

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

May 11, 1984

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Statistics Canada Unemployment Figures

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. I want to ask him about this morning's unemployment figures released by Statistics Canada . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — And I'm sure those who are applauding will have noted that Saskatchewan's job creation record over the past 12 months is only the seventh best in Canada, six other provinces having done better. For example, the number of people working in Manitoba has jumped by 19,000 in the last year, and Saskatchewan by 3,000, and that the latest figures show that the number of unemployed in our province has increased by 1,000, to a total of 39,000 compared with just a month ago.

In the light of these statistics, and in the light of your 1982 campaign promise to create new job opportunities for anyone who wanted to work, do you still believe that the government's job creation efforts, such as Opportunities '84, are adequate to deal with what is clearly a pressing situation?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that no matter how much we do, there's still more to be done and, in fact, later this morning you will see some of the "more to be done" with the second reading of the Industrial Incentives Program, which should, our estimation is, provide 1,500 permanent jobs for Saskatchewan people.

Month over month, my understanding is that there were 5,000 additional people working in Saskatchewan . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — 7,000.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I'm sorry, 7,000. I sure don't want to make a mistake of that magnitude. And, Mr. Speaker, we are again number one in Canada, the lowest unemployment rate in Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, as the Deputy Premier well knows, the lowest unemployment rate is achieved by alleging that a large number of additional people are working on Saskatchewan farms.

Are you aware, Mr. Deputy Premier, that the number of non-agricultural jobs in Saskatchewan has declined very sharply since you took office two years ago?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, there are 5,000 fewer unemployed than there was last month. In a month we've put 5,000 more people to work. I think that's significant and, for the most part, I understand there's some degree of permanence to the positions that are coming into Saskatchewan. They're not short-term programs to qualify people for UIC, as has happened in other jurisdictions.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Deputy Premier. He talks about increases from March to April, and it would be a strange year in which there were not increases. Are you aware of the fact that among young people, among young people, compared with two years ago, April of 1982 — and you may remember that month — the number of employed is down by 8,000 and then number of unemployed is up by 5,000?

In the two years since you have held office, are you aware of those figures, and are you taking steps to deal with that situation?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that what almost everyone is becoming aware of is that the members opposite are hurting a little bit because of the success we're having in turning around the unemployment numbers. And last month, Mr. Speaker, they sat over there and they gloated while their colleagues in Manitoba slipped into first place, for whatever reason.

We are now back in first place, and I'm not happy that we're in first place, only in first place. I would like to see a continued trend of 5 per cent, 4 per cent, 2 per cent, whatever. And we're working toward that.

I think that, rather than sitting there condemning the programs of this government, he should be congratulating us in the direction that we're taking, and help us get the job done.

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

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the number of unemployed in the last two years, from April of 1982 to April of 1984, has increased from 28,000 to 39,000, and the rate of unemployment has increased from 6.3 per cent to 8.3 per cent, do you feel that it is the opposition that was hurting, or do you feel that it is these more than 10,000 additional people unemployed who are hurting, and your government should be doing something to help?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I have some sympathy for what the Leader of the Opposition says, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have the numbers before me, but I know that the years '79, '80, and '81, there was a significant out-migration of people from Saskatchewan. In 1982 there was a 2,000 in-migration; in '83 it was even higher. And in November of '83, I believe it was, that we broke a million for the first time in our life, as it relates to total population, and we've had, I think, today a higher number in our labour force than ever before.

So, yes, unemployment's up. We have more people employed than ever before, but unemployment's up simply because we have more people living here. The reason we have more people living here is people are looking at Saskatchewan as the place of excitement, the place of opportunity, and the place where we're going to get things done and make things happen for the benefit of all Saskatchewan people.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes, I have a question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, consistently the government has indicated that the reason that what is happening is that there's such an influx of people into the province. The in-migration statistics from Statistics Canada indicate from January to April, 1984, the in-migration was 5,680. Correspondingly, Mr. Deputy Premier, the out-migration during the same period, from January to April, 1984, was 7,205. How can you stand here and justify the increased unemployment rates when, in fact, there is a greater out-migration than in-migration by over 2,000?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well, I think this is in order. I think it's in order for me to say I simply don't believe him, and I . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, I'd appreciate that and, Mr. Speaker, later in the day, day, when we get into estimates, and I have my data before me, I'll support the

arguments that I put forward in the earlier answer.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well, certainly I'll make this current information, on a very vital source of the argument provided by the minister, available because these same statistics are available, produced by his government.

But I want to draw to the attention of the Deputy Premier that in respect to the out-migration, Mr. Deputy Premier, the out-migration is worst among two groups: age 20 to 24 there was 1,374; from age 25 to 29 there was 1,541.

I want to ask you, in light of this rapid out-migration of young people from this province, will you put into place an economic policy to give job opportunity to our young people which you held out during the election?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I'll just go back once again, Mr. Speaker. Something is working. Something's in place now. Now, it's maybe escaping members opposite, but on an actual basis, the number of employed increased 7,000, March '84 to April '84 — 7,000 more people working last month than the previous month. We are the lowest unemployment rate in Canada — lowest unemployment rate in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for the record. Having said that, we want to do more. I would like to see the trend. We've one consecutive month now, gone down. I'd like to see it go down forever and ever. I'd like to see the trend go four, three, two, one.

The members opposite, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, are feeling a little bad because their colleagues in Manitoba couldn't get the sustained number one, sustained number one ranking as it relates to unemployment numbers, and I think since we're dancing some statistics around, probably the reason that their colleagues in Manitoba can't get the sustained number one position, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no confidence in the administration, as demonstrated by the Carleton poll that puts the NDP at 9 per cent across Canada, probably the lowest in history and going down.

Now there's a trend, Mr. Speaker. There's a trend that we could talk about for a while, from 17 to 13 to nine.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Final supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Premier, in light of the very revealing and disastrous statistics in respect to young people, in April of 1982 — 1982, April of 1982 — when we were government, 103,000 young people were employed. Today . . . In April of 1983, there was 96. April of '84 there is only 95,000 employed. Youth unemployment has increased from 13,000 to 18,000. Do you think those statistics reveal a keeping a promise of a great future for our young people of this province?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, there is a great future. There is a great future for our young people in this province. I'm very proud. I'm very proud to be part of Saskatchewan. I intend to be a part of Saskatchewan for a very long time, and I think there's a great future for all, all people, all people who want to come to Saskatchewan and make Saskatchewan part of their future.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the only people who don't think that Saskatchewan is a nice place to live, a great place to be, are members opposite — the NDP. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I wish that the NDP would rethink their position and get on our bandwagon and help us make things happen. It's a wonderful province; great things happening here. And proof of some of those things that are happening, Mr. Speaker, are 7,000 more people working this month than last month. We're in number one place as it relates to unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's a rather enviable position.

I don't understand this hollow ringing from opposite. It must be a problem of the anatomy. I don't know. I've never heard such hollow ringing, except coming from an echo chamber, Mr. Speaker.

### **Custom Combining in U.S.A.**

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many of these young people that the minister claims have jobs are back on the farms in my constituency. There are a lot of young people back on the farms. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Many of these young people expected to go custom combining this spring in United States. Have you used your office to apply pressure to see that they can go down combining in the States, or are they going to have to go through a long, tedious procedure to try and get a work permit? Where does it stand to date as far as these young people going custom combining? I have literally hundreds in my riding that expect to go to work and have a job, and I think they're going to be denied that. I have this question for the Minister of Agriculture.

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I was beginning to think, after some several weeks of absence of any role of the farm critic over there, that he had been, in fact, muffled by his colleagues; or, number two, had forgotten about the farm population out there in total.

And the short answer to your question is: yes, my office has been in contact with the minister's office in Ottawa in an attempt to see what was being done, and if, in fact, we could do anything. And as you will probably well know, at this point in time things do not look particularly good. The Canadian ambassador has had a number of meetings in the U.S. to see if, in fact, the situation could not be as it was before. But at this point in time things do not look particularly good.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister that things do not look particularly good. I do not agree with the slander that I haven't been asking a question. Where have you been for two weeks? Where have you been in the last two weeks, Mr. Minister?

The question is: most of the young people involved in custom combining come from Saskatchewan; most of those come from southern Saskatchewan, particularly in the area in south-central Saskatchewan. These people are looking for some definite answers, not for your sympathy.

What have you done in relationship to negotiating with Ottawa and applying a reciprocal agreement saying that the same thing will apply if Americans want to come up here? Are you working at that kind of an arrangement? Are you applying some pressure that these people can get jobs this summer, that they expected to do?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, hon. member, as I mentioned earlier, yes, in fact, some probably seven to ten days ago now — I don't recall the exact date — my office was most recently in contact with the minister's office in Ottawa to get a reading on the situation to see if, in fact, things were being done to try and have it so as the custom combiners and their crews could again make the usual trek into the U.S. and combine from the gulf right back up into Saskatchewan.

But of course I accept, and realize, that we do not write the U.S. laws, nor, in fact, do we write the Canadian federal laws. And certainly we've done what we could, and as recently as the last seven to 10 days; and in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, discussions have been ongoing almost since last year when this same issue came to the forefront — probably not much less than a year ago.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of

Agriculture could tell me whether or not he or the Premier have been in touch with Governor Olson from North Dakota on this anti-Canadian legislation which has come forward in Washington, which precludes many, many young Saskatchewan — and I say “young Saskatchewan” because of the fact that most of the people who are being neglected here and refused work permits are from Saskatchewan — whether or not you have used your good office in dealing with Governor Olson to see whether or not this anti-Canadian regulations and legislation can be put aside, so that the young people from Saskatchewan can go down to the United States as usual and have employment this summer?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, hon. member, the relationship that we have with some of the North Dakota folks is, in fact, extremely cordial. And I can't speak for some of my colleagues as far as exactly what they've discussed, but I personally have met with, on more than one occasion, with Senator Bakewell in the last month, number one.

And number two is, I suspect my colleague, whose riding borders the North Dakota state, has met some of his colleagues down there and no doubt had discussions on a wide range of matters as it relates to between our jurisdictions.

And finally, our relations there, in so far as good and cordial relationships and solving something, are fostered by these kinds of cordial discussions, whereas flag-burning tends to deteriorate fruitful discussion.

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

#### **Health Care for Northern Saskatchewan**

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I was asked a serious and sincere question by the member from Athabasca regarding an accident which occurred in Buffalo Narrows on Friday, April 27, 1984. And I'll quote from *Hansard* what the member asked me to do. He said:

I asked you, Mr. Minister: will you carry out a full investigation into the situation that happened from 12 noon until that individual arrived at University Hospital in Saskatoon?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House, and to the member, the results of that investigation. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the results were ready yesterday for the minister. I was unable to be acknowledged . . . for the member, excuse me. I was unable to be acknowledged, so I'd like to present this information to him today, so that when he goes home this weekend he can relate this information to his constituents.

First of all, I would want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the accident time was at 12:05 noon, and that the community health worker went to the nursing station and returned to the accident scene with the emergency kit. A local nurse — not one employed by us, but a local nurse in Buffalo Narrows — was at the scene at the time and provided emergency treatment, including an injection of demerol. The patient was taken to the airport, and the plane log indicates a departure time of 12:20 — that's the plane log — and the nurse accompanied the patient on the plane. So actually there were 15 minutes that had elapsed from the time of the accident, as reported by the vehicle operator, till the individual was on the plane.

The plane flew to Ile-a-la-Crosse, as the closest physician location, arriving there at 12:40. That's a period of 35 minutes. It was decided to take the patient to Saskatoon, and the plane log indicates it then departed at 1:10 p.m., arriving in Saskatoon at 2:50 p.m. Our government nurse, who was in Ile-a-la-Crosse, accompanied the patient for this portion of the flight.

The member had mentioned something about the air ambulance, and that the airplane that took the individual to hospital was a Beaver. That is correct. It was a single-engine Beaver. It was the

only plane immediately available at the time of the accident. There were two planes available in the community, one a twin-engine Cessna owned by Athabaska Airways, but for which no pilot was available, and the single-engine Beaver. In this situation it was by far most expedient to use the available solution of the Beaver. To await the air ambulance there, or at Ile-a-la-Crosse, would have delayed the treatment.

I want to indicate that the elapsed time for the treatment of the accident . . . or to come from the time of the accident to the University Hospital was approximately three and one-half hours.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the minister that the information that you have given in this House today is completely false. Mr. Speaker, I will ask a question to the Minister. I told you in the House the other day that that individual laid on the street for 45 minutes. You're telling me he laid there for 15 minutes. All the information that I gave you, Mr. Minister, you have come up and you have contradicted that.

I ask you this question: where did you get this information from?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite raised a sincere and serious question. I took note of that question. I asked for a complete investigation. This is the results of that investigation. Now if he wants to indicate that the members of my department are lying, he has every right to do so. I don't think that member would want to do that. He asked for a complete investigation from the time of the accident to the time that the fellow was in the University Hospital. These are the results of that investigation.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you indicating that the wife of the individual who laid on that street for 45 minutes — are you indicating that the wife of the individual that was so badly broken up, who accompanied the individual to the airport, to Ile-a-la-Crosse, and then on to Saskatoon in the single-engine aircraft, was telling me a lie?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, I can understand it that the member is concerned about this, as I am. I have done what he asked me to do. I am not calling any mother or any wife a liar. That is the last thing that anyone on this side of the House would do.

I was asked to investigate, Mr. Speaker, to investigate what happened from the time of the accident to the arrival at the University Hospital. These are the facts that my department supplied to me.

Now if you want to call those people, those good public servants who deliver health care in northern Saskatchewan, if you choose to call them liars, you so do. I don't call anybody a liar. I was asked to investigate, and there are the facts of the investigation.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister: will you get in touch with the wife of the individual who is laying in the University Hospital up there, and still in danger of losing his arm? I ask you: will you get in touch with his wife? Will you get in touch with the patient who is suffering up there in the hospital, and then report to this House what you get?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — I was asked to find out what took place, what transpired from the time of the accident till the individual was in the University Hospital. We have done that; those are the facts of the case. I'm sorry that you're not satisfied with them, but that is exactly what happened.

I have no intention of slandering or making any comments about the people in the accident. I was asked to investigate. There are the facts, and I'm sorry to see that you are inclined to say that these are lies when these were brought forward by diligent civil servants, people who supply

health care to your constituents in northern Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before orders of the day, we have quite a number of students in the Assembly, and I would like leave of the Assembly to introduce students.

Leave granted.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Today I have two groups of students from my constituency that I would like to introduce to you. One group comes from the Kyle Composite School — 29 students from grade 7 and 8, accompanied by Cheryl Boyle and Carol Argue. They're situated in the Speaker's gallery. I'm very pleased to welcome this group to the Assembly today.

I will be meeting with them at about 11:30 for pictures and for drinks later on. I look forward to the opportunity to discuss with you the operation of the Chamber and any questions that you may have; that all hon. members welcome the Kyle group to our Assembly today.

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

**Mr. Weiman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker, that I introduce to the Assembly the entire east gallery. I say that because I have two groups from Saskatoon, from my constituency. They are 80 in number.

I want to indicate that they exhibit keenness, intelligence, excellent behaviour — characteristics that's shared by, at least, members from the government side of this House. I'm sure that their visit here this morning has been informative.

I'm a bit under, under a bit of consternation, though, what protocol to use to introduce which school first, as one is named after a bishop, and one named after a priest.

I think I will begin with the bishop first, so I want to introduce the school of Bishop Klein, 49 students in number, accompanied by three excellent teachers — a fact that's well-known throughout the city of Saskatoon that produces these excellent teachers; Al Mitchell, Dick Nieman, and Ray Weinkauff.

As well, if I may continue, I would like to introduce the students and teachers of Father Vachon School, which number 31. They, too, are accompanied by some excellent teachers.

I would like to even state further that throughout the city of Saskatoon they are probably recognized as the second and third best teachers in all of Saskatoon. It's just a matter of coincidence that the second best teacher happens to be my brother, and the third best teacher in the city of Saskatoon happens to be the teacher of my daughter.

I realize that probably right now many members in the House are questioning in their minds who is the first best teacher in the city of Saskatoon. I have it on good authority the first best teacher is temporarily on leave for these past two years.

I would like to indicate, because there are two schools, that I will be meeting with Father Vachon's students immediately after the introductions for pictures and refreshments, and then immediately after that, 11 o'clock, with the teachers and students of Bishop Klein School for pictures and refreshments. I ask the full Assembly to please applaud my guests.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, a group of 20 students from the Porcupine Plains High School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Grant Ziola; by chaperons and parents, Gladys Dignees, Leona Tacknik, and Harold Halliday. I'd like to welcome to the Assembly here today.

I hope that your stay in the Assembly and your watching of the procedures here in the House will be educational. I'm sure that you'll find Regina a different place from where we come from up there. We live in the north country. Regina is in the south. And don't mind the wind down here; it happens now and then. I'd like to welcome you here today. I'd like the Assembly to join with me in welcoming you to Regina. Have a pleasant stay.

I'll be meeting with you at 10:30 in the rotunda for pictures, and in my office a little later for drinks. So I ask the Assembly to join with me in welcoming you today.

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

**Mr. Johnson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity also to introduce 32 students from MacNutt School in north-eastern Saskatchewan. MacNutt is right up in the north-east corner of my constituency. They'll probably represent about a third of the MacNutt population here today. And I was going to ask them to stand to be introduced, but I see that the rest of the students are leaving, so whatever is left will be my group from MacNutt.

They are grades 5's to 9's. They have along with them — and I could be mistaken with some of the notes I have here — Mr. Kramer is the principal over there, but Mrs. Toderian and Kevin Scheppert, and also Penny Scheppert. Now if I have that wrong I'll apologize later on, for I'll be meeting with you at 11 o'clock in the rotunda area for pictures, and later on in the members lounge or the members dining room for drinks. I would ask the Assembly to welcome my group of people from MacNutt.

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

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 51 — **An Act to establish the Industrial Incentive Program** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this bill was originally introduced I made a few comments, and I just would like to add a few words to what I said at that time.

I think the first point that needs to be made about this act to establish an industrial incentives program is that this government isn't prepared to admit that there is a recession in Saskatchewan. They're not prepared to admit that. And they're not even prepared to admit the seriousness of it. And yet the evidence is all around us, Mr. Speaker.

The other day I indicated that 8 or 10 (and I listed them) of the small manufacturers in Saskatchewan that have built and modernized and expanded their plants that are presently near shut-down conditions. They have skeleton staffs on duty, and these people have equipment, have the tools to do a job, but they don't have a market. And now the minister is introducing a



bill saying: you spend \$30,000 and we'll give you \$7,500 a year from now if you've created a job, for every job you create.

The formula and the whole program doesn't take into account the seriousness of the recession. I don't think there are very many manufacturers — and I named some of them that I'm familiar with, and whose equipment I've used — that are going to say, "This is great; this is great. We're going to invest an additional \$30,000 and employ 10 new people. And then we're going to get that \$75,000, and that's going to make our business go." Well I don't think that's where it's at. The minister knows that that isn't the case, and that isn't the stimulus that we need to get manufacturing going in Saskatchewan.

What we need today is a government that will have a little vision, and a government that would get out and promote the good products that are manufactured — the rock pickers, and the cultivators, and the equipment that's . . . the rod-weeders, the equipment that's done wonders for the Saskatchewan farming community — and would promote the sale of this equipment.

And if the farm community's income was such that farmers could afford to trade, they'd be buying this equipment. Dealers that I've stopped in, and see their lots full of equipment, aren't complaining that there's a lack of manufacturing and processing in the province.

The other problem that exists is that, in the whole realm of job creation, Saskatchewan isn't number one, like the Premier likes to say — "We're number one, and we're world-class." Saskatchewan's lagging in seventh place. Saskatchewan's in seventh place, after just two years of this administration.

Now we have before us a bill here. Now we have before us a bill today that says they're going to create these additional jobs, or this kind of a program. There are some aspects of this bill that I want to get in when we're dealing with it in committee of the whole, but the main thrust of it is that if a manufacturer, Mr. Minister, gets into a situation that's job intensive, this bill discriminates against him.

If a small investment will create a lot of jobs, he's not going to get that \$7,500 you're bragging about. He's only going to get a small percentage of that, because it hinges on the investment. This bill doesn't encourage the person — the entrepreneur that wants to get involved, get into manufacturing, create a lot of jobs. He's going to be discriminated against again, and he's not even going to get the amount. He's not even going to get anywhere near the amount that the minister brags about it.

Someone across the way asked me if I read the bill. I certainly did. I'm wondering if you did, and if you discussed this bill in your caucus. I'm really wondering if you did, because if there's somebody in Prince Albert, Mr. Minister, if somebody in Prince Albert gets involved and has an industry that creates 10 jobs, but he only needs \$30,000 worth of an investment, how much money is he going to get per job? How much money is he going to get per job?

What kind of industry is that, the minister asks. Well, use your imagination. Use your imagination. There are job-intensive industries where a person can get involved and create some employment that doesn't take millions and millions of dollars of investment. But these people are being discriminated against.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that this bill is a typical PC bill. It's a typical bill that indicates your government's approach to the economy. There's lots of talk; there's lots of cheering, like you're demonstrating. It's very short when it comes to the approach. You've got lots of "open for business" slogans but you've got no closet of economic development strategy. This bill falls far short of the commitment that you've placed before it.

When the minister introduced it, it was such great fanfare and shook up even the universe that

our lights went. Well, Mr. Minister, I want to assure you that when the businessmen of this country get this bill, they're going to be in the dark. They're going to be very much in the dark because this bill isn't going to do what it's designed to do.

This bill isn't an industrial incentives program. This bill isn't an industrial incentives program because we have the incentive out there, and that is, create some market opportunities — create some market assistance. Rather than get Agdevco cut back like you have and shrivel them down to a small little operation, gear 'em up and let 'em sell your product. Let 'em get out there and do some industrial incentives that will sell the product, and the manufacturers in Saskatchewan will produce and produce like they have in the past, and they will be number one again when we see a change of government.

Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments in closing debate, and I do sincerely hope that the member opposite is sincere when he's saying that this is a typical Tory bill, and I do sincerely hope that he also votes against it because it will cinch up the business community for our particular party for a very long time.

He talks, Mr. Speaker, about the need for a government with vision to develop markets to market our rock pickers and our rod-weeders and take this “shrivelled-up,” as he called it, this shrivelled-up Agdevco and turn it loose and send it out to the world to market things.

Well, and then almost in the same breath, he stands up in this House and says, “Mr. Speaker, this Tory government is spending too much money on travel.” We're gallivanting around the world and yahoo . . . (inaudible) . . .

Well let me tell you something about the marketing efforts put in by that shrivelled-up little Agdevco. That shrivelled-up little Agdevco, Mr. Speaker, has just come back again from Bulgaria with a commitment for another whole bunch of cattle, and indeed, discussions in the area of counter-trade and third-world projects and joint ventures, etc.

In addition to that, we were in Saudi Arabia, where we, in fact, were at an agricultural fair, marketing . . . As a matter of fact, I'll send a picture over to the member opposite where the minister (the good-looking dude that he is) was standing with a Rock-O-Matic rock picker made in Saskatchewan, in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, I think — a very successful agricultural fair, agricultural equipment fair, in Saudi Arabia. We have identified a potential for things like grain trailers in Saudi Arabia . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe . . . Thank God this guy is agriculture critic, and not critic for this department, because we do have other programs for it — Aid to Trade . . . This is industrial development. This is to create processing and manufacturing opportunities here in Saskatchewan. Market development is quite another thing. You tell me how . . . You're so far out to lunch we have to pump sunshine to you, my boy. I can't believe it.

In any event . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. It's very difficult to hear in the Chamber with that amount of shouting, and I would ask the members to give some order and some decorum.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, while he talks about what we need — a government with vision to develop markets — when I tell him the work we're doing in the market development arena, he doesn't want to hear about it.

**An Hon. Member:** — I do. But I want to know how it relates to this bill.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — You brought it up. I'm responding to your debate.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close very quickly, in a hope, in a hope that it will somehow cause the chatter from the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg to be toned down somewhat, and that the member for Quill Lakes and I can get on in a very congenial way with the estimates from my department. And the very cordial member that he is, I know that we can get through those estimates very quickly, because he's a rational and reasonable sort of a man.

But I'm going to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that I hope members opposite have the courage to stand up to their convictions, live up to their convictions, vote against this bill. If they believe that this bill won't work, and if they believe that this bill isn't popular, they should do just that. They should do just that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I've had meetings in Yorkton, in Saskatoon, and Regina, and in Saudi Arabia, and Bulgaria, and Holland, and Germany, and Australia — but more recently in Yorkton, Saskatoon, Swift Current — and meeting with the business people that will be affected by this legislation.

You know, Mr. Speaker, my department (even though this bill isn't passed yet), my department has had over 300 inquiries as it relates to this bill on how do we qualify, where do we get our application form? And I'll tell you something else; I'm not sure how many we've said yes to, but I can tell you it's several.

My cordial friend, Mr. Speaker, is becoming less cordial.

**An Hon. Member:** — And going to become a lot less cordial.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I bet. I'm going to close, Mr. Speaker, now, by simply saying I would urge all members to support this very innovative piece of legislation. It has, in fact, received the support of the business community that it is designed to help. And I therefore move second reading of the bill.

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

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 43**

Muller	Birkbeck	McLeod
Andrew	Berntson	Lane
Taylor	Katzman	Pickering
McLaren	Smith (Swift Current)	Baker
Hepworth	Schoenhals	Duncan
Currie	Sandberg	Dutchak
Embury	Dirks	Young
Bacon	Sutor	Hodgins
Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Myers	Rybachuk
Caswell	Hampton	Schmidt
Meagher	Glauser	Sauder
Zazelenchuk	Johnson	Martens
Blakeney	Thompson	Engel
Lingenfelter	Koskie	Shillington
Yew		

Nays — Nil

Bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**INDIAN AND NATIVE AFFAIRS SECRETARIAT**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 25**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, to continue on with the estimates' questioning on your department's function, responsibilities, and progress towards social and economic conditions facing northern . . . pardon me, facing the Indian and native community, I want to start off by raising the question that was brought to my attention here two weeks ago by the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians association of Saskatchewan . . . pardon me, AMNSIS.

The executive informed that there was a 20 per cent cut towards their core funding. At this point in time, Mr. Minister, I want your detailed explanation as to why there has been a 20 per cent cut on core funding to the AMNSIS organization.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — As I explained to the member yesterday, there has been a reduction in organizational funding with the stress and direction towards human services. However, in a number of matters with the particular organization you speak of, we're still discussing funding in that regard.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. But isn't it fact, though, that we have a budget that was submitted on the 21st of March that has specific allotments there that indicate the amount of dollars that will be supplied to various groups and organizations throughout the province and, in particular, seeing as how we are under estimates for the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat branch, you have a specific decrease of 20 per cent.

Mr. Minister, your answer to my question leads me to think that you can come in, in later months in this fiscal year's operation and approve the additional 20 per cent cut that has been arrived at with this fiscal year's budget presentation.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, as I indicated to the member yesterday, there has been a reduction of 20 per cent, and we will not make up that 20 per cent. However, we are discussing some items with the particular groups, such as the technical unit funding and so on.

However, I think in all fairness, the member should look at other areas and other departments where there's increases in spending on native matters, such as native education. So we look in the larger context, but in relation to your question, yes, there has been a reduction of 20 per cent.

**Mr. Yew:** — Well, thank you. At least we know then that that is the fact of the matter, that there has been a decrease of 20 per cent where it's core funding for AMNSIS.

You indicate to me, Mr. Minister, that there has been certain increases in other areas. I don't dispute that, Mr. Minister. Certainly there may have been certain increases. The normal increase to compensate for the 6 and 5 program, I suspect, considering the high inflation and high cost of living, and the operations and administration of various organizations. All that has to be considered.

The point I would like to raise at this point in time: if there have been increases in the other areas, fine. But the issue here, though, is like, for an example, you have several of these programs under various groups or departmental branches, such as the community college board. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: what kind of control do you see? What kind of relationship do you see in terms of control and meaningful input by the native organization in these other areas of program funding increases that you talk about?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'd like to advise the member that we see the various organizations having a major significance in where we spend the taxpayers' dollars. The various programming that has been carried out across government has been as a result of consultation. I can use a program that I think the member is well familiar with, the SUNTEP (Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program) program, for instance, where we've had an increase in funding because the program is working. And we're reviewing other programs. Some haven't worked that well; some are better. And quite simply, we use the rule that's used in a few other departments, all our departments I believe. We're trying to get the maximum value for the dollar that's spent.

**Mr. Yew:** — While we're on the subject of funding to native organizations, Mr. Minister, I took a note here of questions that were raised earlier in the year by the various parent native organizations, and I refer to the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) and AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan), whereby they had various issues raised with respect to the undermining of those current parent native organizations by yourself, by your department, and by your government.

And the undermining issue of those parent native organizations is a question of what type of support, what type of commitment, you have given to other organizations that are springing up and trying to claim that they are the true representatives of the Indian and native community when, in fact, they haven't got the support of the community in terms of the establishment of their organization or organizations. You know, where was that democratic process of electing those people? But I'll leave it at that for now. What type of support, commitment, or funding have you provided, if you have provided that type of support to other organizations?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I believe the member asked me a similar question yesterday, and this morning I supplied the member with a list of the organizations that we have funded. So if there's any particular organization that you are wondering about that doesn't appear on the list, my answer is no, unless you want to become more specific.

In regards to the native organizations, we have a constant dialogue with both organizations. In fact, yesterday I appeared in front of all the chiefs from Saskatchewan, including Chief Sanderson. And we had a meaningful dialogue, talked about progress that this government has made regarding child welfare, regarding hunting and fishing rights, and so on. We have a dialogue that seems to be working well and is improving as the years go by. Unless you have something more specific, I don't see us as undermining anyone in any case.

**Mr. Yew:** — Well, I'm pleased. And before I go on with my questioning, Mr. Minister, I want to thank you for the information that you provided. It gives me very little opportunity to be able to assess this information, information I just received a copy from you about three, four, or five minutes ago and it's rather . . . the procedures are rather unfair here. We, on the opposition side of the House, have very limited support staff, research staff, and we don't get the luxury that you have over on that side of the House whereby you have a lot of people to back you up.

You've got the civil service component. You've got the senior management component. You've got the technical advisers. You've got the legal advisers. You haven't, Mr. Minister, as compared to the opposition, we just are short-staffed, and we just haven't got the capability of having the type of support staff that is required of us to be able to come up with some, with some intelligent presentations here, factual in arguments, regarding your policies and your programs.

Anyway, you asked me to get more specific. Mr. Minister, I'm pleased to note from the information that you provided that you're still recognizing that native parent organization such as the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) and the AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) organization.

The reason I had raised that issue, Mr. Minister, is the fact that in January, earlier this year, there's a number of issues raised with respect to funding and commitments to other organizations and groups. But I'll leave that for now, Mr. Minister, seeing as how the information that you have provided indicates to me that your department is following an appropriate course and recognizing the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, and the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan are such that they are the parent native organizations, and that they are the appropriate route to take in terms of developing and maintaining communications, and working with those groups in terms of the Indian and native issues of this province.

I want to go on, Mr. Minister, with another line of questioning. In terms of your department, in terms of the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you may be able to give me a breakdown of your executive staff and provide me with the names and qualifications of those people. And also, could you provide me with the percentage of native people employed under the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, I'm pleased the member asked me that question. In the Native Secretariat our percentage of native content is 43 per cent, and the member may want to reflect back to when the former government was in office, because I think their percentage was considerably lower than that. I have the information for the member, and I'll send it across, and if there's any inadequacies in the information, I'd be pleased if the member would simply contract me.

That reflects to another statement made by the member. Basically, you asked us a question yesterday, and I supplied it to you by this morning. I'd advise the member if anything is required by him, he could simply telephone me, and I will supply the information gladly. I don't think there is any point in waiting for this opportunity to get questions; and, in fact, the member from Athabasca has done that, and I've supplied him with questions, and I believe that he has no complaints as far as our co-operation is concerned. Whether the opposition lacks capability or not should not hamper you from contacting me for this information.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, thank you for this information again. Again, I must say I haven't had the opportunity to review that, but I'll ask you the next question with respect to your native staff there, Mr. Minister. You claim there is 43 per cent of native, of people of native ancestry in your department. I commend you for that progress, for the recognition of ensuring that there is a reasonable percentage of native people involved in your department. Mr. Minister, how many of those native people employed in your department are in the senior management level?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Approximately 15 per cent would be in senior positions. However, I want to advise the member that my view is that we must work towards a situation of increasing that percentage, and I've made that known and we're constantly attempting to improve that across government. We recognize that higher native content is necessary in some other departments as well. So that's something we're working on.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I would like to ask just a couple of questions of the minister, mostly regarding child protection and The Family Services Act, which the Minister of Social Service has talked about and I know is in the, I suppose, in the preparatory stages of being brought to the Assembly. But what I would like to know: is there a committee or a group which is having input from your department into changes which will be coming forward in The Family Services Act?

You'll be well aware of concerns of native groups in dealing with the placement of children who are, from time to time, taken out of native homes and placed into non-native homes. And that concern, I think, is well founded. I would like to know what kind of a committee there could be, or is, as a liaison between your department and the Department of Social Services, and whether or not you can inform the Assembly whether you intend to be involved in a white paper this summer which would deal with that matter, or whether you intend to sort of fly a piece of legislation in this session that will be a discussion point for the coming months.

I think either way you do it, it would be encouraging to all people who have interest in this area if there were a discussion paper, a white paper, or tentative legislation, which you would introduce now, maybe not with the intention of passing it in this session, but which could be discussed over the summer before we come back here in the fall.

And maybe what I'm asking you is whether or not you can give us a little bit of a detailed report, not a two-word report but a detailed report, on whether you're at on this matter of child protection as it relates to native families and children.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'd like to advise the member that in December 1983, pursuant to requests of the Indian people of Saskatchewan, we co-operated in forming a technical committee on Indian child welfare. This was formed by us together with the federal government and the Indian representatives.

Since that time, we have been working and making progress regarding the issues, and it's been a constant dialogue. The lead department, obviously, in this government is the Department of Social Services; however, the secretariat is involved in this process as well.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — The secretariat, as it's involvement in what you call the technical committee on Indian welfare, I think you called it — has that committee brought forward a report, or is that an ongoing study which hasn't reported yet, or what status, I guess, is this committee at?

And also, what involvement does the federal government Department of health and Welfare or Indian Affairs, I'm not sure which — have they got permanent people on that committee?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The Indian Affairs department, federally, is involved. Senior people are involved in it. At the present time, I believe there's two proposals from FSI (Federation of Saskatchewan Indians) that have been submitted to the committee that are being considered now.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — And when do you expect that the committee will report to the Department of Social Services? I guess what I'm saying is: is this part of the reason that we haven't seen the amendments to The Family Services Act come forward is that this committee hasn't reported yet? And if they haven't reported yet, when do you expect the technical committee to bring forward a report so the legislation can be amended and brought forward?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — As far as the timetable for the Department of Social Services, I think you're going to have to address the minister responsible. However, I have no problem in providing you with the material. As the committee makes recommendations, I will provide you with the results.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — But I guess what I'm asking: has the technical committee reported to you and then, subsequently, to the Minister of Social Services?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, they haven't reported because of the new proposal put in by the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) recently.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Minister, when do you expect that you will be able to give a word to the Minister of Social Services, because I'm sure when I will write to him and ask, he will say, I'm waiting for the minister in charge of your department to bring forward these proposals.

And it's sort of a catch 22 that many people are being caught in, between yourself and the Minister of Social Services. He will say, "I'm waiting for this report." And you will say, "Well, I'm waiting for this report."

What I would like to know: when will your recommendations be going forward to the Minister of Social Services so he can come forward with the plan?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The member may be aware that the issue is complex because of the involvement of the federal government and because of the distinct jurisdiction of the federal government over the Indian people.

Both my representatives and the representatives from Social Services are both involved in this committee. So there's no catch 22 situation, and this is verified by the position of the Indian people, and I'm sure if you know any of the Indian people who are the Indian leaders, you could give them a call and they'll confirm to you that they're pleased with the progress, and we are making progress. And again, I'd be pleased to supply you with details of progress.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well, Mr. Minister, what I'm questioning you about is when the legislation will be coming forward, not only from the point of view of Indian and native people, but there are many other people in the province who see the number of children in the care of the Minister of Social Services not going down, but increasing over the last two years. I think, in the last month, there were 2,400 children in the province, who, as their official parent, had the Minister of Social Services. And I think that's unfortunate, and what I would like to know is when we are going to see a trend begin where more help is given to families in crises, rather than ripping them out of the homes and putting them in charge of the Minister of Social Service s- which is what is happening under your government.

And what I would like to know is when your committee, regardless of who is involved, will be giving the final report so the legislation can be prepared, because, as many people are saying in my area, that the reason the legislation on The Family Services Act isn't coming forward is because they're waiting for that report.

I don't know whether that's accurate or not, but I think the public perception is that, because this technical committee hasn't reported yet, the amendments to The Family Services Act aren't coming forward, and they aren't here in the House the way they were promised a year ago. Now we're hearing that maybe we won't get around to it till this time next year. And this time next year you people will be into a pre-election campaign, and you will not want to bring forward controversial legislation. And I'll tell you, the people that suffer in this whole exercise are the children of the province who are being taken out of the homes.

And I would like to know when that report will be coming forward.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well the member has stated some interesting theories, none of which have any relevance to what's happening in Saskatchewan. The situation that our committee is involved in is not involved with the review of the situation province-wide. We are only reviewing the part involving Indian children. We are not holding up the new act. You have



to understand that the federal government is involved here, because Indian children are a special jurisdiction. In other words, I think the previous member asking me the questions understood that the Indian children were being dealt with through this committee.

Now in terms of the act for the province, I don't think I can comment on the act. The hon. minister responsible is the proper person that you should ask about the act. However, I don't think this business of ripping children out of the homes helps us in our endeavours of trying to clean the situation up. I might remind the member that when the member was the minister, I did legal work for the Department of Social Services, and I saw what your act did. And we're trying to clean that situation up.

But in regards to the Indian children, it's nowhere related to any delay that may take place with the act.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Minister, I would say to you that we're getting conflicting reports from 15 minutes ago when you said: yes, you were having input into changes to The Family Services Act. When I asked my initial question, subsequent questions were based on information you gave to this committee. You said you were involved, that you were involved with the Minister of Social Services in planning changes to The Family Services Act. Now you're saying you don't have any input.

Maybe we can go back to square one and you can clarify it for me whether you're having any input into changes to The Family Services Act or not. Because it is you who is giving two different stories on whether you have any influence or not.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Again, the member is stating things that simply weren't said. Here is the situation. The situation is that we have a review committee now. That review committee is discussing the implementation of new ways to deal with child welfare problems regarding Indian children. This committee is made up of the federal government and the provincial government and the Indian people — their representatives. We in no way will delay the implementation of any new act, because if we need more time our decisions will result in a collateral legislation. However, we don't know that at this point.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well I think what the line of answering that the minister has given shows the total confusion in the government in dealing with the children of the province who are in a crisis situation.

I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, when you have unemployment rates that have doubled since you have come to office, when you talk about the unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan which is at 90 per cent, Mr. Minister, I'll tell you that there's a reason why the number of children in the care of the Minister of Social Services has increased as it has since you came to office. Because I want to say that, when families are unemployed, the number of children who are abused and the number of family breakdowns increases dramatically, and you, Mr. Minister, are doing nothing to solve that problem.

Whether it is in the area of Social Services or in Indian Affairs, the unemployment crisis in this province, particularly in northern Saskatchewan, is at the root of what we are talking about here in terms of families in crises. Because families without work tend to have more family problems. This will be indicated by any study you wish to pick up, whether it's in Saskatchewan or Canada or the United States, because the problems associated with unemployment lead to family breakdown and families in crises.

And for you to say it's not my responsibility and say it's the Minister of Social Services, and for him to say, no, it's not my jurisdiction, it's the minister in charge of Indian and Native Affairs, I think is unfortunate. And we will see whether or not the legislation comes forward. I don't believe it's going to now, simply because politicians are dragging their feet on The Family

Services Act and, rather than 2,400 children in the care of the minister, we will see, 25, 26, and 27 by the time of the next election.

And, Mr. Minister, you may deny that you have any responsibility, but I'll say that, either in your role in charge of this technical committee or in cabinet, you would be hard pressed to explain to the people who are waiting for the amendments to that act that you, as a minister, earning \$60,000 a year, have no responsibility. The public of Saskatchewan will simply not accept that, and you can go on defending why it isn't coming forward and you have no responsibility. But the public who are waiting for it aren't believing that 2,400 children, at this time, should be taken out of their home and put into other situations because The Family Service Act isn't changed.

And you can go back and say that when we had 2,000 in care of the minister, that wasn't great, and I'll agree with you. But you have promised the people of Saskatchewan amendments to The Family Services Act for two years, and there are none there. And you, Mr. Minister, are a part of the cabinet, and a part of a department which influences changes, and you are doing nothing but dragging your feet.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, the member is totally off base talking about different departments. But he stated some interesting facts, according to him. And I intend to clip the *Hansard* and provide it to the Indian leadership that have been dealing with me in the matter of child welfare. And it strikes me as a little strange that as late as yesterday I was complimented in the dialogue and the progress that we were making in this matter.

But all of a sudden the member seems to stand and has some different facts to convey to us. So it will be interesting to see what the Indian people think of your comments, and I think I'll be interested in conveying your message to them.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I go back now to the discussion of Indian and native self-government, Mr. Minister. And I have information that came out after the last constitutional talks that indicate that a number of leaders at this conference were disappointed with your government's performance at those talks. The president of the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Natives), and I'll quote from this paper, a report of his assessment which states that:

Mr. Sol Sanderson said that he was disappointed with Devine's performance at the first ministers' conference.

The item goes on to say that Devine's officials have . . . Well, I'll read the total paragraph, Mr. Minister, so you'll know the issue that I have at hand here:

During the conference Devine said he doesn't want Indian self-government entrenched in the constitution until he understands what this would mean. It's certainly not our fault that he (Devine) doesn't know more about Indian self-government, said Sanderson.

He said that Devine's officials have attended numerous meetings and discussions in which self-government has been fully discussed, and either that the Premier or his representatives didn't do their homework.

But, Mr. Minister, I want to let you know that there is some disappointment with respect to the constitutional talks. I wonder if you may comment, Mr. Minister, as to the position that you take, the understanding that was arrived at in terms of the last constitutional discussions.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — First I'd like to thank the member for a sensible question after our break. I think the question is sensible because in the area of constitutional reform we have many, many groups and factions, and many governments disagreeing with each other.

I believe that at the constitutional conference, one of the disadvantages is the publicity given to the conference, the fact that the media is there, the fact that many pressure groups are there, interest groups — and duly elected groups, I might add. The consultation process has not stopped at the first ministers' conference. I want to assure the member that the dialogue is still going on. For instance, yesterday the Premier and I met with Dr. David Ahenakew to discuss some of the constitutional aspects.

We believe that the position taken by the Premier is pragmatic. Dealing with self-government, for instance, we would like to know what is meant by it. That's one of the questions we asked. In March, I met with the Hon. John Munro, the Indian Affairs minister for Canada. I submitted a series of questions to him, and I would be pleased to supply the member with a list of those questions if he calls me.

The questions were meant to help us, as a province, understand where the issue of self-government is going to, because I think the member realizes that we have municipalities involved, we have the provincial government involved, and we have many people in Saskatchewan involved in that particular process. All we want to do is understand the system. The federal government has supplied us with some information to date. The Indian leaders have supplied us with other information. In fact, I got more information yesterday on the type of legislation we may be looking at for Indian self-government. So I think a lot of the press originated right after the first ministers' conference indicated something that doesn't exist today. And I think it's an improvement, and it's a constant progress that's being made.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I certainly would be pleased to receive a copy of the discussion document that you referred to. I am keenly interested into the type of progress that's made in this area. I have quite a number of people in my area that raise an issue with respect to points in those issues held on the constitutional discussions.

And I want to go on, Mr. Minister, and ask the question. I just . . . When I received your document earlier this morning, I compared the economic development . . . well, in total, I compared funding to Indian and native organizations. The 1983-84 grants to both the Indian and native organizations totalled last year \$3,660,880. I note that this year's budget has decreased. It's down to \$3,508,669. And I know it, as well, that the Indian economic development programming, that portion as well is down, as compared with the last fiscal year's budget which was 2,072,000.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, with respect to those two funding allotments, why is there a decrease in the total allotment of funding support to the native organizations and the amount allotted for, specifically, the economical development programs of those organizations — that, as well, has been cut?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Perhaps the member could clarify the question. However, you will note that the economic development portion hasn't been reduced. I'm not sure what column you're looking at. If you wish to specify, I could clarify it.

**Mr. Yew:** — Yes, Mr. Minister, I take the copy of the budget that was presented to me by the Minister of Justice in last year's fiscal program, and I compared the total allotment — 1983-84 grants to Indian and native organizations, totally 3 million — 3.6, and your portion of grants to native organizations that state there's a decrease from 3.6 last year down to 3.5 this year.

And then I went on to the sections — specific sections — and I look under the program that you handed me a few minutes ago — Indian economic development fund is down from 2.075 million, it's down to 1.98 million.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Thank you. I understand your question. The reason for the difference is that when the fiscal year ends, we had the majority of the economic development funds

which did go out. However, some didn't, for reasons of not supplying us with the adequate information, or else perhaps the proposal wasn't deemed feasible, and so on. So it's difficult when you get to the year-end to land on the nose of the same figure that was projected, but it's very close.

**Mr. Yew:** — Okay, Mr. Minister. I'd just like to get back for a moment then to the issue of the first ministers' conference, Mr. Minister. And I just want to get more detail, more into detail and specifics here.

And I want to raise the question to you: do you, as the minister, and does your government support the principle of Indian self-government, Mr. Minister, as discussed at the most recent constitutional conference? When will your government begin to acknowledge the rights of aboriginal people, and begin to be a part of the solution rather than a part of the problem?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The Premier has clearly indicated that he agrees with Indian people acquiring more rights to govern their lives. However, to speak of self-government, our difficulty is in exactly analyzing what is meant by that particular definition; and as I mentioned earlier, that has been part of our problem. We know that The Indian Act wasn't a good piece of legislation and has caused many problems over the years. We know that it doesn't work properly. But we don't want to make the same mistake by introducing something which is just as bad as it was.

So we've clarified our position, time and time again, that we are interested in giving Indians more control of their day-to-day lives in some form. We think that has to be done. However, I think we are a ways away from seeing what is meant by the federal government with the sub-government legislation. And if the member has, for instance, read *The Penner Report* I'm sure the member understands the complexity of the issues involved in that particular transition.

**Mr. Yew:** — I have with me, Mr. Minister, a copy of a study, a report that was put out last year. It's entitled, *Unfinished Business*, and it relates to the aboriginal peoples and the 1983 constitutional conference, and it was produced by Norman K. Zlotkin; it's a discussion paper. And I want to say to the minister that it is interesting that with all the good intentions of the first ministers conference — the initial conference I'm referring to as compared with the last conference — there was not as much progress made. That's my conclusion.

I understand that there are ongoing discussions between your department and the native groups, but that doesn't lay any concrete progress as far as the official constitutional, the last constitutional discussions were concerned. It's my conclusion that there was little progress at the last conference. But certainly I commend you for continuing the dialogue with the parent native organizations. I wonder if you may want to comment; I would be interested to hear if, in fact, that was your conclusion, that there was very little progress made at the last constitutional conference.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — My conclusion from the conference was that we have to increase the dialogue through the year and not wait until constitutional conferences roll around with the cameras and the lights. And that's why we've been increasing our dialogue and making progress since the constitutional conference.

**Mr. Yew:** — Now dealing more specifically, Mr. Minister, throughout estimates I've looked at funding and programs and policy in all the departments that have gone through estimates, Mr. Minister. I have noted with interest that we have actually had decreases in funding to various programs that affect the Indian and native community. And I, you know, can't see, at this point in time, any specific concrete economic strategies to help alleviate the crisis situations that we have in many of those communities, Mr. Minister.

And you know, with respect to the programs, the policies, and the estimates that have been reviewed in this House since the submissions of the 1984-85 budget on March 21st, there have

been cuts and there have been no priority or special recognition really to emphasize stronger support for that particular group of people. I wonder if you may comment on that.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I want to remind the member that our budget applies to all of Saskatchewan. And I'm sure the member is aware that there are already people interested in utilizing the venture capital concept in tourism in northern Saskatchewan, and so on. The energy matter is going to be a high-profile matter in northern Saskatchewan. The mining companies are taking a renewed interest in northern Saskatchewan, and I think the member probably is aware of that.

I can point to industries such as the wild rice industry which, since this government took office, seemed to blossom in northern Saskatchewan. It's my understanding that they feel they can sell all of the product for this year. In fact, the member, I believe knows Chief McKenzie from La Ronge, and Chief McKenzie was just in my office two days ago. He indicated that that is successful. He also indicated that the manufacturing processing of food that's carried on in La Ronge is working so well that they're unable to supply the market. They have gone ahead, taken advantage of what was available from the provincial government, and have become successful at it.

We are trying to pass this idea on to other areas in northern Saskatchewan as well, but I think the member wouldn't disagree with me when I say that the past history of problems, DNS and so on, has devastated many areas in northern Saskatchewan. It's going to take some time to get things moving. But I'm optimistic about northern Saskatchewan because I go there, and I see the opportunities that are available.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I recognize that there has been problems encountered by former administrations, and problems encountered, as well, by your administration.

But as far as I can conclude, Mr. Minister, your government's open for big business policy have been a failure. They have benefited, certainly benefited the big banks and the big oil companies. But your policies have, to date — seeing as there is no concrete specific plan, no concrete specific self-sufficient economic strategy in place — your policies, which I haven't got, which this House hasn't had the opportunity to receive, which the Indian and native community out there hasn't had an opportunity to receive . . . I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your government's policies have been bad news all around for the ordinary working people of Saskatchewan, for the farmers, for the young people of Saskatchewan, the unemployed employables, small businesses and, in particular, Mr. Minister, the Indian and native community. Those big business policies of your government have been especially unfair for the Indian and native community, both in northern Saskatchewan and throughout this province.

The Premier, Mr. Minister, the Premier and his Conservative ministers are just as bad as the Trudeau Liberals in Ottawa. And they are, Mr. Minister, just as unsuccessful. The Liberals in Ottawa were the ones that caused the recession in Canada. The Devine Tories here in Saskatchewan have brought that recession into our province. The Premier and his narrow-minded cabinet ministers are arrogant and not at all sensitive to the needs of the ordinary people of this province.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, they pretend that Saskatchewan did not participate in the recession. They pretend that our economy is booming. They pretend that small businesses are doing very well. They pretend that their job-creation talk is actually creating jobs. And they pretend that welfare reform is not just an attack on the victims.

But, Mr. Minister, I say to you that pretending is not enough. Your slogans and your policies of "open for big business" have failed, particularly in the Indian and native community. And this government has totally and completely failed to address the severe and pressing needs of Indian and Metis people. Under this PC government, in fact, the circumstances of native people in the

North, in the cities, and elsewhere throughout this province is getting much worse. We have, Mr. Minister, more than our share of jails, unemployment, social assistance, and poor education — far more than our share.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, when will your Conservative government address the real issues? When will native people get their fair share of jobs, of economic development opportunities, training and education opportunities, and Indian and native self-government?

Mr. Minister, we, in the Indian and native community, must have justice in our society and recognition of our issues. All around us, every day, we see the clear evidence that this government is abdicating its responsibilities, abandoning the Indian and native community, ignoring their interests, failing to meet head-on with the real gut issues.

In British Columbia, for an example, the harsh right-wing government of the Conservatives talks about the new reality. After these two years of harsh right-wing Tories in Saskatchewan, native people see very clearly that the Tory new reality is in Saskatchewan, and it's all bad news, Mr. Minister.

Funding for the economic development programs for the Indian and native community have decreased, and there have been funding cuts to schools and educational institutions, boards in our cities, and this is doubly unfair for the native students. There are some cut-backs to funding for job-training programs for natives, Mr. Minister, and there have been a decrease in capital works activities in northern Saskatchewan. There has been, certainly, a decrease in economic development activity.

The Conservative government's priorities are clear, Mr. Minister. Your government have huge hand-outs and give-aways to big business. Your policies have tax and royalty cuts and holidays to those major companies. And you have created a big, huge deficit for the people of Saskatchewan — a huge budget deficit of \$829 million, Mr. Minister, which is, by the way, driving up huge interest rates.

And also, Mr. Minister, they have and will affect the services in this province. Services and the quality of programs will diminish — will decrease. You have a big cabinet, Mr. Minister, with a 50 per cent budget increase in funds for those new ministers, for the former ministers as well as the ministers that were increased in this legislature. And yet you have yet not provided any concrete specific plan to help alleviate the high social and economic incidence in the native community. You have yet no commitment to jobs for Northerners, no commitment to economic development for native people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister.

At the moment we have unemployment in the North that ranges, at an average, 66 per cent. And in many more remote communities, it's as high as 95 per cent. The welfare rates have also increased by 50 per cent.

And, Mr. Minister, the other day I pointed out to the Minister of Justice that there was a high number of Indian and native people incarcerated in the correctional centres in this province — 63 per cent.

And we looked at the university and technical training institutes in terms of enrolment of the Indian and native community, and we saw a very low enrolment figure of that particular group of people — 2.5 per cent.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, that those are issues that must be looked into. Those are issues that your department must try to resolve.

We have never been a part of the social and economic mainstream of society. We have not been the beneficiaries of any Tory government, and certainly not the major beneficiaries of this

government, of the Conservative government. The major beneficiaries have been the rich people. All those tax and royalty holidays, those high interest rates, have benefited the banks, the bond dealers from the East, out-of-province companies. They have not benefitted the people of Saskatchewan. And we, in this province, have to foot the bill for your mismanagement, Mr. Minister, for your government's mismanagement. We have to foot the bill. We have to pay back that \$829 million, and we have to pay back, on top of that 829 million, huge interest payments that will range somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$100 million annually.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your government must start recognizing the high — the social and economic problems of the Indian and native community. I have no further comments with respect to the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, unless some of my colleagues have. But I want to conclude, Mr. Minister, by commending you on some of your efforts, but certainly your government, your Premier, will definitely have to move in a more concrete, positive manner than it has in resolving many of those issues.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, a couple of questions. First, with respect to grants for future years, for this year, not last year's grants in respect of which you gave me information last evening, but this coming year, do you propose to make any grants to Metis organizations, or non-status Indian organizations, other than the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, I have no plans to.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you may be familiar with the name of Bruce Flamont.

**An Hon. Member:** — Never heard of him.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Never . . . Well, the member for Souris-Cannington, I will recall for his memory, the offices which I now occupy, and which he occupied, which had when I took over, little indications of the local which Bruce Flamont was served by in that particular office. It's that Bruce Flamont — the one who was in the office of the Leader of the Opposition when the member for Souris-Cannington was the Leader of the Opposition. That's the one I'm talking about, and the one who subsequently went and did valuable work, as I recall it, for the Crown Investments Corporations — in what capacity, we have not been able to ascertain, but at least did valuable work, I'm told. And I understand that his work consisted of organizing a Metis organization or a non-status Indian organization in the NMA, if I . . . I'm not sure have I got the right name for it.

And what I am asking is that . . . My first question is . . . What's the name of it?

**An Hon. Member:** — National Metis Alliance.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — National Metis Alliance? Have I got the right name? But at any rate, do you have any proposals for making grants to the National Metis Alliance, or whatever other name may be given to Mr. Flamont's organization?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Is Mr. Bruce Flamont an employee of your agency, or to your knowledge is he employed of any other government agency of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Another one. Well the member from Souris-Cannington indicates that Mr. Flamont has joined the parade to the Liberal Party. So you

are telling me that Mr. Flamont is not an employee of your agency, and you are unaware of him being employed by any other agency of the Government of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — That's correct.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Does he have a contract of service with your agency or, to your knowledge, with any other agency of the Government of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — This one I'm reading from a column of Mr. Eisler's, where it says, "Flamont is an active supporter of the Tories, a fact he doesn't deny." . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Yes, the same one.

Mr. Minister, with respect to the National Metis Alliance of Saskatchewan, if you are not making any grants to the National Metis Alliance of Saskatchewan, does this budget contain any money for you to enter into any contractual arrangements of any kind with the National Metis Alliance of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, not to my knowledge. I suppose something could be done during the year. I have no intention of doing so.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask a different question now. Could the minister indicate what settlement had been made with respect to treaty land entitlements in the last couple of years? I'm not asking which ones earlier arrived at have been completed, but what new ones have been completed. What selections of fulfilments of treaty land entitlements have been made and agreed to during the last two years, whether or not the surveys, etc., have been completed?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — As I indicated to the member from Cumberland yesterday, the entitlement process is under review by this government at this time.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, it has been under review for a couple of years. The member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, early on in the term of this government, announced that it was under review, and people were looking at reducing the number of acres by conveying other valuable consideration or more valuable land or fully developed land. These were the suggestions made by the now Minister of Justice.

Can you indicate when you will indicate to the registered Indian organizations of Saskatchewan whether or not you will move forward in the fulfilment of treaty Indian land entitlements.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — As I indicated to the other member yesterday, I am consulting with the various Indian leaders. They're aware of our position. They are aware of our dialogue that's going on. We're working on a resolution of the situation.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what objections do your government have with the formula earlier arrived at for the resolution of treaty Indian land entitlements?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well It's obvious that the formula the Leader of the Opposition was referring to is part of our review process. The formula under your government was under effect from 1976 to 1982 and didn't result in much. So, obviously, we have many aspects of the formula that we're considering. We're considering ways to deal with the situation and to work with the Indian people in the communities involved. So it's all part of the same process.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, there were several aspects to the formula, and I'm trying to find out to what you take objection. Is it the 128 acres, or is it the



calculation of band members as at the date, I think it was '75 whenever the . . . whatever the effective date was. Or what are you objecting? There aren't many aspects to it, and some of them are set out in treaty. To what could you be objecting?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I didn't say I was objecting to anything.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, why then are you reviewing something for two years? If your government has had two years to review it, and you yet cannot make up your mind whether you agree to it, even though you say you're not objecting . . . If you haven't detected anything to which you object in two years, don't you think it's time then to get on with the job and not foot-drag anymore on what is, clearly, a debt owed to registered Indian bands which has not been fulfilled?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, I'd like to advise the Leader of the Opposition it took his government six years to get nowhere, and it's taken us two years to get somewhere. We're in a dialogue with the Indian leaders. There are various aspects of the formula that we are considering.

The Leader of the Opposition must be aware that there was a problem with third party interests in finalization of land entitlement claims. That is part of our consideration — the third party interests of farmers, of ranchers, of mineral developers — and our dialogue with the Indian people have included these matters. The difference with us is that we are talking to everyone involved when we're making decisions. And that's what's taking the time. I would prefer to take the time and come out with the right decision, rather than the wrong decision.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, there were some treaty Indian land entitlement issues resolved. There are bands who got their entitlement prior to 1982. Has any band got its entitlement after 1982, pursuant to a decision made by your government, and not pursuant to a prior decision, when all that was left was the surveys of the land at Black Lake or wherever?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the member for Souris-Cannington asks the biting question: why?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, I'll restate my former answer. The matter is under review. We're considering various aspects of the old formula. We're considering the acreage, the count, the third party interests, the implications of land entitlement settlements. That's what's being considered.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, with respect to that now, you've had it for two years. We'll take them one by one. Are you going to deny the acreage, the 128 acres, as I recall the figure?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, I think if I indicated that we accept certain portions of what the solution will be, that would be a disservice to the Indian people of this province. Quite frankly, we have a dialogue with them; we're discussing the issue. When we make a decision, I think in all fairness they have to be communicated to first, and that's what I've indicated to them.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you mean that you haven't told the Indian people that you accept the 128-acre figure that's in the treaties, that you're disputing that?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I've indicated that I'm not disputing anything, and I especially don't want to dispute anything in this House with you on this matter.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm being instructed on what's in the treaties. We'll acknowledge that it's in treaty 4. We'll acknowledge, will we, that, let us say, the Cote Band has, I believe . . . Any one of those, Cote, Keeseekoosie, Key, has some entitlements which are not filled. The treaty says 128 acres. Are you saying you don't agree with the treaty?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — What I am saying to the Leader of the Opposition is that I've achieved a dialogue with the Indian leadership and the Indian people of the province, with the bands, and this dialogue includes a resolution of the treaty land entitlement matters. The Indian people have indicated that they would prefer that this matter not be debated, but be solved, and the Leader of the Opposition appears to want to debate the matter and appear to want to grab the headlines on the issue, and that's not my intent.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, nothing could be clearer than that it's not your intent to grab a headline, because ordinarily the press reports some action, and up to now the minister has indicated no perceivable action in this, or perceptible action. And, accordingly, you're unlikely to get a headline by announcing that you are entering into a dialogue.

What I am asking is whether you are going to make any decisions, and when would you predict that a decision would be made as to what parts of the existing formula you will agree to, and what parts you don't agree to? For how long is the review going on?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I can assure the member that the dialogue is going on. The matter will be resolved when the matter is resolved, and he'll likely know about it when he has a chance to read about it in the *Leader-Post*.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm delighted to hear that the matter is going to be resolved when it's resolved. I would have assumed that he would have suspected that I knew that and, accordingly, he wasn't conveying very much to me.

But what I am asking the minister is: would he indicate his prediction as to the approximate date upon which this matter would be resolved?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The Leader of the Opposition knows that, during his reign as premier, there were problems with the entitlement process. The public saw problems with it. So obviously the Leader must understand that it's a difficult set of issues to be resolved. We have a federal government with a jurisdiction over Indian people, and we have the province with a limited jurisdiction to resolve treaty rights and land entitlement.

Now what I'm telling the Leader of the Opposition is that we're discussing all the parts of the entitlement process with the Indian leadership and with our cabinet, and I'm indicating to the Leader of the Opposition that I would rather not get into a dialogue with the Leader of the Opposition on the relevant points presently undetermined. I don't think it does any good to the Indian people, or anyone else in the province. It may do some political good to the member opposite, but I don't think it does any service to anyone else.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I am not interested in the political aspects of this, at least as far as Regina Elphinstone are concerned. There are not a large number of unfilled treaty land entitlements in that constituency and, accordingly, at least in so far as my status as an MLA is concerned, I am not raising those issues for that reason. I am simply pointing out to the minister that there are unfilled treaty land entitlements. Now we can start from there.

Do you agree that there are unfulfilled treaty land entitlements? Both the federal government

and the previous provincial government agreed upon that point. Do you agree on that?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do you agree that at least one of the treaties indicates that the treaty land entitlement should be filled on the basis of 128 acres per band member?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The terms of the various treaties are different, and the treaties are part of the consideration that is presently being taken by us.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I'll ask again. Do you agree that at least one of the treaties involves an entitlement of 128 acres per band member?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, obviously it refers to that, and there are other elements for determining treaty land entitlement as well.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the acreage, what other considerations are there set out in the treaties? Let's say treaty 4. What other consideration is there? As the member for Meadow Lake makes clear, it was worked out on the basis of a square mile for a family of five. I think that works out, and I think it's 128 acres. My memory is not perfect, but I think that's about it. Does he have any other figure which he is putting forward?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I thought the Leader of the Opposition would be aware, but the treaties do not anticipate the date that the population count would take place, and I might advise the member that that is why your government had to determine a cut-off date, and did. So those matters also fall into the areas of consideration which we have presently undertaken.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm aware of the point raised by the hon. member, the minister, and I now ask the minister, are you challenging the cut-off date to calculate the band list for the purpose of calculating entitlement, and that's key. Are you disputing that, or not?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The member has indicated one of the key factors in this determination, and I simply won't indicate what stage we're at on this because it's presently under decision-making process; and that is one of the factors that we are considering. However, again I want to indicate to the member that there are dilemmas which have arisen over the land entitlement issue under his administration.

We're trying to formulate solutions to the problems that we see, in consultation with the people of Saskatchewan, including the Indian people of Saskatchewan who are a part of this province. And I, frankly, don't wish to get into any discussion on the items of consideration which are the cut-off date, the formulas, the third party interests. These are all essential elements, and I have given my undertaking to the Indian people of the province that they would be the first to know when we've made a decision, and I intend to stick by my undertaking.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, it's clear, I think, that the minister is saying that they're not acknowledging, or not necessarily acknowledging the band count as at the previously agreed date. My recollection is December 31, 1976, but it may not be. I'll call it the agreed date — that he is not acknowledging that that is going to be the basis of calculation, and what I want to ask him is: with respect to, let us say, the Beardsy's reserve, are you saying that that's not going to be the basis of calculation?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, it's unusual that the Leader of the Opposition would ask me about the Beardsy's reserve, because when he was out there campaigning, a little over a year ago, he indicated to them that they wouldn't get any land if we were elected, according to what the people indicate to me in that area. Now the people there are under a different impression now,

after I've spoken to them. They're part of the consultation process.

I did not say what you say I said. What I said is that I have an undertaking which I've given to the Indian leadership that, when we have made a decision on land entitlement involving all of the issues which you've mentioned and others, they would be the first to know. And I'm going to stay with that undertaking. I see no reason to deviate from that. I see no reason why I should be discussing these matters with you before I discuss these matters with the cabinet and with the Indian leaders.

Quite frankly, if you were that concerned about the situation, you would have contacted me earlier than today, because this has been progressing for two years now.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I won't dispute the minister's use of the word "progressing." It has been existing for two years, but would the minister give me a brief outline of the progress that has been made in the two years?

You started this study or review two years ago. Now what have you determined? What issues have you determined? What things have been settled in the two years of your review?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, one thing which I did, which your administration never did, I went to visit the various bands involved, personally. I've discussed with the chiefs and councils the elements involving entitlement, and the chiefs have explained to me that the entitlement process can work. However, they wanted to consult with the third party interests, which apparently were forgotten about under your administration — the farmers, the ranchers, the fishermen — in land selected areas.

So that's what I've been doing in the last two years. I've been consulting with the Indians on the issue. I've been consulting with third party people, who apparently weren't consulted with under your administration. So it's been a busy two years, and we are progressing.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, have you made one single decision on the basis of your visits, discussions, and consultations?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The results of the decision will be our land entitlement policy, and that will be the decision.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, while you have been reviewing the previous policy, you have been unable to indicate one single aspect of that policy that you are confirming or, alternatively, one single aspect of that policy which you are changing after two years of review. Is that a fair statement?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — At this stage it's premature. And I indicated before that the decision has to be made considering the former government's activities in this area, obviously, because certain aspects of your actions in those years were as a result of treaty entitlement. So obviously it's part of the whole process. However, when a decision is made, the members will be aware of the decision, but the Indian leaders will be aware first.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we have the minister unwilling to agree that he is even bound by a treaty signed in 1874. He is even calling that stuff into question. He's even calling the provisions of the treaty into question because he is unwilling to state one single thing about his formula of which he is able to be definite today. And obviously some of the parts of the formula were in treaties that go back more than 100 years.

Now this indicates not only that he has made no decisions himself, but that he is trying to reverse decisions of over 100 years old. Is that not true?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — You're correct, it's not true. And, you know, I could understand the questions if it was coming from a new political party. But the fact is that these are old treaties. We recognize treaties. We've never said we didn't. And if you would recognize the treaties, we wouldn't have to be dealing with this situation now, because we've just been in power since 1982. And we recognize treaties, we're going to make a decision, we're going to make a decision considering all the people of Saskatchewan — third party interests, the Indian people — and we think we can make a decision satisfactory to all of those people.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I won't get into an argument with the minister as to who should have done what when. So far as the government of Saskatchewan is concerned, this issue became key in 1931 when the unoccupied Crown lands, which were to be the basis for the settlement of these disputes, were transferred to the government of Saskatchewan. And perhaps the member will recall what government was in office then. So far as I'm aware, nothing was resolved during that period.

There is no point in arguing about what should have been done in 1931, although that was obviously the first opportunity to deal with it by the provincial government.

What I want to ask the minister is, again: will he give this House any indication of any single decision which has been made as a result of the two years of review?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well the difficulty I have with the member's questions is that I'm convinced that he doesn't understand the system at all. You're speaking of a 1930 obligation. The land entitlements were only called in by the federal government in the 1970s when you were in office. 1930 was the date of the land transfer from the federal government to the province. So clearly the obligation arose in the '70s.

Now, I've indicated my answer previously. The situation is, we're coming to a decision on it. I think it's evident to me that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't spoken to the Indian leadership lately, because if he did he wouldn't be involved in this dialogue.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, whether or not I have spoken with the Indian leaders, and there's no point in my getting into that discussion, I am asking the minister what the policy of the government is. And he is telling me that the policy of the government is to visit, to discuss, to consult, and with all of those I agree. I am asking whether the policy of the government includes making any decisions and the minister, in effect, says: no, certainly not for two years. And he is unwilling to give any other, even other prospective date, as to whether it will be two years or more. It won't be more because the minister opposite will not have to deal with this issue for an extended period of time.

What I am asking is: whether or not, whether or not you are prepared to give any sort of an indication as to when the government will have a statement of policy on this issue.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, I can't give a precise date. If I did, I would obviously be misleading the Indian people. I've indicated to them, and I believe they're satisfied in the progress and the work I've been doing in the area. You are actually the first one in the last few days that have indicated that I wasn't making the satisfactory progress, because I've been meeting with Indian leaders this week, coincidentally.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you've indicated you can't give a precise date. Can you give an imprecise date?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, I don't operate that way. The Indian people are aware of the progress. I've got meetings with the Indian leadership. They're aware of what I'm doing, and I'm convinced that we'll resolve the matter satisfactorily to everyone in the province.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I regret that I'm not similarly convinced.

**Mr. Yew:** — I just have one question I want to conclude with, Mr. Minister, before we move along with the estimates. And that is going back to that land entitlement policy or formula that was there with the former administration. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, did the treaty organizations ask for a review of this formula?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, clearly not. That was an initiative of our government because there were outstanding issues that obviously were causing problems in the province, and no, it was our initiative.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 25 agreed to.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **INDIAN AND NATIVE AFFAIRS SECRETARIAT**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 25**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 25 agreed to.

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

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, I do thank my officials and thank the opposition for several appropriate questions.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the minister in expressing my thanks to the minister and to his officials for providing some necessary details, information on the programs and funding towards native organizations.

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **PROVINCIAL SECRETARY**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 30**

#### **Item 1**

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Chairman, I will introduce my officials. On my right is Marj Jermyn, the Deputy Provincial Secretary. Immediately behind me is Elizabeth Smith, director of financial services from Revenue and Financial Services; and Bob Leonard, director of the Provincial Inquiry Centre.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I was wondering if you, Mr. Minister, could provide in respect to, under executive administration, the personnel you have in that subvote — 6.5 — would you give me a

list of the individuals that you have there and their salaries?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — We have some vacancies, of course, in the Provincial Secretary's office, and this is set up in such a way that I'm not going to give it to you, but I will provide you with the information. I will provide you with the information right after 1 o'clock when you come up to my office for coffee.

**Mr. Koskie:** — And in respect to the Deputy Provincial Secretary, I would like a little background as to the professional qualifications and previous work experience.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I can take you back quite a ways. The first time I met the Deputy Provincial Secretary she was working for Agribition, and worked at Agribition for many years, and with a great deal of skill — who was in large part instrumental in making Agribition what it is today, along with a whole lot of the folks that she was working with.

When I was in the opposition, I recognized the talents of this lady, and we recruited her. She worked for the opposition for several years and then she had, oh, a brief lapse of instability and went with another party for a while. Then when the government changed hands she became my assistant in my office. And recently, I would say — how many months ago? — three or four or five months ago, she was appointed to the position of Deputy Provincial Secretary when I became the Provincial Secretary.

**Mr. Koskie:** — And not to drag this out . . . But could you give me a sort of a breakdown of the educational qualifications, other than the political qualifications?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Sure. If it will satisfy you. I'll send you a resume in due course.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'm a little suspicious about "due course." Could you be a little bit more specific as to when the likelihood of receiving this information because I would certainly want it as soon as possible, which means within 10 or 15 days.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay. Although it's long, I'm quite sure we can have it ready in 10 days.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I note that the Provincial Inquiry is under your jurisdiction with the Provincial Secretary, and I wonder if you could give me (and you can provide this later) some statistics — the comparison of the rate of inquiries, say for the 1982, the '83, and . . . statistics if you could, that is the number of people that are making inquiries — whether it is, in fact, going up, or whether this government has shut the phones off to the general public.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — There's a slight downward trend in inquiries, but we're still up in the neighbourhood of 70,000, 68 to 70,000 inquiries, but we will give you the, we'll send the information over to you, again, within 10 days or so.

**Mr. Koskie:** — You indicated that inquiries tend to go down somewhat. And do you have any explanation? What I am concerned with is that the number of problems that are out there now in this here, with the economy and the more centralization of control by government of so many of the programs, I'm wondering whether you can give an explanation, or a possible explanation. I know that you'll have . . . I want a factual explanation rather than a political one.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Sure, I think one logical explanation is the fact that there are 56 MLAs sitting on this side of the House . . . Well, 55 — I bite my tongue — 55 MLAs sitting on this side of the House who have very close contacts with their constituencies and help them through any bureaucratic question they might have. And so there is a slight decrease in the number of inquiries coming through the inquiry centre, because they're dealt with directly.

And in addition to that, I should point out that the departments of government now are much more open than they ever were before, so a lot of the people out there in Saskatchewan deal directly with the departments rather than the inquiry centre.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I don't necessarily agree with the explanation by the minister. I was going to suggest to him that phones in the opposition offices are constantly ringing now. The impression that I got is that the government has become very closed, and what they have decided to do is to turn to the opposition and, accordingly, our load has increased very substantially. And I understand that one of the reasons why they have not bothered going to the provincial inquiry: because the follow-up is less than satisfactory, and so what they have done is turned to the opposition. Leave that aside. That's a debating point.

But in respect to the office of the Lieutenant Governor, can you indicate whether that is being planned to be moved to Government House on Dewdney Avenue?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — In response to an earlier comment, the suggestion that the follow-up was less than adequate, I just can't accept that. The Provincial Inquiry Centre has always done an excellent job, even when you guys were around, with your closed government and everything, but I just can't accept that the follow-up by the Provincial Inquiry Centre is anything less than it was when you were here, and, in fact, it's probably better.

Having said that, I'll move on to the next question that you raised, and that is, the office of the Lieutenant Governor is, in fact, moving to Government House, and the target date for that move is July 1, I believe.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Just coming back to the point that you discussed and elaborated on, I was not in any way derogating against the competence of the people that are in the Provincial Inquiry Centre. They can only do so much. They can receive the inquiry, and they have to pass it on to the various departments for responses.

And so what I was indicating is the complaints that I receive is not that the inquiry centre is not performing the job. It's after it's transferred over into the ministerial offices, and that is where the backlog has developed. And the public has generally come to the conclusion, Mr. Minister, that for speed and results, that they have shifted, as I said, and indicated, to the opposition caucus.

And I leave that point now, and I think that it has been well-addressed.

And I turn back to the question that we are dealing with and that is the Lieutenant Governor. Is there . . . Are all the costs of the transfer of the Lieutenant Governor as of July 1st, you indicated, is that included here in the expenditures, to take care of that?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The expense will be in the Supply and Services budget.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well I was just wondering, under the Provincial Secretary, do you have the jurisdiction of the provincial cemeteries?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — No, we don't. I think at one point it was here, but I think it was moved over to Consumer and Corporate. But it's no longer with the Provincial Secretary.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I was just wondering — do you have any personal staff, associated as personal staff, planted in the Department of the Provincial Secretary, hidden away?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Well I have one secretary in my office that is paid for under the Provincial Secretary, and she has been there only for a very short time — about two or three weeks, a month maybe.



**Mr. Koskie:** — During the course of the past year, can you indicate whether there were any individuals that were relieved of their duties either, in the factious way of explaining it, “fired” or, secondly, that came under the review of the transition team and/or left under the gentle persuasion of the authority to be.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — To my knowledge the only one that has moved is the former deputy, who is now in the Attorney General’s department in another capacity, and to my knowledge that is the only one that has left the department.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

Vote 30 agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Chairman, I’d like to thank my officials for helping me through a very difficult time, and thank the member opposite for the very penetrating and forthright questions in dealing with these estimates.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I, too, want to join with the minister to thank his staff. They have a real challenge there in assisting the minister, but nevertheless, I want to add with his words a thanks to the staff.

The committee reported progress.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 51 — An Act to establish the Industrial Incentive Program

#### Clause 1

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. Beside me, Don Moroz, deputy minister of Economic Development and Trade, and immediately behind me is Rae Haverstock from the Department of Finance, and a very talented person, and we recognized that kind of talent and seconded him to our department.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to draw to the attention of the minister what I think is clearly a misleading of the public, and the anticipation as was set out by the Minister of Finance in his comments during the budget address, and what this bill, in fact, provides.

Under the sub heading of “small business,” the Minister of Finance said in such glowing terms, “the spring.” Under this program, 12 million will be set aside to provide one-time payments of \$7,500 for each new permanent job created by manufacturing and processing firms. Current projections are that this program will create 1,500 jobs.

I’d like to ask the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, whether his bill, in principle, provides that which is set out in those glowing terms by the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I think, I think that the interpretation put on the remarks in the budget speech by the member opposite are, in fact, not accurate. As I understand the member opposite when he is making the quote, said that \$12 million under this program, \$12 million will be set aside to provide for this incentive program. And, in fact, that’s absolutely true. This legislation will set up a program, and we have made the determination to budget up to \$12

million to provide for the terms of the program set up by this legislation.

**Mr. Koskie:** — You raised a slightly different point than what I was referring to, because in the address by the Minister of Finance he clearly indicates unequivocally that for each permanent job there will be \$7,500. And I want to say that in your bill that is not the case because, in fact, it can be less, because it can be 25 per cent of the amount invested.

Now I want to say that this is the type of deception made by the Minister of Finance in your government, and then, when we get into the details of the bill, we find that what is being provided, Mr. Chairman, to the business community is less than what has been promised in the words of the Minister of Finance.

And I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, why have you, in fact, undermined in the bill . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Oh, no. What he tried to do was to make himself look good, but he deceived the business community. And what I'm asking you is: why will you not, in fact, provide that which is being promised by the Minister of Finance?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Chairman, I think what the member opposite is asking is that when a program is announced in the budget speech, he wants the legislation set out in the budget speech. Quite clearly the budget simply introduces new programs, and it does not detail them, and it is generally understood that the detailed information is provided later, usually by way of legislation. And I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the public certainly don't feel that they've been misled in our travels around the province meeting with the business community that will be affected by this legislation. It has been very well received, and they are quite happy with it. So I just don't share the concern of the member opposite.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well you may not. But clearly the indication here is that there are going to be \$75 paid for each new permanent job. That's \$7,500 for each new permanent job. And that's what the Minister of Finance held out to the business community, to this House when it was filled with his invitees. And now, when we look at this bill, if I establish a business and I spend 20,000 and I create a permanent job, I want to ask you, will I be getting the \$7,500?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The minimum requirements under the act will be: first, that you are a qualifying sector (manufacturing or processing); second, that there's a capital expenditure of \$30,000; and thirdly, you create one job; and fourthly, that — well, and it's tied — the \$7,500 just happens to be equivalent to 25 per cent of 30,000. So if you spent megadollars and created only two jobs, permanent jobs, you would only qualify for \$15,000.

**Mr. Koskie:** — But it seems to me that what we're looking at here is an incentive for the creation of permanent jobs. And I wonder why . . . An investment, you say. That's fine and dandy. But I would think that what you people should be looking at is jobs, because of the records . . . of the employment statistics. And I don't know why you would, in fact, put in a provision which would indeed discriminate against a smaller investor, even though he creates the permanent jobs. I just don't see the logic of cutting back, providing he is creating the jobs.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Yes, well, there are two objectives to the program. One is the investment, and you may say that 20,000 is enough investment to qualify, and I'm sure that your suggestion of 20,000 is just as arbitrary as mine of 30,000. We believe that the 30,000 investment plus one permanent job is enough to warrant a 25 per cent or \$7,500 incentive, and we've taken that position.

You must remember there are two objectives: first, the investment; second, the jobs, in either order. I don't care. Both are very important to Saskatchewan, and the legislation provides for both.

**Mr. Koskie:** — In respect to the proposed \$12 million that has been set aside . . . (inaudible

interjection) . . . Well, you can do that, certainly. But what I want to ask there is that it seems to me that there's going to be a considerable, lengthy process, and that a very little of that money is going to be in the hands of the business community this year.

I say that because, first of all, you have to go through the application. You have to have that application approved. You've got to go through the mechanics and the bureaucracy of getting the minister to approve it, and you probably have a constituency name at the bottom of the form, like you do in others, and there would be political decisions as to whether the program is going to be put forward. You may have to have a Tory card before the approval is made by the minister.

But leave that aside and get on to the substantive issue that I want to refer you to, and that is the \$12 million. To qualify for this program, first of all you've got to process your application, and, secondly, you have to complete the expansion. And what I am saying here is that this is not likely to be a very large pay-out during the currency of this year.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — And you're probably right. But to go back to some of your earlier remarks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you don't want me to deal with those . . . Yes. You see when we were out visiting with the business community over the last several months we were told that one of the biggest problems they had with the previous administration was getting through all the red tape, and the hassle, and all of those things. And we listened to them, we listened to them.

The other thing that they told us was that they didn't much like all of the, all of the — what's the word? — patronage, with the note on the bottom of the application form, "He's a good guy or a bad guy." There's certainly no consideration there. The application form is, in fact, one page. The department has committed a 15-day turn-around on applications. And we don't look beyond the application. The business decision is made by the applicant. We're not going to make that judgement.

If the thing is viable, and he has reason to believe that it is viable, and he's prepared to make the investment, and he gets the permanent jobs, he'll get his cheque, and it's that simple.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to ask: if a businessman is, in fact, going to make a basic expansion, would the minister indicate in his view of the factors that he would probably look at before doing his expansion? What are the basic factors that, in your view as Minister of Economic Development, what are the basic factors you would look at?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The answer simply is: that's not for me to say, and we won't interfere with the decision of the businessman. Him and his banker and . . . You know, they make that decision on their own. The politicians and the bureaucrats will not, in any way, interfere in their business decision. If they decide they're going to go ahead with expansion of a new plant, and they do that, and they make the investment and they create the jobs, they get their cheque. And that's our involvement because that's what they asked us to do. They said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I'm sorry. We'll rush it right through here.

But that's it in a nutshell. It's clean, simple, straightforward, and designed to help the manufacturing and processing sector.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well since you aren't wanting to turn your mind to that particular thing, let me turn my mind to it. And it seems to me that if a businessman is going to make an expansion; one, he would look at his financial position whether he can basically afford it — and that's what you're saying is that he has 30,000 bucks he has to put up to get 7,500. So one, he looks at it whether or not he can afford to make the expansion, and secondly, I assume that a businessman would look to see whether there's a sale for the product which he is going to produce.

And then I think the businessman would decide that he would go ahead, if he could afford it and if there's a sale for his product. Now the problem that I see here with your basic program is that the benefit is made to the individual after the fact. And it seems to me that he has to make that critical decision and is not really receiving the assistance at the time of making the critical decision to make the expansion. And it seems to me, if you had been honourable — not you personally, but your government — is that you would have made money available to the small-business people of Saskatchewan, as you had promised, at a nine and five-eighths per cent interest rate. This would have assisted them in the necessity for funds at the time, because yours is probably a year later that they'll get any benefits out of it.

So to that extent, I think it's a program which will put infusion of very, very little assistance or money into the business community when it's faltering under the Tories' economic policy. It will put very little infusion of money into the small-business community, say, right now. No money. Because they have to wait; they've got to go through the process. And I think that is where the program, if I may say, is deficient.

One, why don't you keep your promises of providing nine and five-eighths interest? And secondly, will you agree that the infusion of money to assist them at a subsidized rate would be more effective than on the basis of delayed receiving 7,500 or less?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I think that any efforts in economic development . . . We should be building on our strengths, and the plants that are built should not be built if they have to be subsidized to survive. The . . . Have I got his attention? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

We have, in fact, done a few other things in addition to this program. And the nine and five-eighths wasn't one of them, unfortunately, and, you know, it can be argued that it should be. It can be argued that it may happen yet, but what we've done just in this last budget is the Industrial Incentives Program, that we're dealing with now; the venture capital program, to be brought forward by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business; the fixed rate financing program, that was announced in the last budget; tax reduction for manufacturing and processing; the elimination of corporate income tax; and sales tax exemption for prototypes. Now, I'm sure that, I'm sure that even the minister opposite, the member opposite, understands that.

And I know he does because he just mentioned a minute ago that of course markets have to be there. And they're going to make that decision, and it's going to be a business decision. And it's not going to be something that's imposed on them by politicians or bureaucracy.

They are going to do that analysis, and they are going to make the capital expenditure, based on sound business practices. And they will then get on-stream, and create a job or two, or three, or four, or whatever. And then they'll get their cheque.

And that's, in a sense, rewarding the winners. Makes good sense to me. The business community likes it.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well I wonder what communication you have with the business community, because the communication that we have with the business community right now in the processing and manufacturing, their major concern is not looking at expansion, Mr. Minister.

I want to use, and I'll be brief, but I want to use my constituency as an example. There is a constituency under the New Democratic government established a network of small business and manufacturing, the like of which is not comparable to any other constituency . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

No, I look at Lanigan. We have Keen Industries, manufacturing trailers. I look at Al's Welding in Muenster, and they were manufacturing hydraulic cylinders. I look at St. Gregor, and we have the manufacturing of steel boxes, we have the manufacturing of windows, we have the

manufacturing of tarpaulins for the trucks.

I look at Annaheim, and we have Doepker Industries with a line of machinery and large steel boxes. I go into Watson, and again we find that we had established there the Kerpan Industries, which is operating.

I can go to just about every community in my constituency, and there we had built a base, outstanding base, of small-business enterprises in manufacturing and processing.

And you know, in talking to them, the problem is not a drive to expand, Mr. Minister. What they are looking at now is the depression that the farmers find themselves in, and unable to purchase the stone pickers that are manufactured by Schulte Industries. I forgot that. Schulte Industries in Englefeld.

That is the problem out there, and I mean this here is nothing but window dressing. But what you're doing, you aren't addressing the nature of the problem that's out there, because if the markets are there individuals will expand. You can't subsidize business activity into existence if there are no market. And what we need is not a stimulation of the oil industries with hand-outs and millions of dollars of royalty holidays. What we need is an infusion of the 100 million that you give to the oil companies to infuse, an infusion into the agricultural community.

And following that, you will have, indeed, the necessary expansion in the creation of permanent jobs.

Well, I acknowledge what you are doing here, and we will be supporting you, Mr. Minister . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, you're going to support me.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well, we have in second reading, and we will support it again. But I want to outline to you how ill-advised your direction is, and the lack, the apparent lack of communication with the small manufacturers throughout the province.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Chairman, very quickly, the names of the small businessmen that he reeled off are all, of course, very good businessmen in your constituency, that produce an excellent product, and they send me cards and letters every day telling me what a great job we're doing around the world promoting their product, and . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, not today. That's an estimates question. I think you're a little off the topic . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And I also . . . No, I won't say that. I'll simply say, Mr. Chairman, however lukewarm the members opposite support this bill, we do appreciate their support, and it is in some small way recognition of the fact that the bill is, in fact, a good bill, and all indications are that it's being very well received by the business community that it's bound to affect in a very positive way.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Can you give to the business community a commitment of how long you expect this program, new program, to be in place? Is it a one-year program? If you look into the bill it would clearly indicate that the bill itself seems to be predicated on the fact that it's a one-year shot.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I see. The deadline, Mr. Speaker, is for applications . . . Mr. Chairman, the deadline for applications is March 31, '85. And as the member knows, the question as to whether the program would continue or not depends in large part on the uptake of this program, because if we've satisfied the market that's been developed, there's not likely to be need for the program. And we hope this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you see, you have to go back to your basic Economics 100. You don't build . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, did you? Okay.

But the answer to your question is March 31, '85, is the application deadline.

**Mr. Koskie:** — And by the very nature that the application deadline that, in fact, does exactly what I said — limits the length of the program. That's a one-year program under which applications can be made.

Once again I want to close by saying that this program is just a patchwork. It has no economic planning. And what has happened in Alberta under a Tory government, and the economists are saying, it is just patchwork programs with no basic economic future planning. And that is the concern that I have here, is that this government hasn't put together a clear and imaginative program to develop the small business and manufacturing in the way that we did during the 11 successful years of running this province.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, I'll just close by saying that it may not be clear to members opposite, but the business community understand it very well. I thank you for the support, however lukewarm it may be.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

### Clause 5

**Mr. Koskie:** — Just one question there. I think it's fairly clear under subsection 5(2)(c)(iii) as to when the approval and payment will be made, and it indicates that it will be "12 months of the date that the minister approved the application; or . . . any period of time, other than that mentioned in the subclause (iii), that the minister may allow . . ." And again, I just raise that to indicate that it's quite a considerable length of time that is given to the minister before payment is made, and what I'm saying is that what has happened is that the budget has been fudged to look as though there's going to be immediate help to the business community, when in fact it's into the future. I don't really agree with that premise.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay. What this one provides for is that the application is made and approved, and the business must come into production within 12 months. Now, the business community has said that, in some cases, that may be not long enough. That may not be long enough. So the next one, as I understand it, is a discretionary power that would provide for an extended period to get the unit, or the business, into production.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank my officials, and I move we report the bill.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

## THIRD READINGS

### Bill No. 51 — An Act to establish the Industrial Incentive Program

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, if I can with leave back up, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:19 p.m.