

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 10, 1984**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**PARKS AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned at 5 o'clock, the member from Athabasca had asked me a question regarding the water bombers, or the fire-fighting bombers, and the one that crashed last year. We have the chemical bomber — we already have it replaced. We will be buying two CL-215s, and the federal government will provide two CL-215s, and we take delivery of the two federal ones first. They come in 1986 and '87, and we will purchase our two in '88 and '89.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You will be getting four new water bombers. Is that right? Of the CL-215s. And you will receive them in . . . Is this a 50-50 cost sharing, basically, for them two bombers?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Yes. The federal government will supply two; the province will supply two. We take delivery of the federal ones — one in 1986 and one in 1987 — and we purchase two, and will take delivery of them in 1988 and '89.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I now want to turn to the big game surveys that were carried on last year by your department. I wonder if you could indicate what the moose population is, and if it's increasing or if it's decreasing, and could you indicate what regions are in bad shape or in good shape.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Okay, the provincial moose populations are at a 30-year low, and represent about an additional 5 per cent decline from 1982 levels. Hudson Bay is the only area with an average or better moose population in the whole province.

**Mr. Thompson:** — And could you indicate what the deer population is on that survey, and the woodland caribou?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — The white-tail deer population is 10 per cent higher than last year. It's estimated between 250 and 300,000. I don't have the . . . Okay, the woodland caribou is . . . It's at a stable population.

**Mr. Thompson:** — That was the mule deer or the white-tail deer?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — That was the white-tail deer. If you want the mule deer, I can give that to you also. The mule deer populations are rapidly increasing — 15 to 20 per cent over 1982. And there's an estimated 6,200 mule deer were harvested in the province last year, up 20 per cent from 1982.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, if your officials could break that down and indicate why the white-tail deer population is declining or increasing in northern Saskatchewan . . . I know that there's a good deer population in the southern part, but I would just like to know what the survey showed in the northern part of the province.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — The survey showed that white-tailed deer populations are low in and around the Prince Albert area. Farther north, there are ample supply there, up in that area.

**Mr. Thompson:** — This is what I suspected, Mr. Minister, that the moose population, with the exception of the Hudson Bay region, is very low in northern Saskatchewan. And also, there, the deer population is very low.

Three years ago, that was not the case. The population of deer in the Prince Albert area, and north in the Big River area, and up through Green Lake, there's a large population of deer, and right into the Buffalo Narrows area.

We have had, and I have indicated before, that we have had a large increase in the wolf population in northern Saskatchewan, and there has been no program to really go out and bait the wolves. In the last few years, the department has taken a new approach, and that is one of trying to trap the timber-wolf. And that just doesn't work.

I have watched, myself, and I've had many trappers and fishermen who have come to me, and indicated that they have seen many numbers of kills of caribou, of the white-tailed deer, and the moose population. And I have also seen them, myself, and have been taken out. And one trapper who did a survey for me, and indicated the number of kills in a certain area, and it was just fantastic what these wolves are doing.

A timber-wolf, to me, is the most vicious killer that we have in the world. It literally eats the animal alive. It chews him from the hind legs, and then starts going. And I have seen, have come upon, animals that were still alive, and being eaten alive by timber-wolves.

They hunt day and night, 365 days of the year. I think that the department is going to have to take a new approach, and are going to have to go into these regions. And first of all, I think there're going to have to listen to the trappers, who know what's going on, and put these baits out and keep the wolf population down.

It was not a great problem in the old days, when we didn't have all the roads that were going into the bush areas where hunters could go. Now we have hunters that can go many, many miles in a day; they can drive 400 miles up into the north country; they can get on a skidoo and drive 50 miles in the bush. And it's just the population just can't handle it any more, and we have to control the timber-wolf.

What has taken place in the last number of years is the wolf has been let roam free, and there's just been no control on them, and as a result we have a declining and very low population of moose, and a very low population of white-tailed deer, and a very low population of woodland caribou in them areas. And I would just ask the minister to ask his officials to take a serious look, negotiate with the trappers in the northern Saskatchewan, and put a control on the timber-wolf. Because if we don't, we are just not going to be able to maintain a stable level of wildlife in that area.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, we're definitely well aware that the wolves do take their toll on the wildlife in the North, and in the past . . . Over the last two to three years, in the Meadow Lake and Prince Albert regions, wolf attacks on livestock have increased substantially. And during the 1982 winter, '82-83 winter, trappers and department staff took 77 wolves in the Meadow Lake area, 92 in the Prince Albert region, and in 1983-84 winter, 35 wolves were taken in the Meadow Lake region. So we have accomplished some, but needless to say there's still a problem.

**Mr. Thompson:** — This is right, and what you are saying proves out what I was saying, Mr. Minister. The timber-wolves have cleaned out the northern areas, and now moving into the frontier, and are starting to clean up on the cattle and the pigs. And they go even further.

In Big River this year, an individual had two dogs tied out in his camp — he was logging — and he came out in the morning, and all he had left was the heads of the two dogs. This just goes to show you just how serious the wolf population is.

And as now there is no more animals for them to eat in the north country, they are starting to move, as you indicate, into the Prince Albert area and into the frontier areas; into the Meadow Lake, and is starting to hit the farmers. And I think it's a situation that we shouldn't allow to happen, and I would just urge your department to take a serious look at that, and in the future try to control this, as I indicated, what I consider a very vicious killer.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we're going to continue to promote wolf trapping, through trapping schools and so on, in the North, and hopefully we can get control of it in the not too distant future.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well, I think that's one thing that we know: that you cannot control those by trapping and holding these trapping schools. That is not going to control the timber-wolf.

You talk about the numbers that you killed. That's very small, because timber-wolves are known to have had up to 14 kits — one female timber-wolf. They're no different than a dog. So, they expand very fast, and we just can't . . . We just can't sit back and say, "Well, we're going to trap them, or we're going to hold a trapping school and train individuals to trap timber-wolves."

We have to have . . . We have to go back to the old days when we had the individuals, like Chick Terry, who went around the North country, and he was controlling these timber-wolves with wolf baits. I think it has to be controlled, and make sure that the baits are put out in the trapping season, because that's when you've got to get them. You got to get them in the fall, before the lakes freeze over.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I perhaps could indicate to the member from Athabasca that we're prepared to look at different methods — whatever they may be — and see if we can't get it under control as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to raise a question with the minister responsible for DPRR. In terms of your program for the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association, Mr. Minister, I wonder if I may ask you what you have in terms of program and policy development with, associated with, the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association — if you have any?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association back in 1981 received something like \$120,000. In 1982 it was reduced to \$25,000; in 1983-84 we provided them with \$500. And the reason we did that is: there was something like 20,000 to 23,000 trapping licences sold in the province.

The Saskatchewan Trappers' Association . . . The most members they ever had was something like 1,400 to 1,600, so they weren't representing the majority of the trappers within the province. I met with them. I told them if they had a membership fee of \$5 per trapper that they could generate something in the neighbourhood of 80 to \$90,000 just through membership fees, and that we would provide them with a list of all the people that obtained trapping licences from the year before, which we have. And I don't feel that because they were representing a very, very small portion of the amount of trappers that they couldn't justify getting a grant as large as what they were getting. And that's why we cut it back.

**Mr. Yew:** — With respect to the total licences issued, Mr. Minister, could you elaborate further? Understand that there was a total of 23,000 or 2,300?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — It was 23,000. And something I failed to mention, that in 1983,

\$165,000 was made available to assist the Saskatchewan fur trapping industry. The grants were allocated for the following purposes: production incentive grants; grub-stake grants to the individual trappers; grants to trappers to resolve nuisance animal problems, such as wolf predation and beaver flooding; grants to individuals to assist the department in humane trapping development, and teaching humane trapping methods; grant to the Fur Institute of Canada, to co-ordinate development of humane trapping systems in Saskatchewan and in Canada. So in 1984-85, \$160,000 will be made available to assist these same programs.

**Mr. Yew:** — You have then allotted, have allotted 163,000, Mr. Minister, for the year '83 — fiscal year '83-84. What is your program, then, for the year '84-85 — this current fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — That was the last one I just mentioned, was in 1984-85 — \$160,000 will be made available.

**Mr. Yew:** — Could the minister then provide detailed information to me, in terms of funding allotment, for what program areas, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Yes, I have the list here: trapping education development incentive — \$70,000; graduate student assistance — \$18,000; federal-provincial humane trapping grant — \$9,340; endangered species assistance, University of Saskatchewan — \$4,000; and fur-bearer and trapper education — \$80,000.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, what is your policy with respect to flying trappers into remote isolated out-camps? That trappers generally have this problem in the fall of getting from their communities into the more remote camps that they have. With the former administration we had a policy of flying some trappers into these remote outposts. What is your policy today?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Yes, we . . . Instead of giving it to the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association, we give it to the respective trapping blocks, and they allocate it, as they see fit, to the trappers that are in the remote areas, and they fly them in.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I want to go back to your total licences, trappers' licences, issued for the entire province. And I just want to bring to your attention that I want to argue against the majority of the trappers that have purchased licences to take opportunity of the trapping industry in the southern areas. They may have good reason . . . Well, in fact, they do. Many of them do have good reason for entering into the trapping industry. The unemployment stats that we have today are such that people have to look for many other options of creating some employment for themselves, and some income, alternate income.

But I do want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that many of the trappers in the northern administration district . . . The majority of the trappers associated with the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association are people that have derived their living from the fur industry for hundreds of years. And the fact is, in northern Saskatchewan we have unemployment that ranges as high as 95 per cent, and that we definitely have to try to provide encouragement and support to that industry.

And we have to recognize that the people in the northern administration district have only this option open to them, and therefore we must provide, throw our support behind the trappers in the remote areas in northern Saskatchewan. That's why I raise questions with respect to your government's policy towards the fur industry.

I go back, as well, and raise a few points with respect to the commercial fishing industry, which is quite similar to, in terms of occupations in northern Saskatchewan, to the trapping industry. And I note that your department has undertaken a study into the commercial fishing industry. I just want to raise a question here that — I think I've mentioned it before in this House — that a Mr.

Johnson, A Mr. Ron Johnson, from the department of tourism and Renewable Resources, conducted a — he's a resource planner, I understand — conducted a study into this industry, and there's some opposition voiced or expressed by several northern groups with respect to this study.

One point that I'm very anxious to know — and I know that the people in northern Saskatchewan, the commercial fishermen in northern Saskatchewan, will be very interested to know — is, what is your department . . . It talks about a policy paper that suggests transferring Northerners into other jobs in training programs. But the people, the commercial fishermen themselves, find that this is not very realistic, because the fact is there's such a high unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan. And there's been no major economic development strategy plan put in place by your government, to date, to help alleviate the high unemployment.

I would like to know, Mr. Minister, what suitable training opportunities, and what suitable permanent employment opportunities, is your department referring to, and, if we have such a plan, when will you unveil that plan and provide those training and employment opportunities to those people in northern Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, we've conducted, carried out, a study to develop a fish policy action plan in the North, and the plan has been approved. It accommodates and spells out the role of the commercial and recreational uses of the fish resource in northern Saskatchewan.

There'll be opportunities for people to enter into a recreational fishery, and I think with this new fisheries enhancement fund that we're establishing, that I mentioned prior to the supper hour, with restocking and clearing of rearing ponds and so on, that we'll attract a lot more tourism to the North. Perhaps there'll be more northern outfitting camps could be established on different lakes in the North, and I think this is a positive step.

We're negotiating with the federal government for a cost-sharing program through increases in the licence fees. As I mentioned to the member from Athabasca, that we generate something like \$650,000 this year.

We have asked — I've met with Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the Hon. Pierre DeBane, last week in Ottawa, and he agreed in principle to match our dollars, and I think that is a positive step. We're certainly going to continue to follow that up, and make sure that they come across with some moneys to cost share with us. And I think that will create employment in the North.

**Mr. Yew:** — Yes, you talked about the various programs that some of those commercial fishermen could fall into, with respect to your report. Is it a plan of yours, then, to try diminish the number of commercial fishermen that we currently have in the northern administration area? Mr. Minister, would you . . . ? I'd like to hear what your position is on that.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — No, we have no intentions of cutting back on the commercial fishing in the North. We're looking at maybe making some additions.

**Mr. Yew:** — I got the first part of the answer, Mr. Minister. I understand, then, that you were not at, that one of your policies is not to cut back on the number of commercial fishermen, and that is good, Mr. Minister. I didn't get the second part of your answer.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, we would like to provide additional things in the North, besides commercial fishing, to create employment in the North.

**Mr. Yew:** — I agree with my colleague from Athabasca. In terms of the tourism industry, I certainly don't want to try to knock it down, but I raised the issue about the commercial fishing industry and the study conducted here by your department — the question of the cutting down

on a number of commercial fishermen — because I would not like to see another industry, such as the commercial fishing industry, lost to another industry such as tourism, not at the expense of sports trophy-hunting type of objective. You know, the commercial fishing industry has always been an important source of income to many Northerners, as I've mentioned before. And that clearly is only one of the few options that they have in front of them in terms of supplementing their incomes.

While we're on the subject of tourism, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you and your officials: what number of jobs do you see in that industry? How many Northerners do you see taking opportunity in terms of jobs in that industry?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — I really wouldn't have an actual figure. It would be just a guess. I couldn't even venture a guess. But as far as creating employment in the North with this new fisheries enhancement fund, we probably will be promoting fish farming, for one thing, and there will be clean-ups done in rearing ponds and areas where fish go to spawn. I think we plan on hiring northern people to do this type of work, and we would encourage them to get into fish farming. And I think it would create employment.

Certainly, I know there's been a lot of interest spirited in the wild rice farming in the North, and it's ongoing. We get numerous people contacting us over the weeks past about getting into the rice farming. And they are certainly interested in this fish farming, also. So we're optimistic that we're going to create numerous jobs in the North with these programs.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, you raise several options that could be made available to the commercial fishermen. Have you provided information to those appropriate organizations, the trapping and the fisheries organizations, to enable them to take a firsthand look at those options, and to provide input by them in terms of those other options that you mentioned — recreation, tourism, and fish farming, etc.?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, some of the northern commercial fishermen have already indicated that they are interested in fish farming, as maybe you are well aware.

We have a fish advisory committee, on which there is representation from commercial fishermen, and the Northern Saskatchewan Outfitters' Association, and SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), the wildlife federation.

And I think these messages could be conveyed to the people up in the North by the representation on the fish advisory board. And we'll be discussing with them on identifying areas in which we can spend some of the fisheries enhancement fund money — where it could be best spent and get the best results for the dollars spent. So I'm sure they will convey that message to the members that are on the committee on the respective organization in the North.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I turn now to reforestation contracts in northern Saskatchewan. I had a discussion with the chief for the Lac La Ronge Indian Band just day before yesterday, and along with the chief, one of his councillors indicated to me that they certainly were quite upset about the awarding of contracts to out-of-province firms. And I note as well, in yesterday's paper of *The Northerner*, that this issue was raised. And I just want to read the quote here. It asks, "Why, if the band did not get the contracts it bid on, was it not invited to bid on the other areas that it could have submitted tenders for?"

I see that \$182,850 worth of contract dollars has gone out of this province to two B.C. firms, British Columbia firms. And they are: Folklore and Tawa Enterprises. I'm not sure if that's the correct way to pronounce, but that gives you an idea of which firms I'm talking about.

But my question to you, Mr. Minister: with respect to those reforestation contracts that are being awarded by your department, have you any policy to ensure against contracts such as

these ones going out to out of the province firms? I mean, you know, could you not try to get your department to award those contracts locally to people, to firms and contractors in the province of Saskatchewan, rather than out of the province firms?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, perhaps the member from Cumberland wasn't in his seat when I indicated to the member from Athabasca this afternoon that, to answer the first part of your question, the La Ronge Indian Band could have bid on all the tree-planting contract tenders, but they could only be awarded one, if they were low bid. And you mention us assuring you, or assuring the people of northern Saskatchewan, that we won't take out-of-province tenders and give them contracts. That has been going on for something like seven years. We have only been here two, so it's rather obvious that five years prior to that, five years prior to that, through your administration, out-of-province contracts were going into the North, at that time, too.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, how much money was raised through the sale of firewood at provincial parks in the last fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Approximately \$95,000, and as I indicated earlier, the total cost of providing the firewood throughout the park system is in the neighbourhood of 5 to \$600,000 annually.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, for how many parks . . . At how many parks is the firewood sold? Is it half them, or what is it?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — I indicated earlier that there will be no sales of firewood within the parks anywhere in the province this year.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I'm glad. I am truly glad the department came to its senses. There were a few nuisances like that one. You'd get a bit of firewood that you could almost get in your pocket, the darn strings would fall apart, you'd get your car dirty getting it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't have a fireplace. Unlike the member from Meadow Lake, I don't have a fireplace. I have no reason to steal firewood.

Mr. Minister, I gather if you have got rid of the sale of firewood — and I'm delighted to hear that — I gather you still have the reservation system. And I continue to say what I said last year, is it's a bad system.

It's a bad system because it requires nothing down. You can make a reservation, and if you don't show up, you're not out a nickel. I have gone to provincial parks, and I have had to go into overflow at 8 o'clock — all kinds of those places still vacant. Now if people come in after 8 o'clock they sell them, but Mr. Minister, any system which allows reservations on a \$6 tab, and doesn't get anything down, is a bad system, and I suggest, Mr. Minister, that you should abolish the reservation system. But if you won't, at least make them . . . At least attach some penalty, and say that they have to be there at 5 o'clock, or pay ahead of time — one of the two.

The system you have now is terrible. At 8 o'clock when the, when they will start releasing to other people, there's all kinds of spots that are vacant out in Buffalo Pound Park, the one I'm familiar with. And I'm sure it's the truth in others, Mr. Minister. I say it's a bad system, and you ought to change it.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I answered that question earlier. I guess perhaps you weren't in your place. So what we have done this year . . . We still have the reserve-a-site, with a \$3 fee, with a \$10 no-show fee on top of that. So if they haven't shown up by 8 o'clock, they have lost their \$13, and we rent it to somebody else.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I'm not going to harangue you about it, but I'm sure my colleague from Athabasca has done a better job of this than I can.

I just want to leave the thing . . . I see the Minister agrees. I just want to leave it by saying that the system . . . I disagree, Mr. Minister. I think the system's a terrible one. I think you either ought to make them pay ahead of time, or you ought to bomb the thing. Preferably bomb it.

There isn't enough money involved. It's one thing if you have a \$50 motel room. There, if you make them pay ahead of time, they'll either come, or they'll phone you and let you know they're not coming, and get their money back. But I don't think there's any way to make a reservation system work when you're dealing with \$6 fees. It just isn't enough money. What happens is, they reserve them and don't use them. And it is a bad system, Mr. Minister, and I really wish you'd send it to the same part of the world that you sent the sale of firewood. Just bomb the system; it's a bad system.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, we get a lot of compliments on that system.

There are a lot of people drive 3 and 400 miles, and get to a park, and they can't find a place to camp. But if they can reserve a site ahead of time, for a \$3 fee, plus a \$10 penalty if they don't show up by 8 o'clock in the evening, I see nothing the matter with that system. I would sooner be told on my phone at home that there isn't a spot for you in our park, then drive 300 miles and find out there isn't one, and park out in the street somewhere. I think you'd have to agree with that.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I want to say as well, Mr. Minister, that at least in southern Saskatchewan the parks are getting badly overcrowded. And I suggest, Mr. Minister, that an expansion of the parks system in southern Saskatchewan is badly needed. In the areas around the major cities, and particularly the Moose Jaw and Regina, and also Saskatoon, I understand — not as much because they can go North — but in the southern part of the province, these parks are badly overcrowded.

And I suggest, Mr. Minister, that plans ought to be afoot to expand the parks system. There's not a monumental amount of money involved, and a lot of people in this province get a lot of good, cheap recreation, and wholesome recreation, out of the parks. But it is just getting to the point where it's getting more and more difficult, because they're getting so badly overcrowded. I'd suggest, Mr. Minister, that you ought to have plans afoot to significantly expand the park system in the southern part of the province?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I think we are addressing that problem in the southern part of the province by . . . We had a study done last year on Lake Diefenbaker. We have identified a lot of areas that can be developed. And we're going to be starting on those this summer with the New Careers Corporation program — taking people off of welfare, putting them to work, in preparation for developments to take place.

And you're well aware that Diefenbaker Lake is very close to Swift Current; it's very close to Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, and Regina. It's only an hour or so's drive from any one of those cities. And I think that is a great place to start developments of campground facilities, if we identify that, or whatever is needed out there. And we're going to be spending quite a number of dollars out there this summer.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, how much money do you have budgeted for the expansion of the park system? And by how many additional sites do you expect to bring on-stream in the southern part of the province?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — We sent that information across to the member from Athabasca earlier.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Minister, negotiations for a grassland park have been going on a long time.



And can you just give us a quick update on where it's at and what's happening?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I first must indicate that you had your shot at it for 10 years, and finally signed an agreement in 1981 that we disagreed with. We have had ongoing negotiations with Ottawa, with Charles Caccia, the Hon. Charles Caccia, the Minister of Parks Canada, and Minister of Environment also. And we've made a lot of headway. Instead of a 50-50 cost-sharing agreement, we feel that our donation of 80 to 90 per cent of the land in the park is our contribution — that they should buy the deeded land, and compensate the ranchers that go into the park core, all federally paid for by the federal government.

Parks Canada has exercised its option to purchase the Larson ranch, which was an estate. Updated appraisals have been undertaken on the Walker and Perrault ranches in preparation for acquisition negotiations.

The provincial position on the oil and gas exploration program is being prepared by Energy and Mines, and we will be doing some work out there. I think the budget is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2 million. I'm not sure if that's the exact figure. You can ask that question when the Hon. Minister of Energy and Mines, Paul Schoenhals, comes into his estimates.

We will continue to proceed with the negotiations that we have started, and we hope that within months, or even weeks, that we can sign that agreement, and that in fact they can open the grasslands national park on the centennial year of the first national park established, which was the Banff National Park in 1885. And we hope that they can open it in 1985.

**Mr. Engel:** — The member from Moosomin says we won't get elected on this subject. I don't pretend to be an expert on the grasslands parks, but it's been around as long as I have, and the negotiations have been. And I understood from a meeting we attended down in Val Marie that there is some delay in exploration. Could you update me just on where that's at? There was a program laid out that you'd have to have the exploring done by a certain time. Is this new agreement, this \$2 million or whatever you suggested, is that part of the agreement you're signing now with the feds? Have you renegotiated the drilling or the seismic agreement, or have they relented a little bit on that one?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — The national parks have a regulation in place where oil and gas exploration cannot take place after a park is established. So if they purchase the Larson ranch, there is a large enough area there to start a park, and that oil and gas exploration will be done during the summer of 1984 and early '85.

**Mr. Engel:** — The gas and oil exploration has been completed on the Larson ranch?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — No, I just indicated that that's what the money in Energy and Mines . . . I don't know the exact figure. You can ask the minister when he comes to his estimates, but there is money allocated to do the gas and oil exploration on that particular piece of property I mentioned, the Larson ranch, in 1984 and '85.

**Mr. Engel:** — That's as far as you're going now with the gas and oil exploration. You're not doing the whole 300 sections or whatever was involved in that first core?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Yes, it's going to be an ongoing thing, but that's an Energy and Mines question, really. I'm just indicating a figure. I'm not sure if that's the exact figure or not for '84-85. But it's going to be ongoing as more land comes on-stream within the park area.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Minister, is that the same figure that was originally in the agreement? That was the exploration that was supposed to have been done in the winter-time a couple of years ago, already? That they called a special meeting complaining that that exploration had been held up and it was agreed to be done two winters ago, already. And is this that exploration that you

now plan to getting around to doing, or is this a second agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Okay, the . . . In the agreement, there was to be 100 square miles of gas and oil exploration take place over a five year period, and that five years isn't up yet.

**Mr. Engel:** — I think the agreement was that 20 square miles a year would have been accomplished, and I think the Larson ranch, and some of the other places . . . The concern from the ranchers down there, Mr. Minister, is that your government is dragging their feet on doing the exploration down there, because they'd like to . . . They have a buyer; they want to retire; and they want to quit — especially in some cases, where there is a family health problem, and so on. And there is only one buyer, and that's the federal government.

And I think until that exploration is done . . . Will the federal government take an option to purchase on it, prior to the exploration being done, or is everything keyed or hinged on you finishing off your exploration? I think that's the basic question the farmers are asking down there.

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

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, the feds are negotiating with the Larson estate right now, and once that is done, and the gas . . . Then they get the surface rights. Once the gas and oil exploration is complete in that area, then they have all the rights.

But it's amazing to me for you to say that we're dragging our feet. You dragged yours for 10 years, and did absolutely nothing. Look at what we've accomplished. We're going to have that thing in place by 1985, in a measly three years, and you had 10. I think that we've accomplished a lot, in comparison to what you did.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I wonder if I could ask the minister if he personally is in favour of the grasslands park at Killdeer and Val Marie.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Yes, I am, or I certainly wouldn't be negotiating trying to get the thing established.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — So it's your own personal opinion that the grasslands park is a good idea, and it should be continued. And if there were a Progressive Conservative government, by some chance, elected federally, that would continue on, and you would be in favour of continuing the park in the present form?

I just want to make sure that it's on record, so that later on if things start to change, we know where you're at on this issue. And I think what you're telling me is that you're firmly in favour of continuing on with the grasslands park in its present form.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I would probably . . . Probably I should indicate that if we'd of had a Conservative government in Ottawa from 1971 to 1981, we'd of had the park in place a long time ago. What we've done in a short two years is more than anybody had done for the last 20.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that — for my friends in Val Marie — that we — Francis Walker and others who are fans of the NDP — that they'll be very interested in knowing that the minister is in favour of their grasslands park. And I just wanted to get that straightened out.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, I have a couple of short questions here, and one is regarding supplies to parks. How do you provide supplies to parks? Do you tender out different supplies to the stores or the chalets of the different parks, or do you just appoint someone to provide you with the supplies?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I'd have to answer your question with a question. What kind of supplies are you talking about?

**Mr. Lusney:** — I'm simply talking about supplies to the chalets or the stores, be it bread and pastries or groceries. Where do they pick up their supplies? Or how do you accrue the supplies for the different chalets?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — They use the invite bids for the supplies,. Yes, some of them are private and they handle their own, but, I mean, they invite bids in the ones . . . (inaudible) . . .

**Mr. Lusney:** — Okay, you're saying that you do have some tendering down on the different, probably in the different parks. They would have different methods of acquiring their supplies. I'll give you a specific case — Duck Mountain Park. And I have a baker that complained to me last week that he had put in a tender for the supplies. He felt that he went below, and he certainly went below the company that did get the contract for supplying Duck Mountain, and he was wondering just how that's approved. Do you take the lowest tender, or do you just make a choice from the people that did tender on it, or how do you decide who gets the contract?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, we take invitational bids, and we usually choose the lowest tender. But if you have a specific one that you would like to bring to my attention, I invite you to do so, because I would like to have a look at it.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Very well, Mr. Minister, I will do that. The one that I did mention was a baker in Kamsack, and this was the contract for supplying bread and pastries to the chalet at Duck Mountain Park. I don't know if your people are aware of that situation or not. If they aren't, then I will bring the information to you at a later time and see if we can't come to some resolution of it.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — We don't have that information here, but if you bring it to our attention, we will check it out for you.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Okay, thank you, Mr. Minister, I will. One other question: — what developments do you have planned for Duck Mountain for this coming year?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Okay, at the Duck Mountain Provincial Park, we will be spending \$400,000 on sewer and water; at the golf, repairs to the golf clubhouse — \$22,000; and Duck Mountain sanitary clearing — \$3,000.

**Mr. Lusney:** — I was aware of those, Mr. Minister. What I was really referring to: are you going to have any private development within the park in this coming year?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — We haven't any idea, exactly, if there will be any private sector investment in Duck Mountain Park, but there was a good deal of interest last summer. We put out calls for a proposal on the, on fixed-roof accommodation in the way of a hotel with a licensed dining room. We didn't receive any formal proposals after that from the people that were interested, so the department officials, right now, are reviewing the process and endeavouring to determine the reason for no proposals being submitted. And we have no idea why they didn't come in. The application forms went out, but the proposals didn't come in.

**Mr. Lusney:** — What you're saying then, Mr. Minister, is that of the people that showed some interest in the development within the park, when you asked for proposals, none of them have submitted a formal proposal to you as to what they might want to develop. They just showed some interest, but didn't really submit a proposal.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Yes. We advertised for proposals for, I think, something like 60 days, and the deadline was April 18th, and nothing came in. But we did have two or three interested

groups or individuals that came in and met with me in my office, indicating that they were interested in putting in a fixed-roof accommodation, but no formal submission was received.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Are you going to call for proposals again, or are you still waiting for someone to come forward on their own?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Well, I guess I would have to say that we were disappointed. They showed a great deal of interest, but didn't submit a proposal — I mean, a formal proposal — to us, after showing a great deal of interest. And we're going to check into it and see why they didn't send in their proposals, because we didn't deny them or turn them down. They just withdrew them — never withdrew them, but, I mean, they just didn't send them in.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, I think one of the problems there — because I've talked to some of the people that were interested — and they felt there was a deadline, apparently, on when they had to submit their proposals by.

Some of them that were interested talked to the department, and because of some of the red tape there, they felt it would take a lot longer than what they had in the deadline, and therefore they just dropped the issue. But if you're saying that you're still interested, I will inform them of that, and they can — if they're interested yet — can go and talk to the department, and make a proposal.

I have one other question, then, Mr. Minister, and I suppose you can answer both of them at the same time, then.

With the development that you've been planning for the different parks, has the department done a study of any kind as to what the impact will be of this private development within the parks; whether you have facilities there to accommodate more people within the park; or what impact is it really going to have on the park system itself?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — What we've tried to do is identify, in each respective park, what was needed — whether it be accommodation; fast food outlets; recreation facilities, such as miniature golf courses, and so on, so that . . . And we don't plan on making zoos out of the parks, by any means.

And when people come in and say we're interested in doing something in a certain park, then we put out a call for proposals, so everybody has a shot at them. Then we'll review them, and make a decision on which ones go, or which one goes, or whatever.

And I think that is at no cost to the taxpayers of the province. We lease the property, and we get a percentage of their gross income, with no investment. And we generate revenues that way, and I think its better to do it through the private sector than do it with the public's money.

**Mr. Lusney:** — One other question, Mr. Minister: Greenwater Park. Have you had any proposals, or have you asked for proposals, for development in Greenwater Park?

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Mr. Chairman, we didn't ask for proposals at Greenwater Provincial Park, but we had one unsolicited proposal come in for a craft shop, and we're negotiating the lease at this present time.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Then there were no other proposals for any larger developments within the park.

Mr. Minister, regarding that park itself — I know you're interested in providing or increasing the tourist traffic to all the parks in the province. And what maybe you can do at this point is use your influence with the minister of pot-holes and try to get that highway repaired to Greenwater

Park, because that one has been in terrible condition recently. And you could, sort of, talk to your colleague, and tell him to see if he can get that highway picked up, so people going to Greenwater would have a little smoother road and still have a car when they get there.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 39 agreed to.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**PARKS AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES**

**Capital Expenditure — Vote 40**

Items 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 40 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**PARKS AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 39 agreed to.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

**Hon. Mr. Pickering:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the opposition for their line of questioning. It was very interesting for me, for the first time as the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources. And at the very same time, I would like to congratulate my staff on the superb job that they did in preparation for these estimates.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the minister, and to thank his staff for their co-operation in going through his department today.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 6**

**Item 1**

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

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce to you and the

members of the opposition, Mr. Bill Reader, deputy minister of Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. Immediately behind me — Mr. Don Trew, who's the director of administration.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, Mr. Minister, would you give me the names of your personal staff, their job titles, responsibilities, and salaries?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I could send that over to you right now. I don't have their responsibilities. I have their names, their job description, and amount per month, if that's sufficient.

**Mr. Shillington:** — That will do for now. I would ask that you provide me with the description of their responsibilities in due course. I gather I have the minister's undertaking to provide that.

Can you provide me similarly with the salaries of the deputy minister, and any other executive officers in the department, their job titles, responsibilities, and, as I said, salaries?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes, I have a list, again, of the directors of the branches that you've asked for. Again, they're monthly salaries and yearly salaries, but not description. If you like, I shall have that provided to you at a later time.

**Mr. Shillington:** — That'll be satisfactory if you send it over.

Mr. Minister, in your estimates, you have fewer personnel under all three subvotes. Mr. Minister, your annual report also shows a continuing decline in the membership. I suggest, Mr. Minister, the two are related. This government doesn't believe in co-ops; isn't promoting co-ops; and the effects are beginning to show, Mr. Minister. The membership is declining, and your, your staff complement is declining, Mr. Minister, and I suggest the two are related.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if, in light of the declining membership, we should not be increasing the staff complement rather than decreasing it.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, and the member of Regina Centre, it's true that the Department of Co-operatives is now leaner than it was in the years of your administration, but leaner doesn't mean weaker, as far as we're concerned. Leaner means more efficient, and learner means better.

We have a present complement of staff of 65, whereas I look back in 1981-82, when you were the administration, you had 79 positions in the Department of Co-operatives. And I can say with all confidence in my staff right now, that they are doing a better job than they did in years previous. There's no doubt about that. We've done many things in the last two years, since April, 1982.

For example, we've brought in a new co-operatives act. We're in the process of bringing in a new credit union act, after a series of hearings with co-op members and the public of Saskatchewan.

We've had communications, great communications, with the leaders of central co-ops in the province of Saskatchewan — the presidents and the chief executive officers — and on many, many occasions, they have indicated to me, and indicated to my deputy minister, that the communications now are better than they have ever been, because they are being treated as equals, not as political pawns, as they were from 1971 to 1982.

Co-operatives are growing; co-operatives are thriving. They are vital to the province of Saskatchewan. We know that, they know that, and they respect, and they speak highly of the new communication that they have with the present government.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, Mr. Minister, the membership of the co-ops may be thriving, but they're not growing. I refer you to page 17, credit union statistics.

The membership is actually — page 17 of your annual report — the membership in the credit unions has declined. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that you're failing your fundamental purpose, and that is to promote this co-operativism.

You may have brought in a new act; you may have a number of initiatives. I don't know what they are, and I hope before these estimates are through to find out. But, Mr. Minister, you're not fulfilling the fundamental function of your department, and that is promoting co-operativism. And the proof of the pudding is in the eating, Mr. Minister. The membership of the credit unions is on the decrease. And I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that you need more people in the field working on behalf of co-operativism, and not less.

There are some things, Mr. Minister, that I think are unique to Saskatchewan, and one of the things that has made this province unique is the strength of the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan. And to the extent that it is weakened, some of the fabric of this province is going to be lost. Your department, Mr. Minister; and you will be held responsible for that, for your stewardship has not been one of growth, but one of a weakening of the fabric.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, if you are doing your duty, you would be increasing the staff in this department, and not decreasing it. The decreasing staff in this department simply reflects the decreased importance given to the co-operative movement by this government.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, first, Mr. Chairman, I would comment that — as I did in my first comments — that leaner is not necessarily weaker. The Federated Co-operatives, as you probably well know, when restraint came along, when tough times came along, decreased their staff. They did it for a reason. They had to cut costs; they did. They trimmed the fat in many, many areas, and losing propositions with various retails had to be abandoned for the sake of survival of some of the retails out there.

When you look at the credit union system, the membership there has varied in the last couple of years, but has been a purposeful movement by the credit union system to purge members that weren't using the services and the facilities provided by their credit unions. There is no purpose in having a member who has \$1 sitting in his savings account in a credit union. So that is part of the reason for the variance in membership over the past 10 years or so.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that the fat was wrung out of that department long before this government took office. That department had even more staff in the days when I was minister, in the mid '70s. That department had more staff than it has now. The fat was wrung out of that department, and what you're cutting out is the meat in the bone of that department. That department is simply not able to do the job in the promotion of co-operativism that needs to be done. You have lost 14 staff, and there simply weren't that many extra personnel.

Co-operativism, Mr. Minister, cannot be promoted through slick ads on television. What you need is personal contact. You need people, and you haven't got those people. You've let them go.

Mr. Minister, for the sake of the co-op movement, I sincerely hope that the next election is sooner, rather than later, and you people go to your just rewards, because if you don't, the pieces are going to be that much harder to pick up.

Mr. Minister, I call upon you to go back to treasury board and to get this staff back, because you need them, and the co-op movement needs them. The Government of Saskatchewan has

played an important role in the development in the co-operative spirit in Saskatchewan. It isn't of any importance to you people. That's shown by the budget. You've cut staff.

And, Mr. Minister, you're doing not only the co-op movement a disservice, but you are doing the heritage of this province a disservice, because the co-op movement has played an integral part in the development of our province, and members of this caucus hope the co-op movement goes on playing that important role. And I just wish that sentiment was shared by members opposite.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, it's just that kind of talk, this kind of rhetoric, that's coming out of this member from Regina Centre, that . . . Co-operators all over the province of Saskatchewan have told me that they despise that kind of hypocritical statements that have been coming out of you people for 10 years, using them as political footballs. They want to be treated as equals in the economic sector of the province of Saskatchewan.

And as a matter of fact, despite the recession, the co-op sector has continued to grow, despite what you're trying to state over there. Membership in co-operatives increased from 457,000 in 1981 to 478,000 in 1982. That's a considerable increase, 457 to 478, and indications are that membership is continuing to grow.

Sales and services also increased to 747 million in 1982, from 686 million in 1981. That was during the height of the so-called recession in Canada, and in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, my deputy minister, former employee of Federated Co-operatives, and my good friend the director of administration, will be first in line to tell you that when they moved into this department, morale was at an all-time low. People there didn't know what they were there for. We came in, made some reorganization, made some cuts where we thought it was necessary, trimmed, packaged, and now morale is high.

Everyone in the Department of Co-operatives has aims and objectives and knows where they are going. And that objective is the development of co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan. We're proud of what we're doing; they're proud of their job.

As for the subject of field-workers, we have field-workers in nine centres in the province of Saskatchewan, from Regina, Saskatoon, North Battleford, Tisdale, and so on; Weyburn, and Estevan, and Swift Current, and Kindersley; and out of those nine centres, branch centres, only two positions, only two positions less than in April of 1982. They're getting the job done. They're doing it well.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Where were the two positions in the field offices cut, Mr. Minister? Where were those two positions cut from?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — One in Prince Albert, and one in La Ronge, and the position in La Ronge is in the state where it's about to be filled.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, you said you cut two positions. How can you be about to fill a position you cut? Mr. Minister, that doesn't make any sense.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I'm informed there were three positions in La Ronge. There is one presently filled, in operation, and one more that will be filled. So that would account for the other position.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, it's always the positions away from the head office that are cut. You always cut the job of the man you don't know. And I'm sorry to see that, Mr. Minister. I'm sorry to see that you had to cut the field positions. The field positions, I think, are vitally important. Those field offices out in those regional areas are important to people who believe in co-operativism, and want to use the co-operative movement. And it is regrettable that you



chose to cut the jobs of the people you didn't know. That's always what a government does — cut the job of the man you don't know; save the job of the people you do, without really a great deal of regard for what's needed and what isn't.

Mr. Minister, I want to go on record as being critical of any cut in the field positions in this department, Mr. Minister. The field offices are a vital part of the work of the co-operative movement. The co-operative movement is largely a rural phenomenon, largely a rural phenomenon. There are a great many co-operatives, and a great many more co-operators reside in the riding of the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, or the member from Shaunavon, or the member from Pelly, than there reside in the member from Elphinstone, or the member from Regina Centre. Co-operativism . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What about Shaunavon?

**Mr. Shillington:** — I said Shaunavon. Co-operativism is a rural phenomenon. And those people should be out in the country where the co-operators are. They should . . . You should not be cutting jobs in the field offices. If you've got to cut jobs, and I would rather . . . We, obviously, are saying you shouldn't. But you shouldn't be cutting the jobs in the field offices. The co-op movement is a rural phenomenon, and those people are needed out in the country.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I certainly agree with the member from Regina Centre, and as far as the field services workers are concerned in the area of development, they are still in place. I invite you to phone every branch office in the province of Saskatchewan and ask them if their field-worker is still there. Their answer will be yes, except in the area of La Ronge, where we're about to put another person in there, and because of the demise of department of northern Saskatchewan, we inherited one worker from the department of northern Saskatchewan about to fill another position. As far as the PA position is concerned, that was the field-worker in the area of examination services, not in the area of development.

**Mr. Shillington:** — It's illustrative of this government's priorities that you have increased by \$120,000 other expenses on communication and development. You're increasing the amount spent on ads, with a decrease in the people. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, that you promote co-operativism through personal contact. And the increasing amount spent on advertising is not going to promote co-operativism, it's going to promote the Progressive Conservative Party.

And I suggest that Nancy McLean has everything to do with the increase in your budget, and the co-operativism in it by itself has very little to do. Mr. Minister, you ought to be ashamed of yourself for increasing your advertising budget and decreasing people, because it's people that sell co-operativism and not slick ads on television.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, my only reply to that is that I've been out to every area of the province of Saskatchewan promoting co-operation myself. I've been to Pine House, I've been to La Ronge, I've been to Cumberland House, I've been to Edam, I've been to Bethune, I've been to . . . Where else have I been? I've been to Kindersley, I've been to Swift Current, I've been to Saskatoon, I've been to all the areas promoting co-operation in the province of Saskatchewan. So has my deputy minister and even my director of administration. And we have a person now who is a director of the field service workers — a new position — and his objective is to increase the contact with the field-worker to the people out there interested in developing co-ops, and of course maintaining that contact with existing co-operatives. So I don't buy what you're saying at all.

I believe in co-operatives. This government believes in co-operatives. We have a strong department that is working well, doing its job, albeit with fewer people than you had. And when it goes along with your government's increasing the public service in this province 10,000 from 1971 to 1982, it only makes sense that we can do the job with 5 less people than when we came in in 1982. We're not fat cats in this civil service.

**Mr. Shillington:** — You're not competent cats, either. You're incompetent cats. You're simply not doing the job that needs to be done on behalf of co-operativism. I think, Mr. Minister, the change in the department is illustrated by a memorandum from one, Bet Reader, I think, is the signature, deputy minister of co-operativism and co-operative development, to all management committee. And it reads as follows:

Please advise all staff that no type of communication going forward from this department should contain the phrase 'co-operative movement'. Co-operation is not to be referred to as a movement by any verbal or visual communication, beginning immediately.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that that illustrates the change in this government. This government wants the co-ops to act like any other business. Big business and small business have their role in any economy. But, Mr. Minister, the co-op movement is something different. And if you don't understand that the co-op is a movement, then you're never going to be very successful in promoting the philosophy. I ask you, Mr. Minister, where did this nitwit of a communication originate from?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, I can probably tell you a few things about the co-op movement. I'm a member of four co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan, two credit unions, two retail co-ops. I was a member of the board of a day care co-operative in Saskatoon. So don't you tell me about the co-op movement.

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

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Now, if you want to stand here and argue about the choice of words, you can do that. It's a matter of semantics, but that doesn't mean anything to the solid, down-to-earth folks who are members of co-operatives out there: whether it's called a movement, whether it's called a system, whether it's called a retail store, whether it's called a day care, or whatever. But I've never heard a more ridiculous argument in all my life than the one you're putting forward.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Why did you instruct the staff not to use the word "movement"?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — This is a memo signed by the deputy minister, not signed by me. However, if you refer to the co-operative enterprise in the province of Saskatchewan, the approximately 200 retailers that make up the umbrella under Federated Co-operatives, you can ask them that they — and I'm sure they'll tell you — they don't want to be referred to as a movement.

When I think of a movement, I don't think of the co-operative system. I think of it as something dynamic, something that is charging ahead, something that is meeting the thrust of the 1980s. I certainly don't think of it as a movement.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, then you don't understand co-ops. The whole basic philosophy underpinning co-ops is that it is a grass-roots movement. It is not something that some entrepreneur . . . And they play an important role in the province of Saskatchewan. And it's the responsibility of the member sitting behind you to promote the entrepreneurs. But a co-op is not started by some entrepreneur in Gravelbourg. A co-op arises out of a grass-roots desire to get together and to co-operate to provide a basic service. And that is, Mr. Minister, a movement; that is a movement, Mr. Minister.

And I ask you again why you prohibit the people of your department of describing the co-op people for what it is — it is a grass-roots movement. It is not something that began with a few or many entrepreneurs. I ask you, Mr. Minister, why do you try to strip the co-op movement of its

essence, which is a grass-roots movement?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, I can tell the member opposite that there are many in the co-operative sector of Saskatchewan, or the co-operative system, whatever you want to call it, who don't want to be known as a movement. Those who do wish to call their co-operatives "movements", I have no objection to that.

I know that my deputy minister has said that he prefers not to call it the co-operative movement, and he's been working with them since 1950 . . . 1957. The deputy minister has been working in the co-operative retailing system. He chooses to be not to be known as a movement. I would also choose that also. But what others in the co-operative system want to call themselves, that's up to them.

But I associate movements, as I've said, with something else. And it almost has the rebellious sound about it or something. I don't think that co-operatives are rebellious.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I see. I see. The co-op people who got together in Assiniboia, or Shaunavon, or Kamsack, and formed this store which provided groceries in that community, they somehow or other are rebels. And they're rebels, and this is the establishment of the new Jerusalem.

Mr. Minister, that is absolute and patent nonsense, and it is spoken out of ignorance for the history and heritage of the co-op. The co-op movement began as a grass-roots movement, and that's why it is called a movement, because it began with the people. It didn't begin with some entrepreneur. And they have served a valuable purpose, and I hope their role is continued and expanded.

All right, Mr. Minister, I'd ask you to do your duty and that is to assist those people in the province, be they wanting to start a day care, be they wanting to start a grocery store, be they wanting to start a service-fee co-op, which I happen to belong to. Let them call it what it is; it's a movement. I belong to the service-fee co-op, and it wasn't begun by any entrepreneur, Mr. Minister. It was begun by a group of people in Regina who thought they had a better way. I happened to agree with them. We might prove us wrong. We might all lose our \$250, but I'm prepared to roll the dice and try it.

And I suppose probably there are those in the established co-ops who don't look with favour on this, on this up-start, this service-fee co-op. But it is a movement. It began with the people on the streets of Regina saying, "Hey, we can get food into our kitchens cheaper." And they got a right to try. And that, Mr. Minister, is a movement, that is not an enterprise. An enterprise is something that somebody, some entrepreneur, starts, and that doesn't describe the service-fee co-op.

The service-fee co-op, Mr. Minister, began with the people, the ordinary common people on the streets of Regina who thought they had a better way. I ask you, Mr. Minister, to withdraw this letter; but more important than withdrawing this letter, I ask you, Mr. Minister, to come to terms with what the co-op is in this province, and understand it to be a movement, which is where it began — and it's got a new future. That's where it's going to be in the future.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, we've done our job with that service-fee co-op that you're referring to. We helped them through the incorporation province and whether you want to call them a movement or not, whether they want to be called a movement, that's fine. I'm a member of, as I said, four co-ops. I don't want to be known as a member with a movement.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, that's right, that's exactly it. The member from Prince Albert describe it. This smacks to this right-wing government as being left wing. Anything which begins with the people and which has its roots in the ordinary lives of the ordinary people is left

wing; that's socialism. That's rebellion, as the minister says. It is nothing of the such. It is nothing of the such. The Royal Bank of Canada is an enterprise. The service-free co-op is a movement, and, Mr. Minister, you ought to resign. You really ought to resign if you don't understand, you don't know any more confidence than that.

Mr. Minister, you have cut staff all over the department. This is just to be known, I suppose, as the dark ages of co-ops. Mr. Minister, you've cut two staff in administrative services. Would you tell me where you cut those people?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I'm informed that there were two full-time education co-ordinators, but now the programming aspect has been turned over to the co-op organizations themselves, the central co-ops like, FCL, wheat pool, Credit Union Central, and so on, and the co-op college. So we have two seconded teachers now, which gives us the flexibility of providing an in-service, any type of service, that is required out there.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, Mr. Minister, what you've just finished telling us is you've cut the educational function from your department. You're no longer in the business of supplying the Department of Education with materials which will enable students in this province to learn about the co-operative movement, and to learn about the philosophy of the co-op movement.

And I know that that is what this government wants, because you don't want the co-op movement around in 20 years. You don't believe in it. It is, as the member from Prince Albert said, leftist stuff. It's rebellious, as the minister says, and I know, I can understand why you would cut from your department the educational function.

Mr. Minister, I have heard concerns expressed with respect to the issuance of preferred shares under the co-op act. Mr. Minister, the time-honoured principle of co-operativism was one member, one vote; and division of profits in accordance with participation in the co-op — the patronage dividend.

Mr. Minister, Mr. Minister, we now have a system which is totally foreign to that, the system of preferred shares. And I have heard a goodly amount of concern expressed about that. Because now somebody who issues preferred shares does not distribute profits in accordance with patronage. You now distribute profits in accordance with the number of shares you have.

And that, heretofore, has not been the system. And I ask you, Mr. Minister, if you have not heard this concern expressed and if you don't share it?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well the member has put forward several questions. I will try to answer them all at this time. We are still fulfilling the education function within the Department of Co-operatives with seconded teachers. We have one in Regina and one in Saskatoon. They're working with the schools, the universities, and the superintendents, etc., to promote the teaching methods, the thrusts in education, that we are providing.

As far as the matter of preferred shares, that was written into the new act at the request of the co-op membership. We didn't write it in. They requested it, so it was put into the new act. They agreed to it. You were here in the House last year when we went through the act, bit by bit by bit, and you heard all the letters that we received from all the co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan saying that act is exactly what they wanted. And preferred shares are not compulsory.

You have been unsuccessfully trying to drive a wedge between this government and the co-operatives of the province of Saskatchewan, and you haven't been successful. I invite you to go talk to the chief executive officers and the presidents of all the major co-operatives in this province, and ask them what they feel they are getting from the Department of Co-operation of this government. They are getting communication; they are getting co-operation. I invite you to

ask that of them.

So your days of using co-operatives as a political football are over, my friend. We have a former member of Federated Co-operatives, and a member working with the co-operatives for 30 years, as the deputy minister here. I am a member of four co-operatives myself; a former member of a day-care co-operative. I know what the co-operative system is all about. I know what it means. I know it means one member, one vote; and I know it means people doing together what they can't do by themselves. So don't try and drive a wedge between me and the co-operative system in the province of Saskatchewan, or a wedge between this government and the co-operators in this province.

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

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — This is the first government that has achieved an economic union with the co-operative sector in this province — a \$600 million upgrader. And you people have been crying crocodile tears since the day that project was announced.

This government also instituted the centre of co-op studies at the University of Saskatchewan. You've been crying crocodile tears since that project went ahead. You have nothing; you have nothing to drive a wedge between us.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I don't have to, Mr. Minister. You're doing that yourself with your approach to the co-operative movement.

Mr. Minister, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you about The Credit Union Act. I want to ask you where "the new credit union act" stands. You are, I gather, coming forward with new legislation for the credit union system called "the new credit union act." I ask you where it is.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The proposed new credit union act has gone through two series of hearings, whereby we travelled through the province of Saskatchewan in the summer of 1983 and again in February of this year — open and public hearings.

The input was received from the board of directors, the members, and anyone else who wanted to contribute to those hearings. My department, after those first two sets of hearings were completed, received briefs from anyone in the province — looked over their suggestions. At this point, the department is in the process of drawing up draft legislation, and that's where it stands now.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, can you give me the membership of the co-op guarantee board and their remuneration, if any?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Co-operative guarantee board: the deputy minister is the chairman, Morley Meiklejohn of Regina; Henry Zacharias of Meadow Lake; Les Cowen of Sifton; Robert Linnell of Weyburn. And the per diem is \$75.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Can you give me the number and dollar value of loans guaranteed by the co-op board in the 1983-84 fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Loan guarantees were nil in '83-84.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I missed that because of the chatter. I gather it's nil.

Can you give me the number and the dollar value of any loans of all loans in default?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — There are no loans in default at this time.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, can you tell me how many new co-ops were incorporated in the '83-84, during the '83-84 fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — There were 31 incorporations — 32, pardon me.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Versus 107 in the year we left office. Mr. Minister, I'm not going to go through it all again. Suffice it to say, it's proof of what I've been saying — is government isn't promoting co-operativism and it is being stymied.

Mr. Minister, and all I can say is: I hope for the sake of the co-operative movement that you call the next election later rather than earlier, because I think that it is clear that whenever you call it, you're going to be gone. The co-operative movement dearly needs that.

Mr. Minister, I would ask you about this fate of CCIL (Canadian Co-operative Implements Ltd.), CI (Co-operative Implements). I guess it's not . . . My rural colleagues tell me I'm out of date — it's now called CI. Mr. Minister, is the company in good financial health, or where does the company stand now? It has gone through some difficult periods, and I'd ask you just for an update on it.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — We don't have the financial statement of Co-op Implements on hand, but our representative on the board tells us that the outlook for 1984-85 is optimistic. They face the same problems that implement industries have faced all over the country and in North America, but they appear to be bouncing back.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I sincerely hope that's accurate, Mr. Minister. The CI has played an important part in the agricultural industry, and I hope it's here for many more years to come to play an important role.

Mr. Minister, with respect to co-operatives' securities, can you give me the number and dollar value of all securities, of all applications reviewed? Then I'm going to ask you — you can answer all at once — then I'm going to ask you for the number and dollar value of all new securities approved.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — If you can give us a suitable time period, we'll supply you with that information. We don't have it with us.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Okay, I'll accept that, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I wonder if the minister would advise of the general state of credit unions in the province, and I'm not asking how the credit unions are doing. I've read the figures. But I was looking for whether or not any of them are in difficulty, so as to require the services of the mutual aid board, and I know that's not the right name, but what a year ago would have been called the mutual aid board.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, the system is basically healthy. I'm informed that there are two of three credit unions that are under supervision of the deposit guarantee corporation, as it's known now.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you indicate that two or three are under the supervision. Without inquiring as to the names of the credit unions, could you give me, in rough terms, whether their assets total \$1 million, or their gross assets, or, or \$50 million. Are they big credit unions or small credit unions?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The Leader of the Opposition, we'd be willing to supply you with that information. We don't have it on hand, although I am informed that they are smaller credit unions in the area of about \$1 million in assets.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would the minister be in a position to indicate — and this may or may not be within the knowledge of the department officially — how many of the retail outlets affiliated with Federated Co-operatives Limited operated at a loss last year? Perhaps that question is too precise, but clearly the retail branch of the co-op movement is, perhaps, in the most difficulty at the moment. It appears to be coming out of it, and I would like a comment from the minister on whether or not there are going to be a large number of casualties in his opinion, or smaller number of casualties. Are we going to have a lot of Rostherns, or are we not going to have a lot of co-ops going to the wall?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well at my last meeting with Federated Co-operatives they tell me that their bottom line as far as retails is concerned has improved some \$30 million this year over last. And I know that at the annual meeting of Federated Co-operatives held earlier this spring in Saskatoon, the chief executive officer indicated to me that they had an increase of approximately 16 million from 1982 to 1983. Nine million in savings in '82, to 25 million in 1983, and you refer to Rosthern. That is the only autonomous retail that I know of that has failed in the last 12 months I believe it is, and it's been indicated to me that Federated Co-operatives expects no failures in the coming year.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

#### **Item 4**

**Mr. Shillington:** — If I recall item 4, this is the grants to co-ops.

The figure is precisely the same as last year, Mr. Minister, and sometimes these grant programs, every dollar is earmarked, and you know with some degree of exactitude where the money is going. Is that the case here — are there specific programs for which the money is earmarked, and you could therefore tell us what's going to be spent on each area? Or is it something that's discretionary, that you play by ear as you go along?

If it's the former, would you give us a list of those who you would expect to apply for the grant. If it's the latter, would you then give us the people, or the institution, the co-ops, to which the grants were given last year.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — If my recollection is correct, we give grants to the La Conseil de la Cooperation, the co-op youth branch of the Co-operative College, and, of course, the centre for co-op studies at the University of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Shillington:** — There are no grants here for developing co-ops. And I'm not suggesting they should be given one. But if a service 'B' co-op were to apply for a start-up grant, I gather there is no money here for grants for development or start-ups?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — That's true. There are no grants available for those developing co-operatives. What we do as a department, and through our CMAs (co-operative management advisors) is direct them to access other departments where they can achieve grants. For example, I think of the Crocus Co-operative that achieved grants from the Department of Health. And I suppose retail co-ops of one kind or another could be accessed through the Department of Economic Development or Small Business and Tourism.

Item 4 agreed to.

Vote 6 agreed to.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I would like to thank the minister and his officials.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I, too, would like to thank the members of the opposition for their incisive questioning, and my officials, as well, for providing me with the information.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you. I want to thank the minister and his officials for coming to the House and assisting the House with the discharge of his duties.

## CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

### INDIAN AND NATIVE AFFAIRS SECRETARIAT

#### Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 25

##### Item 1

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

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Mr. Chairman, to my left is Ian Cowie, the secretary of Native Affairs Secretariat; John Reid, the senior policy analyst, — it's right here — and Harold Danchilla, a policy analyst, behind me as well.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just at the outset, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, just so that we're clear on the estimates here, I just want to mention the fact that this is the first time around for the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat under estimates, and that this is a relatively new department. This is, I believe, the first time that new branch is under review under the estimates portion of the Legislative Assembly.

To begin my questioning, Mr. Minister, I've taken a few notes here that I would like to begin by raising questions with respect to the '84-85 *Estimates*, page 49. I note on subvote 1, for other expenses, there is a large expenditure increase. I wonder if you may comment on that, Mr. Minister, and give an outline as to why that large expenditure increase slotted for that area.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I wish to advise the member that the latest figure reflects the actual value of it, and I think in the member's comments earlier, he really gave the reason for this expenditure difference. It's a new, new sector of government, and that's the reason for it.

**Mr. Yew:** — With respect to subvote no. 2, Mr. Minister, how much was actually expended to native organizations in the year '83-84, that fiscal year's operation? And the amounts of grants made, to whom it was made and . . . Well, I'll leave it at that for now.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The actual expenditure was 1,515,630. I can provide the member with an actual breakdown detailed statement, unless you have a specific figure you wish.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I would definitely wish to have a breakdown of the funding proposed, the funding that was there for the last fiscal year, and the funding proposed to the various organizations for the year, fiscal year '84-85. And to just supply you with more specific information about what I need, I could bring it to your attention that during the last estimates, when your department was under the Minister of Justice's portfolio, the minister for that department had provided me with a detailed account of grants to native organizations while we were doing estimates.

And on the information it has: annex 1, the 1983-84 grants to both Indian and native organizations which total 3,660,880; and number two, a comparison of 1982-83 grants to Indian organizations; and number three, a comparison of '82-83 and '83-84 grants to native



organizations. More specifically then, we had: to bands and districts' economic development funding allotment here of 2,072,000; and for policy development 112,350; and for land entitlement 119,900; and towards the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, we had a provincial liaison portion of the budget here for 35,000 communications; miscellaneous grants to FSI; and to the Saskatchewan Indian Women's Association, a budget allotment there as well; and to other groups and organizations, AMNSIS for an example, we had a budget allotment here to Wehta Matowin Communications Corporation and the friendship centres and also to the Saskatchewan Native Women's Association again.

There was a detailed budget information provided by the Minister of Justice at the time. And I wonder if you could provide some detailed information as well, Mr. Minister, with respect to the 1984-85 fiscal year's operations?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The figure that I quoted earlier was the core aspect of the funding. The total '83-84 actual expenditures were as follows: the total is \$3,508,669. And the breakdown is as follows: the Indian economic development fund, 1,980,713; Saskatchewan Indian Women's Association, \$96,300; provincial liaison FSIN, \$80,000; Indian probation program FSIN, 4,986; Key Band, 7,340; AMNSIS, \$846,180; AMNSIS constitutional funding, \$100,000; AIDA communications funding, \$101,650; Saskatchewan Association of Friendship Centres, \$175,000; Saskatchewan Native Women's Association, \$96,500; Saskatchewan Native Women's Association constitutional division, \$20,000.

The figure for the 1984-85 part of it is \$3,202,940 total.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you for the information, Mr. Minister, but you rather ran through that list quite expediently, and I couldn't get the specific figures. Could I ask the minister to provide that in written information please?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, I will.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, as I understand it you are giving the grants to third parties. And would you state the first one for me — the first one that you read out?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — That was the Indian economic development fund which was dispersal to the various bands at the band levels on economic development projects.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, was that the money you paid over to the fund, or was that the money that the fund paid over to somebody else?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, that was the exact amount of the money paid to the bands.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, without burdening you with giving a long list, or perhaps I will preface that by saying, to how many bands was money paid?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The number of projects funded were 49, and the number of bands funded was a little less than that because some bands had more than one. I might mention of the total amount I gave you, was expended to bands as some of that did go to FSIN, but the majority of it did go to the bands for these projects.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, might I ask the minister to forward to me, or to the member for Cumberland, a list of the projects which were so funded which add up to the total which you gave to the House, to the committee?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, I'll provide that.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I note in the subvote no. 2 that there's been a decrease in that portion of the funding by 13 per cent, or specifically, in dollar figures, 457,940. Why has that grant funding been cut by that much, Mr. Minister? Could you explain?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — This represented a general cut-back in expenditures directly to organizations, as our government directed the funding for human services, rather than organizational services. So that's what that represents.

**Mr. Yew:** — Okay. Getting back to the information that you will be forwarding to me later on, Mr. Minister, I want to raise the question of the land entitlement portion of your budget allotment here. Last year it was 119,900. What is this year's allotment to that area?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — This matter is still being reviewed, and there is no established provision for that at this point.

**Mr. Yew:** — There is no established funding, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — It's not possible for us to establish a precise figure that will be necessary in that regard. Therefore we are leaving it until we have a more precise indication of what will be required.

**Mr. Yew:** — Oh, then I gather, I conclude then, Mr. Minister, that you haven't done away with funding support for that portion, and that you will consider funding, providing support for it. Am I correct?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — We haven't determined the necessity or level at this time, and that's the position we're at.

**Mr. Yew:** — When can you get . . . Could you indicate a time as to when you will be able to determine your policy for such, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well that time will be determined when we have further progress in regards to land entitlement, and we are working with the Indian people in regards to that matter. And I suppose it's dependent on when we resolve the situation.

**Mr. Yew:** — I just want to raise a comment here, Mr. Minister. I note that your department was established just very recently, as recently as last spring. The issue I want to raise with you in respect to the process is that the question of consultation with the existing native, parent native organizations. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: what, in your own view, was the consultation process, and whether you as the minister for this department feels that the consultation and involvement of the native organizations was inadequate. I mean was adequate.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I wonder if the member could clarify the question. Are you talking about the consultation at the time of the formation of the secretariat, or consultation as an ongoing process between our government and the native groups?

**Mr. Yew:** — The consultation process establishing the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — On the change of the government, I'd like to advise the member that we saw the formation of the secretariat as a simplification of the former system. As the member may be aware, under the previous administration we had four sectors dealing with the issues that we now deal with as one sector.

Those were: the social planning secretariat, from the Department of Urban Affairs; the treaty Indian policy secretariat, Department of Agriculture; the treaty Indian liaison unit, Department of Agriculture; and the treaty Indian land entitlement division, Department of the Environment. We

felt that it was more efficient and more appropriate to deal with these issues in one secretariat, and that was the main reason for that process.

As far as consultation, we have consulted in previous years; we continue to consult with various native communities as far as their aspirations and the system they would like to see within government. And the secretariat is a reflection of those wishes and our beliefs in efficiency and producing a product that basically is acceptable to the native community.

**Mr. Yew:** — With respect to the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, Mr. Minister, could you tell me briefly and precisely what the mandate of the department is?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I might advise the member that the purpose of the secretariat and the mandate is actually in the legislation, which was enacted by this government, and I'll be pleased to supply the member with a copy of the act.

However, in general terms, the secretariat is there for the purpose of assisting in the development of policy across the government departments in relation to Indians, natives in communities, and everywhere in Saskatchewan. And we attempt to co-ordinate various government activities in relation to all departments. But the specifics of the mandate are actually in the act.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, wouldn't part of that mandate involve establishing a sound economic base for the native community?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Economic health is a prime concern of the secretariat, as well as other departments in this government, and we're involved in the determination of policy regarding economic development for Indians and Metis people of the province, and this is evidenced by our involvement with the Special ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act) arrangements, the ERDA (Economic and Regional Development Agreement) arrangements, the native study which was done by the Secretariat regarding economic development, and we continue to work in that area. So we are involved, and that is one of our primary concerns.

**Mr. Yew:** — With respect to ... following through on the same issue here, with respect to economic development, Mr. Minister, I have with me here a bit of information of a study which your department authorized. It's the project summary of the strategies for the socio-economic development of Metis and Non-Status Indians in Saskatchewan.

This report, as you know, Mr. Minister, was commissioned by your government in 1983, and it was conducted by the firm Zorn, Stevenson and Kellogg, and their final report submitted on the 26th of March of this year. In it we have a covering letter accompanying the report saying that it, plus public input, will later result in: "(a) in a socio-economic development policy which will be prepared and presented for consideration by the provincial cabinet."

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: does the minister agree with the major conclusions of the report that, (1) the government overall policy objectives in relation to native economic development are not clearly formulated.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I think it's clear from the part of the report referred to that the report talks about economic activities at all levels of government. And we certainly believe that, as time goes on, changes have to continue to be made in that field. The report, as the member may be aware, is an objective report. There are several recommendations that I agree with in the report. The report was made available to all cabinet ministers, and all native groups, and all communities with a degree of native content, for input back to us regarding the report. So it certainly isn't an indication of our policy, but I intend to take serious consideration of the recommendations and the findings in the report.

**Mr. Yew:** — I might add, Mr. Minister, that the second conclusion that the report concurred with was that the current level of activity devoted towards native economic development in Saskatchewan is probably insufficient to produce any significant narrowing of the gap between natives and non-natives, in terms of economic development. But indeed the level of provincial activity devoted to direct native economic development expansion may, if anything, be declining. Do you have any comment on that, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I think the report accurately indicates a number of shortfalls in our system that have been developing over a number of years, and I take the educational aspect of the report. I believe the report indicates that educational opportunities are limited for natives, and I use, as an example, our Department of Advanced Education and Manpower recognizing the fact that training must be necessary. I know in the member's own constituency, we all recognize that specific training, technical training is an absolute necessity. And we've lacked that for several years, and I think with the new technical school in Prince Albert, with satellite colleges in the northern communities, we can start to work in the direction that should have been taken possibly before by other levels of government as well. So I think the report accurately indicates the shortfalls. I certainly don't disagree with you on that.

**Mr. Yew:** — Now, Mr. Minister, I have with me here another report and it's entitled . . . It was submitted by the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians. It's called *The Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Foundation*, and it's a proposed strategy, framework, and program proposal. I understand, Mr. Minister, that this proposal was submitted to you and to your department. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, what commitment, if any, has your government arrived at towards this sound proposal that was submitted by AMNSIS?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No final decisions have been made on that particular report that the member's referring to. However, it has been considered interdepartmentally; it's been considered in the context of looking at the other proposals as well — the report that the member quoted earlier.

It's . . . Parts of the two reports, actually, coincide with each other. I think there's a recognition of some basic deficiencies in our system. And the report that the association has provided is being considered by us, and is being utilized.

**Mr. Yew:** — I conclude then, Mr. Minister, that you have no position, no commitment with respect to this economic development proposal. It's a recommendation submitted to you by the parent organization for Metis and non-status Indians of Saskatchewan. You know very well that it is the parent body for that particular group of people.

When, Mr. Minister, will you have a position with respect to this proposal that was submitted to you?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — In our process at the present time, we require further consultations regarding the report that you speak of. And I want to advise the member that we feel that, in this year, we're going to be proceeding to a paper for discussion in cabinet. As the member knows, the solutions, especially in the northern half of the province, are not simple, and we're being cautious — and that's one of the reasons why the report was commissioned by us.

The member is aware in previous years, governments believed they had the answers to a number of the economic problems, specifically in the North, and the results of that are pretty evident today. So we consider the problem highly complex, and we are consulting with all and every group involved, whether they be the group that you mentioned, or the various community LCAs (local community authorities) and the community groups involved.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, you mentioned two things that I took note of. One was consultation, and another related to a discussion paper that will be reviewed by cabinet. Could you elaborate

further on that, please?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The reason this process goes to cabinet, as the member is aware, all of our departments have a part to play in the area of northern Saskatchewan at this time. So any decisions involving La Loche or Cumberland House will be made on the same basis that any decisions are relating to Biggar or Marcelin or the southern communities. So the cabinet considers the North important, and any decisions are made jointly.

**Mr. Yew:** — I noted with respect to the Metis and non-status Indian community, Mr. Minister, that in last year's budget estimates debate there is no allotment at all for that particular group of people, but that you had a 2 million-and-some-odd dollar allotment for the treaty sector. And I understand that you have it as well for this fiscal year's operations of your programs. Why is that, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The reason for the reports that we spoke about earlier is to determine what would be required regarding the funding. However, I want to remind the member as well that he's seen the estimates in several other departments where a good deal of money is spent regarding the Metis people. And I point out an example of Advanced Education and Manpower. So you have to remember that the various departments have effect in northern Saskatchewan, and the Metis people have the ability to utilize the other departments as well.

However, specifically relating to economic development regarding the Metis people, I believe the reports and the studies that we've done will result in the policy that we will be implementing.

**Mr. Yew:** — How soon do you see that policy being implemented, Mr. Minister? Would it be a month down the road? Six months? A year down the road? When can the people of the Indian and native community expect this major economic development plan to be made public?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, I want to preface my remarks by indicating that I don't want to give the member the impression that there's going to be a saviour, grandiose scheme coming down to suddenly cure all the economic woes in the various native areas of the province. The member . . . I indicated to the member that we were working on a Special ARDA agreement. There are various things that are happening that are available to native people at the present time.

As well, our budget indicated various enterprises and initiatives, in tourism, for instance, which are all available to increase productivity, increase economic development in these areas, which will cause employment, cause ownership of businesses and so on.

So I certainly don't want the member to be left with the impression that we haven't been doing anything, and we're coming up with the big answer, because I think it's a gradual process, and I think the problems are severe in some areas, and I want the member to understand that it is gradual, and that it's being proceeded with.

**Mr. Yew:** — I thank the minister for that bit of information, because, you know, your predecessor for the North, the Minister for the department of Northern Saskatchewan, had talked about a fairly important scheme of strategy to help alleviate the high unemployment throughout the North. In fact, I have the letter here that mentions, that states, in fact, that there's a . . . I'll read it out for you, Mr. Minister.

This letter is dated the 16th of July, 1982, and I've raised it several times. And I was just looking at it here the other night, where I noticed that he did talk about a comprehensive plan had already been put forward to all provincial line departments, containing the five basic principles that the government has adopted in terms of the realignment of DNS.

The point that I want to raise is that the minister in this memo had talked about local

self-government . . . self-government for the North, and also he talked about a development in consultation with residents of northern Saskatchewan, a long-term, comprehensive economic strategy. And with your remarks just now, I conclude that there is no such economic self-sufficiency strategy with your government for the Indian and native community. I wonder if you may want to comment on that.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I think the member has possibly confused the roles of the two ministers involved. The member from Meadow Lake is not my predecessor, he's still responsible for northern affairs. And it's obvious in northern Saskatchewan that our roles are closely related due to the high native population. However, I think your question, in relation to the letter from the minister responsible should be addressed to that particular minister.

**Mr. Yew:** — The letter had stated, Mr. Minister, that this information had gone out to other southern departments within the provincial government, to other line departments. And I wondered, you know, what type of plan that the minister was talking about. I concluded that that information certainly must have been distributed widely among the other cabinet members. And I had thought that you may have . . . may want to include a comment on it if you did receive that information?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well obviously, our secretariat is working with the northern secretariat people, and I still think the specifics on the letter should be directed to the appropriate minister. However, it's clear that if any policy does result, it's going to result in conjunction with all departments of this government.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, with respect to land entitlement issues for the entire province, what is the current status of that program in your department? Have you made any progress? Have you made any significant land entitlement settlements with the treaty people in this province?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Significant progress has been made in the land entitlement process, and the secretariat is still working on the entitlement process, and the development of this government's entitlement process.

**Mr. Yew:** — The secretariat is still working on the entitlement process for this government. Mr. Minister, I gather, then, that your policy is not complete yet. And if that is the case, how can you stand there and state that there is significant progress in the land entitlement settlement issue?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, I can stand here and say that because that's the fact. And we are proceeding. The issue is highly complex, as the member must understand. And we have been dealing with the Indian people involved in the process, the Indian representatives, and it's my view that we're close to a solution of the situation. And I expect that that'll be announced by this government in due course.

**Mr. Yew:** — So, Mr. Minister, I'll have to shake my head and frown at the three major areas that I questioned.

There is this position taken by yourself that all of these programs or policy development issues that are important to the Indian and native community will be announced in due course. And I just find that to be kind of a way for your government to dodge the issue — the issue of coming out with concrete programs, concrete policy to help alleviate the high unemployment, high welfare, and the problems that we have in the native community.

I want to, on . . . Mr. Minister, with respect to your department, I understand that you're also in charge of the Indian and . . . The information that I have here from last, from the last minister, the Minister for Justice, indicated here . . . And I'll read it out to you:

The Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat has a responsibility for maintaining an

overview of housing policy related to native people.

Mr. Minister, and we have under your department a number of housing program responsibilities; I, at this point in time, want to ask you, Mr. Minister: what is your department doing with respect to the problem of the housing for the native community?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The Native Affairs Secretariat doesn't get involved in housing matters for the native community. That's the total responsibility of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation which now extends to all of the province.

**Mr. Yew:** — You can't . . . I would probably be raising more specific issues with respect to the housing program and other support programs, Mr. Minister, as we come into estimates for the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation portion of the legislative proceedings here in the House. I can't really grasp what is being said here, Mr. Minister, just what type of involvement is your department then . . . does your department have with respect to this information I received a year ago by the Minister of Justice?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The secretariat's responsibility is to assist in the development of policies, vis-a-vis native and Indian people. The member spoke of the land entitlement situation, for instance, that is primarily a responsibility of ours; however, in other, regarding the other sectors of this government, we act in a consolidative manner.

And in housing, for instance, obviously a secretariat doesn't deal with housing matters; as I am the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, I felt the corporation adequately deals with issues involving northern Saskatchewan and native communities because of the structure of that particular corporation.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I just want to go back to the proposal that I discussed here a few minutes ago, the proposal that was submitted by the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan. I want to ask you: have you as the minister responded to this proposal that was submitted to your government, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I would like to advise the member that the particular proposal is being studied and is part of the overall study that we are doing. Also I must advise the member that the contents of that particular proposal have been discussed by me and various native leaders, including people at the community levels, involving the proposal that you speak of, and the study which was commissioned by us.

**Mr. Yew:** — I didn't get the answer, Mr. Minister. Could you repeat that answer, please?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — We have not given them a formal answer as to the proposals. As you can see from the proposal, it is complex, involves many sectors of government, and it's an all encompassing proposal; so the answer is no.

**Mr. Yew:** — I take it then, Mr. Minister, that a formal response to the association will be forthcoming as soon as the discussions and the reviews have been undertaken by cabinet, regarding the discussion paper you mentioned a few minutes ago with respect to native economic development programming in the province.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** Well I'd like to advise the member that this — yes, that will be forthcoming. However, if you look through the proposal, you'll see that the proposal is actually proposing various aspects of change that would change our present system of government. The various departmental process would require significant changes to implement the proposal. So, as we're going along with other departments, providing services to the native community, we have to be cautious that what we replace it with what will work. And that's why we

commissioned the study, and that's why our officials are working with the report, and the various reports involved, and consulting with the native communities.

**Mr. Yew:** — But getting back to the question, Mr. Minister, the association can certainly expect a formal reply by your department. Am I correct or am I misunderstood?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes.

**Mr. Yew:** — I talked with, and met with the executive here just recently, Mr. Minister, with respect to this program on economic development for the Metis and Non-status Indian people of the province. And it's my understanding that this package, this formal proposal that was submitted by AMNSIS was accepted by the federal government, and that things with respect to the programming for a major economic development initiative had gone quite co-operatively between them and the federal government, and that the rest was now hinging on the province with respect to economic development for the Indian and native community in Saskatchewan. You know this is, like you say, a complex proposal. But at the same time I want to ask, Mr. Minister, you know, what efforts have you made to co-ordinate and to arrive at a co-operative position such as has been arrived at between AMNSIS and the federal government?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'd like to advise the member that we haven't received a communication that the federal government have accepted the proposal. My understanding is that the native economic development fund people have reviewed the proposal. As late as late last week our people from the secretariat have met regarding the fund. However, we haven't been advised as to the acceptance of it.

**Mr. Yew:** — The association had, you know, felt, you know, many of the proposals contained in this proposal were very significant towards the establishment of a sound economic base for the Metis community, Mr. Minister. Metis, Indian, and native community, pardon me. A concern was expressed to me that thus far we have continuously gone in a cycle, had our Indian and native community subjected to adult basic education courses, training courses, social assistance, rations, unemployment insurance commissions, band-aid solutions to their economic, social and economic disparities, etc. We continuously go in a circle, in a cycle, a band-aid solution type of approach.

And the organizations that I have talked with, the representatives that I have talked with, feel very strongly that those issues will have to be addressed, Mr. Minister. We certainly have to get our act together and start considering the involvement of the native organizations in terms of looking very seriously at their proposals and their recommendations. And I wonder at this time, Mr. Minister, if you couldn't take some personal interest and commitment with respect to this proposal and submit — at least, if you haven't acknowledged the statement or proposal, at least acknowledge the proposal, and at the same time give the native organization a clearer indication that you are aware of the proposal, and that an indication that your government will address this package and its initiatives, its recommendations, at some clear time and date down the road.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I want to advise the member that that indication has already been provided to the group, and the premier has, in fact, met with Mr. Sinclair and myself, discussing various items relating to it. So that indication that you asked for has already been made. I've been personally involved with it. All proposals are taken seriously by me, regarding native affairs, and I assure you that that particular proposal is being considered, as well as other proposals, and our study that we commissioned.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:01 p.m.