in northern Saskatchewan. I've said that - how many times? It's a serious problem; certainly, it is a serious problem. But it's a serious problem in northern Canada. It's a serious problem across northern Canada. In the isolated communities of northern Canada, unemployment is a serious problem. There's no question about that. So I don't think we will gain much by carrying on the discussion of that, because basically I'm agreeing with him: unemployment's a problem.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I suppose we can all agree that unemployment is a problem because anyone who would suggest that it wasn't would be anything but being honest with themselves and the people of the province. The point is, is what we are doing about it. And I say that very little is being done by this government, and you're not the only one who is included in this blame.

I know the Minister of Highways, in this area as well, had \$6 million in the budget, when he came to office, for northern highway development. He cancelled that totally, and then a few months later sent out a news release as if he was a great hero, announcing \$1.5 million for northern highways. And I say that that kind of playing around with politics, and playing around with the taxpayers' money, and playing around with the people of the North, is not acceptable.

When I talk about Sask Housing and their problems in creating jobs and building houses, that's not the only problem. I have heard that many, many people in the North have been sent notices from Sask Housing that they are being asked to move out of their houses, Sask Housing houses, because they cannot pay the rent - which has been raised once or twice since this government came to power. And the suggestion is, is to kick the people out of the houses and board them up.

Now, if that's the Conservative government policy for solving the problems in the North, I say that it's ridiculous and something that you should take a look at and your cabinet should take a look at. Because in developing the North, whether you choose to do it, as I mentioned earlier, through the private sector . . .

If you're saying public sector, putting of money into is wrong, I'll agree with you. I'll not agree with you, but I'll allow you that privilege to say that public investment in the North is wrong. That's your philosophy. But then you have a responsibility as a free enterpriser and a capitalist to see that your capitalist friends go to northern Saskatchewan and carry out the development, because to do what you're doing, which is nothing, is not acceptable.

Therefore when we see the fact that in dealing with throwing money at issues in the province, I can tell you you've thrown money at the oil companies, and I'll mention Imperial Oil who had profits of \$600 million in 1981, and you can explain to me how they were the most likely people to throw money at. But I'll stand on our record that where we put money into people in the North was far more moral than where you put money the day you came to office - \$130 million to the oil companies - every one of

which showed profits for the past 10 years.

And what I would like to suggest to the minister, that he look very carefully at the priorities of this government because I say they're on the wrong road. Politically you may be wise in what you're doing, but morally you are terribly wrong because there are many people suffering as a result of your politics.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, this is very tempting. If he missed . . . This member talks to be about, politically this is wise. Well, I'll say when you talk about something that's wise, politically or whatever, you're talking about what the people of Saskatchewan told that group what they wanted done with northern Saskatchewan and with many other things that they'd been doing, under the guise of what that member would so sanctimoniously stand here . . . (inaudible) . . . about morals. That's something that I take a great deal of offence to, coming from the member from Shaunavon. I will not have him stand there and talk to me about what's morally right and what's morally wrong.

We are accepting responsibility for the social problems of northern Saskatchewan. My colleague, the Minister of health, has been better accepted in northern Saskatchewan by people involved in the health services than any other minister of Northern Saskatchewan ever was. And my colleague, the Minister of Education, as has been admitted by several of your people over there, has been well received by people in northern Saskatchewan who are concerned with education, with retraining and with training, which is the basis, and one of the basic things that must be done.

And our budget of March 29th pointed that out, Mr. Chairman, that the important problem and economic development of the North, as well as across this province has to do, as much as anything else, with training, with training of our young people, with education so that people can be ready for the jobs of the '80s and the '90s and into the future. Those are long-term solutions; that's why the money goes into those long-term things. That's why the Minister of Education and continuing education in this province, in this government, is well received in the North by people who are concerned with education and with their families.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — That's why that Minister of Health is well received when he talks about the health concerns of northern people. That's why I'm well received in communities in northern Saskatchewan, because I've addressed the problems that are serious . . . (inaudible) . . . And that's why this ridiculous sanctimonious preaching to us about morals in this House is so ridiculous, and appears ridiculous to everybody who is watching through that television camera, and everybody who would ever watch you in this committee. You are being absolutely ridiculous with this approach - absolutely ridiculous. The people of northern Saskatchewan have no time for it either.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Chairman:** — May I have order? The member for Quill Lakes has a question.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Chairman, I think it is a moral question. I think unemployment is a moral question. I want to say that the Catholic bishops in their social program said that

society has a moral obligation to see that people receive employment. And you're going to stand up and indicate that we have no right to address you in respect of our concerns for hundreds of people in northern Saskatchewan.

I want to say that you criticize our program as being handouts and what you have substituted is a vacuum of nothing. You are able to give welfare to the rich, the oil companies, \$150 million, \$130 million, without blinking an eye - without blinking an eye. But to the poor, the undertrodden of northern Saskatchewan, you have left deserted, Mr. Minister. You have left them deserted, and you know it. You have no economic program in place. And it's rather interesting, members of this Assembly, that as soon as someone wants to discuss what is going on in northern Saskatchewan, they are branded.

There are two classes, I guess, of citizens, according to the minister, because if they stand up and want to discuss northern issues, he calls them 'that radical group.' They are northern, my friend, Northerners, and they have a right to speak out and to participate in what's going on. I would like to ask the minister if he, in fact, can define that group which is so-called radicals. Will he define to the legislature who in fact is this great radical group which is opposing him, apparently - opposing his plan to do nothing? Opposing his plan to do nothing, and they're called radicals. So I want to specifically ask the minister: will he, in fact, designate who these radicals are in northern Saskatchewan, these undesirable citizens of northern Saskatchewan, as he has designated? So, for the record, will you indicate to us: who are all the radicals?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe if you would ask your member from Athabasca he could tell you every one of them. They were the people who were out after his nomination with the - the last time within your party - under the auspices and with the help of the member from Cumberland at that time, and on and on. But, anyway, I won't get into that. The radical group that I made reference to, and just in a comment regarding some of them, and there are one or two in each of these communities - not in each of the communities, in several of the communities. But I would say that the . . . when I'm speaking about Northerners and northern people, I'm talking about the solid folks that are in every community, the majority, by far the greatest majority of northern people, that are well represented by people like the member from Athabasca, who will also identify that same element that I talked to you about, by the way. So why don't you ask him about it? He'll tell you about who they are and how they're cutting down on the proposals for development in his constituency. Now there's a Northerner, if you want to talk about Northerners.

And it's just such a strange thing when you stand here - and I would say, in a very sanctimonious way - and talk to us, and I include the member from Athabasca in that, to us who have lived in northern Saskatchewan about that. And I would say you have every right, sure, get up and ask these questions all you want and continue this committee in the venue that you have now and continue to dig yourself a hole even deeper than the one that you found yourself in a year ago. And you'll find yourself with no members in this House, if you continue this kind of thing. How will the people of Saskatchewan ever, ever take you seriously with this kind of an approach to the long-term development in northern Saskatchewan or anywhere else? So don't preach to us about morals.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well, I want to indicate here, Mr. Chairman, that I think what we should look at clearly here is the priorities of this government - the priorities here in northern Saskatchewan, where more attention needs to be directed than anywhere in

Saskatchewan because of the high unemployment. And this government says, 'We can't do anything; it's long-term.' That's the essence of the minister's statement.

Here we are today, concerned with up to 85 per cent unemployment in community after community. And I would think that that is a relevant discussion for this legislature - very relevant. But I would go on to say that what, when we had an opportunity to discuss the crisis of Saskatchewan, the members opposite brought in a flag debate a month old, from Manitoba.

They had an opportunity here to discuss an issue of burning concern to the people of northern Saskatchewan, and what did they do? They went and dragged out an issue which, for political purposes, tried to use for political purposes. Here they had an opportunity, an opportunity to deal and to show and to demonstrate to the people of this province that this government has concern, has compassion, has a direction for the people of this province. But not that. They didn't deal with any issue which was of concern to the people of this province. They dragged something out of Manitoba - a month old - not even relevant, shouldn't even been in this House.

**Mr. Vice-Chairman:** — I'd like the member to stay on the subject. We needn't get carried away off on some other tangent.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I understand what you're saying. I take your comments. There's a lot of members, Mr. Chairman, who do a lot of talking from their seat, but I certainly don't hear them getting into the debate. And I could name a few of them, because they want to talk from their seat because they aren't allowed to talk from their feet.

So what I want to say here is that the evidence that has been put forward by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan is one that he is opposed to what the previous government was doing in respect to development of the North. We ask him: what is his policy to replace that? And he says some very long-term plan. And when we ask him, tell him that there's 85 per cent unemployment in this province in northern Saskatchewan, we ask him what he has done during the course of 11 months, and he indicates two or three small projects. He has not indicated to us an economic plan of development in order to create jobs.

Certainly, in the South here, what we have done is to put into place a program for the hiring some students, and hiring some who are unemployed. But specifically the North is an area quite different from the South. And I want to ask the minister: has he any immediate plans in order to alleviate the heavy unemployment in northern Saskatchewan? What are his immediate plans?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, the member talks about 11 years of all that they did, and the problems are still with us. What I would say to what we have done in the last year: by and large has been an extremely frustrating exercise but a very necessary exercise in clean-up, and it's under way and it's ongoing. And we remember, and I hope the hon. member will remember clearly what a judge of the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan said, Judge Noble, that DNS had become a bureaucracy run amok, which is a very strong statement coming from a judge in a series of fraud cases.

We talked earlier about some of the problems that my colleague, the minister of Sask Housing, has had with the housing developments, and what was northern housing, and all of those projects. A clean-up. And I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, and I tell the committee today that there were some serious problems there. And so we don't

apologize for that, and we will never apologize to the people of Saskatchewan, and I will certainly not apologize to this committee for undertaking a clean-up of something that had run amok as the judge said. Never will we apologize for that because we believe those are the kinds of things that were going on under the former administration - some of those same sanctimonious people involved in the administration on their cabinet benches. And we don't apologize for cleaning up what the people of Saskatchewan said: 'Boys, you're gone because of those kinds of acts.' And they are gone, and most of those . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — So, if they're trying to get me apologize for spending a year in attempting to clean up the department . . . We've started with a clean-up of the department, and I'm sure that it's under way, and it's gone very well, and it's been well received by an awful lot of people in northern Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if there's any reason to carry this on any further, but it's beyond me when I look at the members who represent that area. And last night we carried on this debate on these estimates for three hours. Excellent. An excellent debate in the sense that we went to the crux of the issues. We talked about what's there in northern Saskatchewan, and we talked about the problems that are there and agreed that they have to be addressed, and they are being addressed. And in fact the member from Cumberland on several occasions last night commended the department, and commended the government for some of the things that we're doing - specific things. That's the kind of co-operation that we would look for from responsible elected members of this Assembly. That's the kind of co-operation that I urge the . . . and I believe have received from the members who represent northern Saskatchewan.

In a sense, we've said, 'Look you do no service to your people,' is what I was saying last night. You do no service to the people that you represent in the constituencies that you represent by coming here and adopting the gloom and doom type of negative attitudes that comes totally as a result of sitting in caucus with some of the other members who have seen fit to enter into this debate today. And so now we have some positive members who have identified some real problems, and have come and said, yes, we'd like to talk about these things in a positive and co-operative ways. But they're being tainted by some of the doom and gloom stuff and I would say the Opposition Whip is probably the best example of that, that is in that group of eight over there.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabour the points that are being made here; I simply want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for verifying and supporting many of the points that I raised here in the three-hour debate over the estimates being discussed today. I take exception though, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the hon. member for Meadow Lake has stated a figure, quoting the unemployment rating in northern Saskatchewan as being 36 per cent. That is, Mr. Chairman, grossly, grossly misleading the people of this province. That is grossly misleading this Assembly in terms of the disparities in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman.

People in the North, themselves, elected members of the northern administration

district, including various organizations like SLANG (Saskatchewan Association of Northern Local Governments) and SANC (Saskatchewan Association of Northern Communities), and the native organizations, AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) being one official representative of the native people in the northern administration district, have voiced a tremendous amount of concern with respect to the high unemployment in northern Saskatchewan. There is unemployment in northern Saskatchewan, at the very minimum 85 per cent, and at the maximum at least 98 per cent, at the maximum in many of the northern communities.

Now, when the minister comes here, when the minister that is responsible to advocate for the people of northern Saskatchewan, when the minister is here doing estimates with the official opposition of the province and states to this Assembly that employment in northern Saskatchewan is only 36 per cent, I have to take exception. I have to take exception because that is grossly misleading the House, as well as misleading the people of this province.

I attended a meeting with the minister present on the 24th of March, where we had representatives from various local communities - from the east side, from the far northern regions, and from the west side. People were represented there by elected officials at the community level. They were also represented by various native groups, and they wanted to get some direction, some answers from the minister that is supposed to be responsible with advocating for the people of the northern half of this province. They came in there with an open mind. They came in there with an open spirit of co-operation. And they wanted to discuss the serious issues that relate to their community, to their environment, to the top half of this province. I took exception then, and I take exception today, to the performance of that minister that is supposed to represent northern Saskatchewan, because when the minister was asked at this particular meeting, with reference to various serious issues, he perpetuated confrontation to the extent that he did not respond in a manner that was expected from a minister that was responsible for the people of the top half of this province. He did not respond to the serious questions regarding local government; he did not respond to questions regarding training and education; he did not respond to questions regarding the housing programs and the housing problems in northern Saskatchewan; he did not respond to questions raised about the surface lease agreements that were of prime concern to that particular group of people.

There were people there, Mr. Chairman, there were people there - elected officials - that were arguing with respect to serious issues related to . . . One, for example, I'll use: the surface lease agreements. Those surface lease agreements are very important for the people of northern Saskatchewan, because it gives them a bit of recognition, recognition to the extent where at least there is emphasis and special consideration given to that group of people because of the disparities that exist in northern Saskatchewan.

When the minister was asked with respect to the surface lease agreements, and I also raised the question in this House with respect to the surface lease agreements, the minister stated at the time that they were looking, they were looking at possibly revising the surface lease agreements. I can't remember exactly the words that he used at the time. I believe it was 'retention of rate of employees' or something. That is the first time that the people at this particular meeting ever heard of that expression. Later on, at this House, in this Legislative Assembly, I got up and raised the question during question period and asked the minister whose advice he was taking in terms of changing that policy. Well, he responded back saying that he had consulted some individuals. I got

back to him and I asked: 'Did you have a formal submission or proposal given to you by any group or organization or elected leaders in northern Saskatchewan?' And his response was no.

I ask the members of this House, the government of the day: where are they taking their direction from? Because the fact remains - I've stated it before - the North is shrinking. The province is shrinking. The North doesn't exist with this administration. The top half of the province no longer exists. I've stated it before and I'll state it again: members of this government seem to think that the province ends in P.A.-Duck Lake, the province ends at Meadow Lake. Well I'll tell the members again, and I've told them before, that people exist, communities exist, north of Meadow Lake and north of Prince Albert.

That northern administration district, Mr. Chairman, is a vast area. It's a vast area and it has 46 settlements. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that possibly the only time that this administration, that this government, will recognize northern Saskatchewan is when the private sector - the multinational corporations - will be prepared, when this government will be prepared to give away the valuable resources that we have in the northern administration district. It seems to me that is the only time that this government will ever recognize the disparities in northern Saskatchewan. The only time they'll recognize the North is when they want our valuable resources. That is about the only time that they'll ever come to recognize northern Saskatchewan.

I point out again, and I've pointed it out before during one of our recent debates, that we have a lot of disparities in northern Saskatchewan - a high unemployment rate. We have, Mr. Minister, 85 to 98 per cent unemployment. We have a high welfare dependency roll. I have figures here compared from February of this year to February of last year which indicate to me that there has been a 30 per cent increase in the welfare case-load in northern Saskatchewan from 1,400 up to 1,826. Now that was, the figures that I took out were two months old. I would assume now, today, that you have quite a substantial increase since February.

I take exception with what the minister has stated as well, with respect to the well-received program that he has for northern Saskatchewan. He mentioned a while ago that he has a program that his government, that his administration has been accepted by residents of northern Saskatchewan. I want to say to the minister, last night during our three-hour debate on estimates I asked you about a letter that you wrote on July the 16th, whereby you referred to this master plan of yours to resolve the problems that exist.

You pointed out that you had a plan regarding a self-sufficiency economic development program. You also had a plan for local government. I asked the minister last night, and I've asked him before, and I'll ask the minister again - where is that plan? When can the northern administration district and the people in those various communities that I've mentioned expect to receive some indication as to what your economic development plans are to alleviate the high unemployment roll, the high welfare case-load that exists in that northern administration district?

I just want to go on, Mr. Chairman, and show the members of this Legislative Assembly the memo that he wrote on July the 16th. I've kept it, and I've discussed it, and I've raised questions with respect to this memo. And I will continue to raise questions with respect to that memo.

One of the things that I've noted with respect to this government, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that they neglect to consult, to involve, and to have public participation in many of their programs and many of their policies. When the minister wrote, for an example, this memo, he directed this memo to the staff. He didn't direct it to the people that were affected at the community level. That is why I say people at the local level are confused. They are being kept in the dark with respect to this government's approach for northern development. They don't know what the minister is doing, what this government is doing, to help alleviate many of the disparities in northern Saskatchewan.

The memo was written and directed to the civil service component. Now I have no qualms with the civil service component in La Ronge, but at the same time if the minister was sincere in his public participation talks, in his consultation talks, in his public involvement talks, he would have directed that and his approach to northern development would have involved northern leaders, northern leadership. It would have involved the LCAs, the LACs, the three incorporated centres, the two native organizations - the FSI, AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan). It would have involved the Northern Lights School Division. It would have involved many of the representative groups that live in northern Saskatchewan. But at present, to this point in time, Mr. Chairman, people are quite frustrated. They still don't see what this government has in terms of services, programs, and major initiatives in respect to social and economic programs for northern Saskatchewan. They still wait and hope that we will have some form of direction provided to us.

With respect to the estimates in front of us, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a question with the minister again. You have . . . And we discussed economic development time and time again, last night, and prior to that, and again today. With respect to your allocation of \$1.4 million, Mr. Minister, what is the criteria for clients at the community level? What is the criteria? What is your policy with respect to the distribution of this fund?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I think, Mr. Chairman, I'll be pleased to answer the question. There's no problem with that. I would make this comment to the hon. member, and I mentioned, as well, that we went through that and he will know, as well, that we went through many of the same questions last night. I do notice that the hon. member has got a little audience of some of the folks from the North today, and now he's repeating the questions, and that's fine, and I'm glad it's a . . . But anyway I would say to the . . . I would say that the criteria under item 15 that you mention, that the people would be able to come forward, and if the project is feasible and is demonstrated to have social benefit and various other things like that, then that money would be available for certain grants. But certainly we would be very careful to look at the feasibility and viability of it, and we're not there to just throw money onto more money.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'd like to ask the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan a couple of questions because of the issue raised by the opposition that . . . their allegations that the government had a moral obligation in northern Saskatchewan to continue the practices of the previous government. And I would like to . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order, order. The Attorney-General is making a statement.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'm sure that the public is well aware of the allegations made by the opposition. And I wonder . . . And I will preface my question with a few examples. This is the policy of the New Democratic Party when it was in government. This is Northern



Saskatchewan loaning policy: \$2,500 loan to - I'll give the individual's name if the members opposite want - \$2,500 loan; purpose: pool room; purchase, two professional pool tables - one Brunswick Ranchero pool table, one Brunswick AM 130 pool table, and one Bob Wood shuffleboard table. This is the type of business enterprise that the NDP promoted. What happened, of course, was that it immediately went into default. It was not viable in the first place. It was strictly the handout, the demeaning handout give-away, which I think is a greater moral wrong than anything the hon. members could come up with.

Let me give you another example: \$4,000 for a hockey school. The individual was unsuccessful. After getting the money, immediately after getting the money, was unsuccessful in establishing the hockey school due to his lack of management experience in limited population base, as well as from heavy drinking.

I give you some other examples. I give you some other examples that . . . \$50,000 loan. Nothing ever came about it. Nothing ever arose from some of these examples, even a start-up to let individuals go into business. Some questionable financial transactions were made by the client leaving him in an unenviable cash flow. Problems arose immediately.

Here's another one, a clothing store. This is before it even opened up and the money's handed over. Like, it didn't even start up. The individual soon realized that the project was uneconomical due to, primarily, underfinancing and a lack of management expertise. Attempts to refinance failed, so she decided not to proceed any further.

Here's one, Mr. Speaker, where they didn't even put the purpose of the loan down. The individual was to go into the theatre business, I gather - a \$1,100 loan, for someone to go into the theatre business. So they got an 8mm projector and an 8mm screen (an 8 x 8 foot screen). Someone's to go into business with these two items. With these two . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Let's have some names.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'm prepared to give them. I don't think it serves the individual any benefit, but I'm sure that the hon. members opposite would love to have these peoples' names dragged before the public.

So here's why the business failed, Mr. Chairman. The NDP don't want to hear this, but here's why the business failed. Because the client was not fully set up to run a commercial venture, the fact that he had his 8mm projector and an 8 x 8 screen, and believe it or not one of the reasons for the failure is that he could not compete with television. He couldn't compete with television, that's one of the reasons for the loan default. No regular show dates, and very poor films.

Mr. Speaker, I give these by way of example, or Mr. Chairman. I give these by way of example, because nothing is more demeaning to an individual than a straight handout, pouring money on some slipshod excuses. We're far better off . . . I believe the hon. minister is quite correct when he said that the problems are long-term, that the problems have to be dealt with in a constructive and a substantive nature. The idea of just throwing money for pool halls and pool tables and shuffleboard tables, that is the demeaning attitude, and I say morally sick attitude of the New Democratic Party when it ran Northern Saskatchewan. And I ask the minister responsible for Northern Saskatchewan if he sees any morality, any morality, and any benefit in the type of loan programs brought about by the New Democratic Party when it was government?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, in answer to the hon. member's question, certainly not. When I indicated to the committee before . . . When I indicated to the committee before . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — The Minister is trying to make a statement. I need order, we can't hear him through the noise.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — When I indicated to the committee before that a good deal of this past year, Mr. Chairman, has been spent in a clean-up operation, and the examples that the Attorney-General has raised here are a few, a very few of many, many, many examples - and many of them much more substantive than those, in terms of dollar cost as well. But when I indicated that we do have a grant program for economic development in northern Saskatchewan, the hon. member from Cumberland asked about what would be the criteria. Certainly we would look at feasibility; we look at viability; we look at something that can have some long-term benefit. And that's just the difference. The kinds of examples that are raised by the Attorney-General are the kinds of examples that the people of Saskatchewan said to us, 'Clean that up and let's go at this thing in a reasonable way,' and that's what we're doing in our department now.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had no intentions of getting into this debate again today, as I indicated I was through with my questioning the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, but I see that the Attorney-General has decided to get into this and to slur all the business people in northern Saskatchewan, and the ventures that were going on in northern Saskatchewan. And that's nothing new for the Attorney-General, Mr. Chairman. I go back to when we talked about the youth camps for young offenders in northern Saskatchewan, the dirty camps, and the type of insinuations that he brought before Northerners in this legislature, and I'm not really that surprised that he would get up here today and bring Northerners down the way he has brought them down today.

Mr. Chairman, he talks about businesses in northern Saskatchewan, and small businesses such as poolrooms, and clothing stores that never got started, and theatres. And as I indicated in the House the other night when I spoke, when I asked that a committee be formed to travel into northern Saskatchewan and just see what the conditions are in the North . . . And then he would realize that in these small, isolated communities a poolroom is a viable source for an individual to start up, and it's also part of the social life that individuals in that community need, and we address them.

But when he got up and spoke today, he spoke of the poolrooms, and he spoke of the theatre with the wrong projector, but, Mr. Chairman, he omitted to talk about all the other loans that went into northern Saskatchewan and successful ventures that were carried out. And I also want to point out that when the Department of Northern Saskatchewan set up that loan fund in northern Saskatchewan, that the citizens of northern Saskatchewan, not only were they isolated, but they had no way of borrowing any money. I ask you, if you're living in Camsell Portage and you're 600 miles away from the nearest bank in Meadow Lake, how are you going to borrow any money to start a poolroom? And I ask you, if you're in La Loche and you're 300 miles away from the nearest bank in Meadow Lake . . . And that's what Northerners had to go through. There was no banking institutions for them to borrow any money. And they are still not there.

And sure there was going to be failures, but for the Attorney-General to get up in this legislature and point out that the failures were the poolrooms and some of these businesses that went broke, I tell you there's a lot of people have gone broke in southern Saskatchewan. Not only did they go broke just in the last few years but they went broke for many, many years, as long as this was a province. But to zero in on the citizens of northern Saskatchewan and to omit the successful operations that are going on there and I ask you . . . That's why this committee should go into northern Saskatchewan and take a look at some of the successful ventures - some of the successful cafes that have started up with money from this government, and are paying back their loans, garages that have paid back their loans. The fishing industry is going ahead, and a lot of them loans are being paid back. Trapping loans are being paid back, bush operations, and they're being paid back.

Naturally, there had to be chances. There's high risk. But I tell you, this government that sits on the other side of this House is taking high risks when they will guarantee \$32 millions to Batoni-Hunter to build an arena in Saskatoon - I think that's high risk.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — And I don't think that the Attorney-General has the right to stand up in this House and create the type of slur that he has on the citizen of northern Saskatchewan and their businesses. And like I said before, I could expect that from him because of the fact that he has made them slurs before on the types of dirty . . . (inaudible) . . . and dirty hospitals, and that type.

But I ask the Attorney-General to think this over again before he gets up in this House, and if he wants to bring out some of these cases, let's hear about some of the success stories that we have. Let's not zero in on things that are all bad.

I want to also say that when you take a look at northern Saskatchewan today, and you take a look at what it was like 10 years ago, it's quite a difference. With the types of housing and roads and schools and everything we have in northern Saskatchewan, it's there now. The only thing now that we're lacking is that economic base. I ask you to address that economic base, and not stand up in this House and slur the citizens of northern Saskatchewan. And if you're going to get up and do it, give us some of the success stories, don't zero in on the failures.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I did not want to get back into this debate. I had indicated that I was through questioning the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and the only reason I'm up on my feet is because the Attorney-General decided, in his wisdom, to take part in the estimates of DNS. And with that, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I think, Mr. Chairman, the points that were made in reply to this question regarding economic development grant fund, and so on . . . There's no question, there were some successes. But what has been pointed out, and what I want to very clearly point out, is that there were some failures, and they were based on the fact that the criteria regulations left a great deal to be desired. During this clean-up process that I referred to earlier, we have addressed that. We have addressed it responsibly, and I don't know what more can be said about it. And we continue to address those kinds of things in a responsible way because we take it very, very seriously, when we as a government spend or reallocate taxpayers' dollars in this

province.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes, I want first of all to say how little the contribution to this estimates here today was made by the Attorney-General. As my colleague indicated, he picked out two or three individual items to slur northern Saskatchewan. Clearly does it indicate the disrespect that this government has. A man holding one of the highest offices in this province will stand up and give examples of failures.

What I want to point out, Mr. Minister, we have banks - commercial banks - which borrow money, and many of those loans which they make, there is a failure of payment, no doubt about it. We have Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), which we have established to assist business communities, primarily in the South. And I want to say, there are failures there also.

And I want to say, in respect to your grant program, I ask you: can you give to us, since your criticisms seem to be based on some failures, I ask you, can you give us a guarantee that in respect to your economic development loans and the grants which you put forward, can you give us the guarantee that there will be no failures?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I can't give you the guarantee that there'll be no failures, but I certainly have no hesitation in giving you the guarantee that there'll be far less failures than there were under your administration.

**Mr. Koskie:** — And I want to say, very glib answer, Mr. Chairman, because obviously he'll have a lower rate of failure, because obviously he's doing nothing in northern Saskatchewan. And if one does not venture out to do something, it's very difficult to fail. And that is exactly what is happening with this government.

And I want to say that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and I'll say it just as soon as when I feel like it, just as soon as I like. The member from Moosomin, who seldom enters the debate, stood up while I was on the floor . . . Never gets into any debates. All he can do is sit there on his seat and heckle. I want to say, Mr. Minister, that you have demonstrated to this House that your government has essentially deserted the northern part of this province. You have clearly indicated in your response and the goodness of your approach that you have no economic program for the development of the North.

And I want to say that if your criticism merely is against the progress that we have made in the North, that you will not indeed receive the support of the people of this province.

I want to close in saying that you believe in welfare for the rich and the oil companies - no problem there. There's a new welfare taking place in this province: welfare for the rich, the friends of your party. But I'll tell you: nothing for the people in northern Saskatchewan. 85 per cent unemployment, and the minister contradicts that and says there's only 36.

I ask the minister in closing, I ask the minister: have you done a projection of what the projected unemployment rate will be next year? Have you done any surveys and analysis as a result of your economic policies in the North, whether or not you will likely be able to decrease . . . use your figures, 36 per cent; use mine, 85 per cent . . . What are the projections of addressing the high unemployment in northern Saskatchewan, where people are losing all hope for the future? What are your projections in respect to next year?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, we are addressing the problems. I would ask the hon. member if he has any projections for all of Canada, for the western world in unemployment for the next year. So to put that question that he's asked me into perspective, does he have any projections for all of Canada, for the rest of the world, what the unemployment rate will be? I would say to you that the unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan is being addressed and we believe in a long-term way. I don't want to get into this in any more detail because we've talked about it before, last night, and on and on and on.

I was interested in one comment from the hon. member and it was almost unbelievable to me. I believe he said something like, 'You must venture out,' and 'to gain something.' Which goes back to the old adage of nothing ventured, nothing gained. And that's the first time that anyone in Saskatchewan or anywhere in Canada has ever heard a socialist using the motto: nothing ventured, nothing gained. It's really strange.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Chairman, I am shocked. I am absolutely shocked at the way in which this minister wants to dismiss the problems of northern Saskatchewan, with the callousness of his answer. He says, do I have the statistics for Canada, the unemployment statistics for Canada for next year? And I want to say: of course. The federal budget was brought down and it is expected to only decrease, in spite of the infusion, about half a per cent, from about 12.5 per cent down to 12. Here is an area of the province with 85 per cent unemployment, and the minister says, 'Well, we are going to look at it in the long term. No, we haven't looked at unemployment,' and he asks me a question.

I'm asking you: have you done any analysis of what the unemployment is going to be relative to the economic development that you're proposing for northern Saskatchewan next year?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, I would say that we haven't done a detailed analysis and you don't need a detailed analysis of unemployment when you recognize, as I have said many times in this committee, when we recognize that unemployment is far too high. We know that. So why would you want to spend a whole lot of money doing detailed analyses of the potential unemployment for next year?

I've admitted to you, and everyone in Saskatchewan who's a thinking person at all know that unemployment is too high in northern Saskatchewan. We know that it's too high in all of Saskatchewan, even though in this province it's the lowest it is in all of Canada. But we know, in this government, that it's still too high. Okay. Why do we need an analysis of that? We know that that's a problem. What I have said to the committee last night, what I've repeated to the committee today is that we are addressing it with some long-term solutions and we're talking about retraining people for jobs. And that's the crux of dealing with unemployment in any society. You know that if you search yourselves for it. And we know that. And we will be addressing it in an outcome.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I, again, am mystified at what the minister is saying. He says that here is the northern half of Saskatchewan. And he says he has done no analysis on employment or job projection for the next year. But I want to tell you that when they were dealing with Batoni-Hunter, the Premier came into this Assembly and he indicated all of the potential development of employment and benefits to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now we have here in the whole northern half of the province, and we have a minister in

charge of Northern Saskatchewan who, one, has not analysed the project of unemployment for the next year. Secondly, he has not, in fact, taken an analysis of the projects which he's putting into place, and to give us the statistics as to the impact it will have on the employment.

Are you telling us that you have no analysis of what the expected unemployment is to be next year? Are you telling us that you can give us no analysis of the economic thrust that your government is supposedly giving to the North, the impact insofar as creating jobs in the North? Are you telling us that you can give us neither the projected unemployment, nor the projected jobs, because of the economic development which you say is coming?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I said to the committee, unemployment in northern Saskatchewan has been high for many years,. Unemployment in Saskatchewan this year is high and is recognized by this government. It's recognized to the point that this government has determined that we must act in that area. I've said that, and we've been through it, and I can give you the projection that next year unemployment will be high in northern Saskatchewan. Unemployment will be high, too high, next summer. Next year unemployment will be too high in northern Saskatchewan. No question about it. We will be addressing it, and we'll be moving it, and we'll be moving to economic development.

And I'm interested in the member's comments. When he stands here and talks about unemployment and what it means to the northern people, at the same time makes comparison - and now it's interesting to hear from the member from Quill Lakes that the opposition caucus is against the development of Coliseum Holdings and the NHL franchise to Saskatchewan and all of the jobs that that will create for Saskatchewan citizens. I'm interested in his comments about that.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to indicate clearly that I want to object to the minister indicating where I stand in respect to the entry of the Blues. Certainly, I'm totally in favour of the development. I am totally in favour - I'm unqualified support of the Blues being located in Saskatchewan. I am, however, concerned by the government's list because they have tabled no reports that we, in fact, could look and see . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Get off the topic.

**Mr. Koskie:** — No, he raised the issue, and I want to say that it's unfair, Mr. Chairman, and I think he should be called to order on a subject matter that isn't even a . . .

**Mr. Vice-Chairman:** — I think that was mentioned . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order! You mentioned the position with Batoni when you were making your statement before . . . (inaudible) . . . and then the statement . . . (inaudible) . . . so I would suggest to both members that we go ahead and get back to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan which is the topic on hand, and let's get away from straying off to other departments or other things.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to indicate first of all that I don't want the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, because he is unable to answer any questions in respect to his department, to try to side-track the attention by trying to establish where I stand on the project which has nothing to do with northern Saskatchewan. But why I raised the issue of Batoni-Hunter project in Saskatoon is that precisely the supporting documentation that came into this House by the Premier were all of the benefits and the employment

accruing from it. And that is all well and good - very good. But I say here we have northern Saskatchewan, the northern half of this province, and today in estimates we can't even get the minister to stand up and indicate what are the economic projects which he is proposing. And we cannot get him to indicate the likely job creation of the projects which he intends for northern Saskatchewan. Can you give that information, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we have gone through the projects that we're proposing and that we're talking about, and that we see as having some long-term benefits, certainly. We've gone through those this morning; we went through them last night, as I indicated earlier in this morning's deliberations. We went through them once the member from Quill Lakes was in here as well, and already this morning, and it's clearly on the record. So I don't see why we should repeat it now for a third time, when I couldn't see the sense in repeating them for the second time.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I said a while ago, a few days ago, that this government, the Conservative government of the day, will certainly leave its mark in northern Saskatchewan. I stated at the time that there is neglect, that there is ignorance, on behalf of the Conservative government, to the people of northern Saskatchewan. Facts and figures can't . . . We can use the facts and figures and the performance of that administration. I told members of this Assembly that this government will leave its mark. That mark will be a high welfare dependency rate in northern Saskatchewan.

It will have a lot of problems, a lot of social problems, alcoholism. It will leave its mark in terms of a higher unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan. It will leave its mark of social unrest; that is what it will do.

Now just a while ago the Attorney-General - and I take exception on behalf of the people that I represent - that he slurred northern residents. What he in fact did was jeopardize and distort potential people that may make an application for an economic development loan, for an economic development application pertaining to some local industry or other. What the Attorney-General has done today is a disgrace. It is a disgrace and it's an embarrassment made on behalf of the members of this government. It's an embarrassment. It's a public embarrassment.

I, for one, would never stoop so low as to bring out individual loan applications and smirk and slur the people that were involved in such transactions.

I stated, a few days ago, to the minister responsible for DNS, that they should go into northern Saskatchewan and see the problems in the North themselves. And my colleague from Athabasca introduced a resolution here in the House asking for a committee to be assigned and to go into northern Saskatchewan and look at the disparities that exist. But that resolution was rejected by members of this Assembly.

Well, I challenged the minister before, and I'll challenge the minister and the cabinet again to go into the northern administration district and see for yourselves the problems that exist in the North. In fact I may put forth a resolution calling for a commission to study the social problems that we have in northern Saskatchewan: the high unemployment, the alcoholism problem, the high welfare dependency roll that we have in northern Saskatchewan. I believe, in all sincerity, if this government has any commitment whatsoever, if it has any understanding for minority groups, if they have

any confidence that they can do a job and hold up their heads and take on a responsibility as government of this province, they ought to be able to do that much. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I could, in reply to that, just respond to the hon. member in this way: it is my intention, and our intention as a government, to have many more of our members of this committee more aware of the problems of northern Saskatchewan. and there will be some trips into northern Saskatchewan this year by members of our caucus, and I would invite both members who represent those two constituencies, in some of them at least to be involved in meeting with our people, and showing the members of this caucus, of this government caucus, that is very concerned about social problems in all parts of the province. And you can certainly have the opportunity this summer to show a great number of members of our caucus the northern part of this province.

**Mr. Yew:** — I'll certainly look forward to that meeting, Mr. Minister, and I hope that you will not hold these particular meetings that you talk about on an individual basis. I hope that you will go into northern Saskatchewan and hold a full-fledged northern area meeting, where you can, yourselves, the cabinet, will see for yourselves and hear for yourselves the serious issues that face people in northern Saskatchewan. And I'll take you up on that offer, Mr. Minister. And for now, to close debate, Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions, and I suppose we can go into detail on the estimates.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

#### **Item 12**

**Mr. Yew:** — A brief question, Mr. Chairman, to the minister responsible for DNS. In terms of project management, Mr. Minister, what is the status of this branch? Is it still intact, or has that been dismantled and done away with entirely?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — What was project management is split between Sask Housing, I believe, and the Department of Highways. And the sewer and water construction, as I think we indicated to you last night in detailed questions about the various sewer and water projects in communities, still remains within DNS.

Item 12 agreed to.

Item 13 agreed to.

#### **Item 14**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — In the area of day care, I just want a point of clarification from the minister, whether he can inform me: do the same provisions apply to day care in what was DNS, apply to residents up there as southern Saskatchewan now, as a result of that change?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — The jurisdiction for day care in the North is under the Department of Social Services, as the hon. member will know. If you . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Do you want the answer? You want the answer to this . . . okay, day care in the northern part of the province is now under the Department of Social



Services, and the same rules apply as they do in southern Saskatchewan, I'm informed.

Item 14 agreed to.

Item 15 agreed to.

Vote 26 agreed to.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN**

**Capital Expenditure - Vote 27**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 27 agreed to.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN**

**Vote 69 - Statutory**

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:54 p.m.