

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

June 6, 1985

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 13

Item 1 (continued)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Do you have that information for me, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll provide the . . . Will you take that to the member from Regina Centre, please.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the records in the companies branch show that interior dimensions design associates were just registered to do business on February 27th, '85. The contracts which you refer to are '84. That is why, Mr. Minister, I suspect that the contracts . . . There must have been contracts after the dates you gave me here.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure about the date of registration. They've been operating as a — I'm told as a partnership company since about December of '83. And I believe on the paper, if I just think back to it . . . Did it say inner dimension on the paper?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Inner Dimension.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay, I'm sorry, but just for your . . . The name of the company is Inner Dimension. Inner, I-double-n-e-r.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, I see that. All right. Mr. Minister, what were the terms of the contract? Basically, what was the service . . . You told me what the service provided was. They were doing interior decorating. On what basis was the . . . What was the terms of the contract? Was it a fixed sum agreed to on August 30th, '84? What were the terms of the contract?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I'll give the following. This is just from the contract. Total amount payable under this contract shall not exceed \$70,000, to be composed of \$65,000 for fees, including all subconsultants, and \$5,000 for disbursements. Fees charged shall not exceed the product of time expended and hourly rates. Invoices shall show complete cost breakdown. These upset costs shall not be exceeded unless specifically authorized, and so on.

So that's it. The expenditure up until now has been \$33,039.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you going to give me a copy of that document setting out the contract, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, I'm not going to give you the contract, but I just laid out to you the way in which the fees were set in this particular case.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well it makes quite a difference, Mr. Minister. If, as I suspect, the fees are something that are negotiated as a service is performed, then it is, to put it mildly, an inappropriate arrangement to have with the deputy minister of the department with whom she is working. And I suspect that is the case.

I suspect that you meant what you said, maximum expenditures of \$70,000, but under close scrutiny it might well be less. So I suspect, Mr. Minister, that the expenditures are discretionary. And to put it mildly, it's inappropriate to be having . . . for the family of a deputy minister to be dealing with the department. That is quite inappropriate.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, to confirm what you just said, and that is that the expenditure is a maximum expenditure and that the amount of fees are to be negotiated between the department and the government, between the department and the company in accordance with the services provided.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we went through this before supper and what the member is suggesting — the particular company that the member wants to pick out here is one that Lois Devitt is involved in and so on, and who happens to now be the fiancée of the deputy minister.

There are basically three firms in Regina that do this type of work, all of whom work on the same basis for the Government of Saskatchewan, and in fact on the same basis for other companies, and the same basis for the Crowns, and so on.

The firms Bowering Charbonneau, Inner Dimension, and Radius 2 Interiors, all three of those firms if we work on a rotating type of basis and all three of those firms do the work on the very same basis, same terms of contract, all of those things. They're all done the same way.

So for the member to . . . I know the member is out, as he usually is, to look for some scandal or whatever, but I can tell you that quite clearly there is none, and no contracts have been let, no contracts have been awarded to this particular firm since the lady in question has become the fiancée of the deputy.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What, Mr. Minister, are the names of the other firms then?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I just outlined them. The names of the other firms: Bowering Charbonneau; Radius 2 Interiors; and the third firm is the one that you have been raising questions about, Inner Dimension. All three located here in Regina.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, will you confirm . . . Will you answer the question. The amount of the fees is a maximum. The actual amount is to be negotiated between the company and the department in accordance with the service provided.

I want to say, Mr. Minister, while I'm on my feet, I don't know why you won't give me the contract. You clearly have a potential conflict of interest here. If you've nothing to hide, give us the contract and let us know, and we will get on to something else. There are no end of issues to deal with. If we can clear this one, no one would be happier than I am. So if you can give me a copy of the contract, and if it confirms what you say, then we'll move on.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, what I will undertake to do . . . The contract that's signed with Inner Dimension in this case, with the Saskatchewan Place, is very much the standard contract that is done. What I will undertake to do, if the member will give me an undertaking — and the reason that I am reluctant is only as has been outlined for a long time. The long-standing practice is that we don't divulge that in a public sort of way because of the competitive nature of this business as well as others, and I've said that there are other firms in the rotating basis in that business. If the member from Regina Centre will give me the assurance that if I send over the contract, and I am willing to do that if you give me the assurance that it's on a confidential basis between you and I as two members of this legislature, I will undertake to provide that to you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I will give you my undertaking that no one else will get a copy of

the contract. I won't give you my undertaking there won't be further questions on this after I see the contract. So I want to know what you're asking of me.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Yes, that's fair ball. I mean if you have further questions from it and so on, but I will undertake to give you the copy of this particular contract on that basis.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I assume, Mr. Minister, that's coming over forthwith. While I'm having a look at it, my learned friend from Pelly, has some questions.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I would say just one further thing, and I will send it over to you. The questions, you know, as you raise them, if they get into the rates and all those kinds of things, because that is the competitive nature as I have indicated, and if you undertake not to deal with that, well then, of course.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, I will not disclose the rates. I have no interest in what is actually being paid, because I don't know what the . . . I wouldn't know what anyone else has paid. That's not my interest. My interest is the nature of the contract and how much discretion the department has in determining the actual amount that's paid.

(19:15)

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. I'll send that over now to the member.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, while we're on buildings, I have a question on buildings here, and that's in regard to some buildings that were purchased for Department of Highways. And I would assume that any buildings that may be purchased for other departments would be done through your department, through Supply and Services.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Did the member . . . Is he asking buildings purchased for, on behalf of the Department of Highways? I would say that that would be right, that we would do that.

MR. LUSNEY: — Okay, Mr. Minister. I have a specific question here then on a building, an old power station that was purchased on behalf of the Department of Highways in Wilkie.

Could the minister tell me when that was purchased, and what was the purchase price of it was?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — We have not purchased a building in Wilkie. I believe the Department of Highways did, and we'll certainly be willing to send you the details of that purchase.

Mr. Minister, could you undertake then to send me whether that was . . . Apparently that building was demolished to make way for a curve in the highway or something. Could you send me the cost of the building, the purchase price of the building, and whether the demolishing was tendered, the job for demolishing the building was tendered at the time.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. Just so I'm clear here. The indication you were giving is . . . It wasn't a purchase of a building for use by the Department of Highways, it was a purchase of a building which was in the way as a highway was being constructed.

Okay. But anyway I hear from my colleague, the Minister of Highways, that we'll provide the information to the member. We'll undertake to do that. I'll undertake to get that from the Department of Highways and send that to the member from Pelly.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, with respect to this. I have not had a full opportunity to review it, I must say. It does appear, however, that the actual amount that may be billed — it's an hourly amount. I know all about billing on an hourly rate. I do it as a lawyer.

To put it mildly, it's not capable of any precise definition, and the hourly rate is all . . . In checking a bill which is billed at an hourly rate, you need to do two things: you need to check the rate — the rate you set out in the agreement. You need to check the number of hours, and that's a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. Minister, I know that these matters do not always follow a logical course and that affairs of the heart are not always, as I say, follow a logical course. It is, though, inappropriate for a deputy minister . . . for a family member of a deputy minister to be negotiating with the department, and she must be, for her hourly rate of pay.

The agreement — well as I say, I haven't had a chance to look at it — does set out the pay in an hourly basis. And that is a discretionary matter, and it is inappropriate, Mr. Minister, for this arrangement to be going on.

I'm not going to ask you when the relationship between your deputy and this lady involved began. I don't think that will add much to the inappropriateness of the contract. It is inappropriate, Mr. Minister, and it ought to be terminated. And it is all the more need, Mr. Minister, for some conflict of interest guide-lines.

I don't think this province has ever had a government which is so in need of conflict of interest guide-lines. This happens weekly. We come in here Monday morning saying, jokingly, what's going to be the scandal of the week? And sure enough something will turn up — at least one a week if not more, Mr. Minister.

In that regard, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: do you have anything that approaches conflict of interest guide-lines, or is it just everybody at the trough, as much as you can take for as much as you can get away with?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, once again the member talks about what's inappropriate. I have outlined here, this particular lady that the hon. member from Regina Centre wants to . . . is in business in the city of Regina; it happens that in recent months has agreed to marry the deputy minister of Supply and Services. No contracts or no negotiations or anything like that have been negotiated since the lady has become the fiancée.

You can talk about what's inappropriate if you like. I don't believe that it is inappropriate that she is in the business. The contract was negotiated well in advance. It certainly wasn't negotiated with the deputy minister.

I guess all I can say to the hon. member, as I have said before, there have been no new contracts awarded just on the very basis because we are sensitive. Regardless of what the hon. member from Regina Centre says, we are sensitive to those kinds of things, and there have been no contracts negotiated with this firm since. And I would say quite frankly to you, because there are very few firms, and I've outlined the three in this city that are involved in the kind of work that we're talking about, very few firms involved in it, I would say quite frankly that it's probably to the . . . This particular lady and this particular firm are probably losing because this particular relationship, and that you can talk about fairness if you like, but I would say that that's not altogether fair either. But we will deal with the perception as well as the reality. And the perception, as you have outlined, is there. And so we've dealt with it.

And the other thing that needs to be mentioned: as you looked at the contract you neglected to say that there was an upside price, and there was, that it shall not go beyond this particular amount. And those prices are set by the people in our department who do an estimate on just how much will the contract probably be worth.

So it's not a matter of an open-ended cheque-book, and into hourly rates and so on, as it is with people from your particular profession, as you alluded to.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, it isn't, but it's also extremely difficult to control. It requires a good deal of often sensitive negotiations.

Mr. Minister, I would ask that you outline for my benefit the manner in which vehicles are purchased for the fleet. How do you purchase vehicles for the fleet?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — There's been no change, and the hon. member is well aware of how it happened in the past. There's been no change in terms of the way the annual buy . . . in terms of the number of vehicles that the government will buy as a whole. The annual buy is tendered, as it always has been.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, one Hauser Chev Olds, I note, made a donation of \$10,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party. I remember seeing it, and remember thinking that an odd figure because they are listed with a number of firms, with one or two exceptions, who are much, much larger than that. They're in the league with Ipsco and CP and so on.

How does Chev Olds make a \$10,000 donation? I note in the *Public Accounts*, in '83-84, Hauser Chev Olds picked up \$1,719,338.89 for the business, and that business began to operate under a new name somewhere in the year, Wheaton Chevrolet Oldsmobile, and they got another \$260,869 for a total of \$1,980,208. Mr. Minister, that figure grossly exceeds the business that any other company got. The next largest firm is Crestview Chrysler Dodge with 606,000 and nobody else, I don't think, got over \$200,000 worth of business.

Once again, Mr. Minister, you're steering contracts towards those who are your political friends. I can understand . . . AS I say, when I read this I could not understand why a company of that sort would make such a huge donation. I can well understand their gratitude now. For \$1.9 million worth of business, I think I'd have shared a bit of gratitude too, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, first of all, a couple of things, just so you set the record straight in terms of the firms that you mentioned were successful, you know, in terms of dealing in conjunction with their manufacturer. My understanding of it is that they work in conjunction with the manufacturer, whichever particular one they represent. These two cases, General Motors and Chrysler, the dealers work in conjunction with the manufacturer and are successful in tender.

As far as the donations to the PC Party of Saskatchewan, I have no knowledge of that. I'm sure someone has, and I'm pleased to report to the member that I'm very confident that somebody has a good handle on who's donating to the PC Party in Saskatchewan, and I know that there are a good number of people that are. And if people in the business community in this province, whether they be in the car business or whatever business, are donating to the PC Party of Saskatchewan, it should come as no surprise to you they were for a good number of months and years prior to us coming into office, and that's one of the reasons why we're in office.

So they had every reason to believe that there should be a change of government. There is a change of government. And they have every reason to believe that this government should remain. But as far as anything that you might try to dig up, as it relates to Hauser or Crestview — I don't know what other businesses you want to drag into the House tonight — but I have no knowledge of anything about their donations or whatever else you would like to talk about.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, Mr. Minister, once again you have the perception of patronage. You have a firm donating \$10,000, and they're in the league with J. Richardson's . . . I want to read this out: J. Richardson and Sons; OJ Pipelines; Canada Safeway; Hauser Chev Olds; Ipsco; McLeod, Weir, and Young; Pitfield Mackay Ross; CP Enterprises; Burns Foods. Mr. Minister, they're in another league in terms of that . . . as high as that donation.

And as I say, when I read this list of donations I was curious about that particular firm. I know now, Mr. Minister, why they showed such overwhelming gratitude, because somebody was steering almost \$2 million worth of business to that firm. And as I say, it is the lion's share of the business.

I haven't had a chance to add these up, but I'll bet you they sold more than . . . I bet you they got more than 50 per cent of the car business in the province. Some other firms, who I would have thought might have been worth something, were missing entirely. Foley in Estevan, I don't see mentioned; Trout Chevrolet apparently sold one vehicle at 13,000. I suppose the Premier might have bought his vehicle there. That may explain their one vehicle.

But that, Mr. Minister, is just grossly indecent — to have one firm contributing \$10,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party and in turn picking up \$2 million worth of car business. Mr. Minister, that is just . . . Again, you are running a patronage operation. And it is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it may be peanuts to the members opposite. It certainly doesn't seem to have been peanuts to this company. Mr. Minister, once again, in this regard, you are running a patronage operation, as you are with the buildings, as you are with contracts, Mr. Minister. And if the other firms aren't upset with this then they're a very patient lot, because that is not a fair way to run government business.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well I don't think it's going to serve anybody to get into a discussion of donations to political parties except that at least I can say that we are very much out front and do publish who donates to our party, which is something I can't say for you folks.

But in any case, I don't believe it's up to the member from Regina Centre or myself or anybody else to decide who's donating in what league. I mean, you say these people are donating. Maybe they're better believers than others. I don't know. How do I know that? I mean, are you going to judge who donates to their church? I mean, some people donate to their church right up to the tithe, and I don't know anything about that.

(19:30)

All I would say to you is that I'm very pleased that the principals, whoever they are — and I say that very honestly, whoever they are — at what was formerly . . . I'm informed that it's no longer Hauser Chev Olds. I'm informed it's no longer Hauser Chev Olds; it's now Wheaton Chev Olds or whatever. But I don't know the people there, never have, and all I can say is that I'm pleased to hear we have people who donate to or party to that magnitude. I'm very pleased about that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, Mr. Minister, I doubt that the public will be. I doubt that the public will view that as an appropriate way to be running the affairs of this province, to be purchasing \$1.9 million worth of business, which as I say must be one-half of the total business going to automobile dealers. And Mr. Minister, I assume this is for the purchase of automobiles. I assume that's what this figure relates to. If it isn't, you might correct me.

Mr. Minister, I doubt that the public are going to find out that to be an appropriate way to run the province's affairs, to be accepting donations of that magnitude from a business, and then in turn for them picking up such a huge chunk of business with respect to automobile sales.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, just to reiterate once again, Mr. Chairman, the member will try to dredge up all kinds of scandal or quasi-scandal. But I would say to the member, as I did before, the tendering process, annual buying of vehicles for the government, is tendered as it always has been through the manufacturers, the major manufacturing companies and the various suppliers here within the province. In this case, you know, you mention this and I believe that it's true, that Hauser Chev Olds, and what was the other firm — I believe it was Crestview that you mentioned — won the tenders on the basis of that tendering process.

And I don't believe . . . I'm informed here, although I don't have the numbers in front of me I certainly would be willing to provide them to the member, and then provide them to the House at some other time. But I'm informed that those same firms won what we could call a lion's share of business in years past when we weren't in government, so that's not something that's changed. These are businesses that are very large automobile dealers here in the city of Regina and in this province, and they have done that type of business for a good number of years, and continue to do that. I must say to the hon. member, though, they donated to this political party, I'm pretty sure, before we were in government. So you don't have to say that their donations are anything in relationship to the work that they are doing with the government or anything like that. They just didn't like you guys.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You may, Mr. Minister, be . . . You may, Mr. Minister, deny, claim your innocence. I doubt quite frankly that an awful lot of people are going to believe you. Mr. Minister, will you, with respect to the tenders which Hauser Chev Olds bid on, will you give us the tender specifications and the other bids, which I suppose we might have got had we enough prescience to be there when the bids were opened.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I'm informed . . . We don't have the tender document but we will send somebody to get it, and I'll provide it to you this evening if you like. And what it will be is the tender document listing the specifications. The document has not changed since when you were the minister of government services, in any great way, so it's the same format and so on. I'm quite willing to provide it to you in case you've forgotten. I know that you read it very carefully when you were the minister.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And you will give me the other bids, Mr. Minister, besides the successful one?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, no. I didn't say that I'm going to give you the bids. I said I was going to give you the tender documents with specifications and so on that people had in their hands when they bid, and you'll see the process. I didn't say that I would give the bids of the various manufacturers. Eaton's doesn't tell Simpsons their business, not does Pepsi tell Coke their formula.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The way bids are supposed to . . . Yes. What you did was just give me something written in hieroglyphics and did not give me the Rosetta stone. I mean, I have no way of interpreting that information without the other bids.

Mr. Minister, if the bids were properly handled, if these things were being properly handled they would be opened in public, and anyone who wanted to go would know what the other people bid and they would know who was high and who was low. That is not the process, Mr. Minister, but I do not see why you won't give us the amount and the other bids. We can then make a determination as to whether or not the thing was handled legitimately. So I ask you, Mr. Minister, why you won't give us that.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. I have no problem in providing that. I'm informed that it's tenders which are opened in public, and all of the firms know. So I'll provide the last year's contracts and so on, and I'll give you the whole works. As you know, there are complicated formulas applied for the life cycle of various vehicles, etc., etc., but I'll give it all to you, and I know you'll look it over very carefully and have some excellent reading at the beach this summer.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, according to the information you give us, last year nine people were fired in your department without cause.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, nine middle and senior managers — I ask you, Mr. Minister, first of all if you have settled with all, if you have paid the piper with respect to all nine of those people who

were unjustly fired.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Yes, I'm informed that all nine . . . There are settlements completed with all nine.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And what did this little exercise in a political vendetta cost the taxpayer?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I would say to the member that he's misrepresenting when he says it's an exercise in political vendetta.

I said last year that there were people in the department who had . . . the deputy had lost confidence in, and were no longer with us. And that's where it is.

So there's no political vendetta. Nine people are no longer with the department. Nine people have settled, and we feel that it's probably good for the taxpayer.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I will let the public judge for themselves whether or not the dismissals can be justified for any other reason.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Minister, you didn't try. You didn't try. You made no effort to justify them. You simply said, we want our political people in there, so that decisions of the sort we have been reviewing for the last two days can be made by our willing hacks.

Mr. Minister, the question I . . . What I really wanted from you was not an attempt to justify the impossible, attempt to justify these dismissals. I actually asked you for the total amount of severance paid to these nine people.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well first of all, we did not . . . You know, the member would leave the impression that we moved nine people out, and replaced them with nine others, and so on. That's not the case.

What happened is that those nine are no longer with the government. They have all settled, as I've said. The position numbers are gone. We have pared back the management staff in a department by more than those nine — by quite a number more.

So we have fewer people in management, a more efficient operation, and those nine people have all settled.

And I would say that that case is closed — all nine of them.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is the total amount of the severance paid to all nine?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I will undertake to send to the member the list, but it is about \$290,000. But I will give you the exact numbers, dollars and cents. But I don't have it here tonight.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, that's \$290,000 which you have used for political purposes. It may be pale, I suppose, in comparison with the travel expenses of this government; it may pale in comparison with what it cost you to take an 11-person delegation to China for three weeks; but it's still \$200,000 — it's \$290,000, Mr. Minister, which might have been put to some other use.

You never attempted to justify the dismissal of these people on any grounds. You did it because you felt that they would not heel when you called them to heel. And I mean that in a political sense. You felt these were not political heelers in positions in which you wanted political heelers. And that's why the taxpayers are forced to shell out \$290,000.

If you can't think of another use for that \$290,000, I can assure you I can. If you're having any difficulty, Mr. Minister, just let me know, and I will run over the list of worthy projects that could use \$290,000. I know the chairman would be delighted to hear me get back into the food banks that I have been into before.

But I say to you, Mr. Minister, that that is \$290,000 which you've wasted. It's taxpayers' money which you just blew away. And Mr. Minister, that is not an acceptable way to run the government.

I say to you under this head, as I've said to you under the other heads that we've been discussing, that patronage is a very expensive way to run a government. It is expensive because it costs the taxpayers money directly out of their pockets. It's expensive because it's also inefficient.

(19:45)

Mr. Minister, I know that in some cases you have replaced those people. Perhaps you gave the position a different name, but you have replaced those people, those professional public servants, with people who aren't qualified to do the job and will probably never be qualified to do the job, but whose qualifications are that they will do your bidding.

Mr. Minister, that's \$290,000 you've wasted. And if you think it's a joke, we'll let you continue to laugh once the camera's on you. \$290,000 is not a joke to the taxpayer.

I don't know, Mr. Minister, how serious the taxpayers took your spendthrift ways until these latest tax increases. And I've noticed them a lot more interested, since April the 10th, on the various ways in which you people waste taxes and waste their dollars. Because all of a sudden it's coming home that this is somebody else's money that's being wasted. This \$290,000 is their money; and it's coming out of their pockets. And that fact has been driven home this year.

So I say to you, Mr. Minister, that the public are a lot more sensitive than they have been in the past about the way this government wastes money. As they were a lot more sensitive than you people imagined about the \$28 million you blew away with Pioneer Trust, so they are going to be sensitive about sums which may appear to be lesser but which, nevertheless, are significant and which expenditures were unnecessary.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member will talk about nine people that left the employ of the Department of Supply and Services, nine people in management. I have said before that we did not replace those nine, although some of the functions that they carried out and so on have been picked up by other people, there's no question about that. We did not replace those nine; we pared back. Within the total Department of Supply and Services, with some increased programming, we have more than 150 people, more than 150 deletions, fewer people than what were there when we inherited the overburdened fat-cat sort of government that you people operated. So more than 150 back.

You talk about spending taxpayers' money on the settlement for the nine that you refer to. If they had stayed on staff for one more year, they would have received much more than that, certainly more than that in one year's salary. And they would have received that amount again in the next year, and in the next year, and in the next year. And you tell me about saving taxpayers' money. I'll tell you that by paring down the department and by moving people that the senior management had lost confidence in, we have saved the taxpayers money, and we make no apology for it. And in fact, the people of Saskatchewan demanded that we do that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That, Mr. Minister, is errant nonsense. If, Mr. Minister, you had decided to reduce the public service, there are other ways to go about it, and well you know it. And indeed, Mr. Minister, this government has been engaged in some of that with the early

retirement, by attrition. Mr. Minister, I don't have to tell this government that there are other ways to reduce the size of the public service issue if you wish.

Mr. Minister, you fired those people and paid that severance because you didn't like the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . because you didn't like what you believed to be their political stripes. In some cases, you were wrong about the political stripes. You were wrong about the political stripe of the deputy minister, for instance. And you were wrong about the political stripes of some others whom I won't mention.

The deputy minister became a public issue, so I'll use that example. But you were wrong, Mr. Minister, about the political stripe of a number of the people that you fired, if indeed you have the right to fire a man or a woman for what they believe in, if indeed you have the right to fire someone for what they believe in.

There was no suggestion, Mr. Minister, made by you or by anyone else, any other members of the treasury benches, who went through political assassinations — to some extent which are still going on . . . If there was any basis for justifying the dismissals, you never tried. You simply said you didn't like them, and they were going. And you didn't like them because you felt they weren't political heelers.

Two hundred and ninety thousand dollars, if that's the figure — \$290,000 of taxpayers' money which you've wasted because you thought you had some political enemies. And you're prepared to deal with them with someone else's money.

I remember introducing a Bill in the last session of the legislature, which did not receive passage, but which would have made the Conservative Party responsible for payment of the severance pay. It was clearly done for the benefit of the Conservative Party.

So Mr. Minister, don't give this Assembly the baloney that you were doing it to reduce the size of the public service. Well, I could use a stronger term, but I don't know if . . . There is a more vivid, a more descriptive, and a more apt term. I doubt, however, if Mr. Chairman would let me use it. So we'll call your explanation, for a lack of a better form, shall we say, baloney.

Mr. Minister, there is just simply no basis for this nonsense that you're reducing the public service. You fired those people because you didn't like the ideas that they believed in. I challenge, Mr. Minister, your right to fire a person for their personal beliefs if there's nothing wrong with the work they're doing.

And I know you don't believe this, but most governments don't operate as you do. Most governments give public servants freedom of conscience. There is some exceptions, of which this government is the most notable, but most governments allow public servants freedom of conscience, allow public servants to follow their own political beliefs so long as it doesn't interfere with the operation of their work.

Mr. Minister, I could name you any number of public servants who worked for the Liberal Party, who worked for the Conservative party — indeed some were candidates — when we were in office. They weren't dismissed. But there's nothing particularly righteous about that; that's the way most governments work. That is the way the federal . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That, Mr. Minister, you might be interested to know, is the way the federal government worked under the previous administration and it appears to be the way the federal government's working under this administration. While they have been rightly criticized for political patronage in hiring, they have not been criticized for a witch-hunt.

So I say, Mr. Minister, if you want an example of a government which has a better way of handling government, you might look to your federal counterparts. Because they have done a vastly better and a more skilful job than you have.

Mr. Minister, you fired them because you didn't like their beliefs. That is wrong in and by itself. It's also wrong because in many cases you were wrong. Many of the people you fired voted for you, and if you had given them half a chance in the public service of Saskatchewan, a lot of them would have gone on voting for you, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well we went through this last year. The hon. member, I believe raised the same . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sure, and that will be an awful long time. But what you need to do is . . . I have never said, I have never said or suggested, nor have any of my colleagues ever suggested, that there was anything to do with political beliefs. I have never said that. That's what you said. You said that.

I said that senior management in our department lost confidence in those people. And when we lost confidence in them, and we have a department to operate, whether you like it or not . . . You maybe want to stand around and get involved in the political rhetoric. We have a department to operate and we will continue to operate it.

And I will just say to you that we are operating it in a very efficient manner. We have excellent people in management in the department, and eight down through the department. We have reduced the staff in our department. The people of Saskatchewan said to us, reduce the staff in various departments across the government. We have done that and we re operating on an efficient basis. The case is closed. As I said, the nine cases are closed. I don't know why you want to raise the old skeletons. There are no problems; we certainly have no problem with the way in which it was done, and there were fair and just settlements. That's really all we can say about it. You and I will once again agree to disagree. And in fact, I'm quite pleased t agree t disagree with you on most everything.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well Mr. Minister, you will have to agree to disagree with most of the public in Saskatchewan because very, very few of them will approve the witch-hunt that has gone on in the public service. Mr. Minister, we are going to have an opportunity later on this evening, in all likelihood, to deal with that in a more direct way with the Public Service Commission. So I'm going to leave it for the moment.

Mr. Minister, can you tell me if the executive director position with maintenance and operations division has been filled on a permanent basis? Can you tell me when the appointment was made?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I didn't hear the last part of your question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Can you tell me when the appointment was made?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — The answer is yes. That position has been filled on a permanent basis. Mr. Chairman, I'd just catch the attention of the member from Regina Centre. Your question was: has the executive director's job been filled? It is yes. It was filled on a permanent basis, and in July of 1984.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Was a private consulting firm hired in any way to assist in that particular staffing process?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Yes, and the name of the firm is Western Management Consultants.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And will you confirm, Mr. Minister, that the fee which was paid to that firm was in the neighbourhood of \$10,000? Would you give me the exact fee, actually?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member, at the time that the executive director of property management . . . we were searching for an executive director in that, we in

fact were searching for three senior management people: the director of divisional service, executive director of property management, and executive director of planning and development. And we engaged this management consultant firm on a package deal to find the best people available for the particular positions. And they did that, and we hired, we filled the three senior management positions through that process . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, and the number, and I don't have the exact number, but I will provide it, but it's in the neighbourhood of \$18,000 for that contract to bring the three people.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Sorry, Mr. Minister, to be a piker and suggest it was only 10.

Mr. Minister, what have you got against using the Public Service Commission? What have you got against using the senior management resourcing branch of the Public Service Commission, who are set up to assist in this sort of activity? Why, Mr. Minister, must you always find somebody to pay some money to?

Again, Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that this is another example of hiring someone who's a political friend of yours. You hire them; you pay them, unnecessarily. This, Mr. Minister, is another example of patronage . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sure I am, Mr. Minister.

I say again, Mr. Minister, you could have used the Public Service Commission. You chose not to. I suggest (a) because you wanted to give a lucrative contract to somebody; and (b) because you weren't sure that you could entirely control the public service, and you weren't sure you'd necessarily get the people that you wanted. You might get someone who's a professional public servant. Good heavens, it's an anathema to this government.

I suggest you did it for both those reasons, Mr. Minister: because you were better able to control who you'd get when you use a private consulting firm, and because you wanted to award a fat contract to another of your friends.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — First of all, the very suggestion . . . And we can get into this, and I really hope, and I would invite the hon. member to discuss the senior management resourcing branch when we get into Public Service Commission estimates in a few minutes, or tomorrow, or whenever you decide to do that. You mention, why did we not use the senior management resourcing branch? The senior management branch was non-existent when you people were in government. Was a thing which we have just brought into play, and is a branch which we are making more and more use of in government.

What we've found in coming into office, and in dealing with the Public Service Commission, and I have — and I'm closer to this than I was before I was involved with the Public Service Commission — we found very much a lack in terms of management resourcing for senior positions. What these people have brought to us is, and we hired the outside firm to do that: the director of divisional services that was hired was in fact and is, a professional public servant here, and was a professional public servant in the province of Alberta before that. The executive director of property management branch, through the competition and through the search that was done by the firm that you referred to, was found here within the Government of Saskatchewan, and the executive director of planning and development came from the private sector in the province of Alberta. And all three are doing an excellent job in the senior management of this department. And I don't understand why the member would call into question the way in which the search was done when the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — It was a waste of 18,000 bucks.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, there was not a waste of \$18,000. It was a good expenditure of \$18,000 to find three quality people to do quality work in the branches, and we're very proud of the work that they are doing.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why couldn't the senior management resourcing branch of the Public Service Commission have provided those services to you?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I just gave you the answer. Because it was not up and running until after that was the case. That's something new, and it's an innovative thing which we have brought into the Public Service Commission, something that you didn't even . . . It was not in existence and I'm really surprised that you are even referring to the name of the senior management resources branch. There was no such thing in the Public Service Commission under your administration. It's a new and innovative approach to senior management resourcing which we have brought to the Public Service Commission, and which is very well received throughout management in this government, and in fact will be a model across this country. Talk about it later in Public Service Commission. I invite you to do that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It is a new name for a service which has long been provided by the Public Service Commission, and that is staffing senior positions, Mr. Minister. The suggestion that this is, previous to whenever this was set up, that this is a brand-new function that they never did before is tommy-rot, Mr. Minister, You could have used the Public Service Commission. That is the way senior management have been hired, except perhaps with respect to deputies. Other than permanent heads, this is the way senior management has been hired for a lengthy period of time.

It's not a new function for the Public Service Commission. You may have given it a new name. You're fond of doing that, of taking old functions and giving them new names, but you could have hired these people through the regular process. I ask you again why you felt it necessary to skirt the Public Service Commission and go to a private consulting firm.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — As a matter of fact, what we did — and with Western Management Consultants it was done in co-operation with the Public Service Commission, so it's not a matter of skirting the Public Service Commission. It was an area that was very much lacking in the Public Service Commission prior to this. Now that that branch is up and running, it is certainly not lacking and in fact is being strengthened every day.

And I would just say to the hon. member that you're off base to a considerable degree this time. But in any case, it was done in conjunction with the Public Service Commission.

As I've said before, we've found three excellent people, and we're pleased with the work that they're doing.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I want to go back to one of your previous answers, which I think was also less than candid.

I want to read you a note that I just was handed. A caller to the office a few moments ago said that McLeod is lying through his teeth. He says that all severance payments have not been reached. His in particular has not been reached.

I ask you again, Mr. Minister, to check that answer. Are you sure they have all been finalized?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, I'm informed that the nine people that you referred to are . . . Agreements have been reached with all of them. And I don't know what else to say.

If you have anonymous callers . . . I didn't know that it was now the practice in the House for members of the opposition . . . And I know you're really in need of research staff and everything else because that's evident every day in question period.

But I would say to you that if your research and if your information that you're bringing to the House is on the basis of some anonymous call to your office, then I would say that that's not the

case, but I'm informed for the best of my knowledge here there have been settlements reached with the nine which you referred to earlier.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, was there people other than the nine who were dismissed about which my question technically did not cover?

Were there other dismissals other than the nine that we've been talking about? Is that where it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have the person's name; I know the person; I know that person from the days I was minister; I know they were there and I know this person was dismissed.

I haven't any intention of giving you his name. The vengeful way in which this government approaches people who it thinks does not agree with it just prohibits, just makes it impossible for me to pass the name on.

So I say, Mr. Minister, I can give you my personal assurance that this person worked there, that this person was dismissed, and the person calls describing you with more candidness than good manners, I suppose, as lying through your teeth. That's not my comments, that's not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. It doesn't matter. We've been tolerant so far. It doesn't matter whose comments. You can't express the opinions of the people on the street in any other form other than in your own opinion. And what I'm saying is that you can't quote other people on things that you can't say yourself. And I think you know that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well in that case, in that case I withdraw the remark. An ardent admirer of the member from Meadow Lake has called me and said that you've made an innocent mistake. And this person suggests that there's someone you forgot about. So I say, is there someone other than the nine who I have not been asking about?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — What I said is that settlements have been reached in all cases. And I'm informed that there is one other. There is one other that is involved in the courts, but a payment has been made to the courts in trust, and so the payments have been made by our department. So other than that I don't know, but I did say to you before that settlements have been reached with all of them in terms of the money sent out to the court and so on. And that's all I can say to you.

If you would like to provide me with the information as to the name, I'd be quite willing to receive it from you, and to check into it, and provide you with the answer on a confidential basis or whatever . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not sure. I'm really surprised, with the kinds of questions that the member is asking, I'm really surprised that anyone out there is watching.

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, during Highway estimates I tried to get some information from the minister regarding his expense account and travels. He gave me some \$7,800 worth. The rest, he said I'd have to ask the Minister of Supply and Services.

Could the minister provide me with a list of the travels of the Minister of Highways — the trips that he made, the cost of those trips, the purpose of them, and who may have accompanied him on those trips?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I gave the computer print-out of the travels of every minister yesterday. And I'm not sure if the member from Pelly was in here, but I gave that to the member from Shaunavon yesterday. He asked for it — all of the travel. I gave that, and he had it in his hands when we walked out of here yesterday. And all executive travel by ministers — destination, all of the other things that you've asked for which is normally provided — the member has it on a computer print-out, the member from Shaunavon. I gave it yesterday in estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member for Regina Lake Centre.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Lake Centre's a riding which has not existed for 10 years.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Just so the members won't . . . I'm told it wasn't a computer print-out. Although it looked like one, it was a typed list and so on. But it's a long list of folding paper and so on, and I gave it to the member.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I was about to say that I was an ardent admirer of yours, but you were innocently mistaken. Because I was in here during the entire estimates, and there was only one computer print-out, and it was the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — It was the space inventory.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It was the space inventory. That's what I was trying to think of.

Mr. Minister, with respect to the firm that you hired for \$18,000 to fill a position which Public Service Commission was patently capable of filling, how was the contract? Was it a lump sum agreed upon in advance? Was it an hourly rate? How did you calculate that?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — We don't have a copy of the contract here, but I'm very confident saying that it was a fixed rate of payment for the job that was contracted.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, with respect to the Central Vehicle Agency, has there been any . . . I'll go back to a period as late as November 5th, 1980, a period when I ceased to have any right to ride on that aircraft. Mr. Minister, at that time, ministers had a right to ride in the aircraft, but no spouses unless they were accompanying their husbands or wives — it wouldn't have been a wife in those days — unless they were accompanying a husband to a function. Has that changed, Mr. Minister? Is there any instance of a spouse having ridden alone on the aircraft without the minister?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. The policy has changed in terms of a minister's spouse riding the plane or anything else. As an example I could use a case where the spouse may not be riding with the particular minister would be a case where, let's say, the minister was in a particular location on some type of business prior and there was another, something totally unrelated function in that community where the spouse's attendance is required and so on. Then I would say that the spouse may have ridden on a different plane to that location. Now those kinds of things carry on. They did in the past, and they still do. But the policy has not changed.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So spouses are allowed to ride on the government aircraft when they are attending a function of some sort or other. Is that what you're telling me?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well I just have in my hands the executive air service guide-lines. The pertinent paragraph here is:

Family members of the Premier, ministers, and the Lieutenant Governor may use the service when required to attend official government functions.

The same policy that was in place. I'm quite willing to send this policy over to the member.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is the policy with respect to the use of the aircraft to do constituency work, to go to and from a constituency?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — The policy is unchanged in terms of, you know, what the member calls constituency work. If it's just the meeting with constituents and so on, and there's no other, what you would call it, you know, more official ministerial government business, the planes

aren't used for that. They're used for government business or government meetings where you represent the government as a whole.

(20:15)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I ask this because the Premier was asked about the expenses of the Minister of Highways. He said he encouraged ministers to live in their ridings, and that to him justified expenses of \$62,000. I took that to mean that a minister could use the executive aircraft to get to and from his constituency because he might choose to live there rather than the capital city. So I ask again, Mr. Minister, are you sure ministers cannot use aircraft for the sole purpose of riding to or from . . . of getting to or from their constituency?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I said that policy is unchanged. As far as taking the aircraft, and I think you quite clearly said to do constituency work, it's quite clear that the policy is unchanged. The Premier has reiterated that. And there's no question that our Premier has encouraged members of the Executive Council to maintain residence in their ridings and so on, but the major thing is to keep their families together and so on. That's very important to us.

A member of the Executive Council may use the government aircraft to return to their constituency if they reside and it's not conveniently served by a commercial airline. That's a reasonable policy, and it certainly fits the circumstance of the Minister of Highways who resides on his farm near Wilkie. Commercial airlines do not fly to Wilkie, as the member knows, or to Unity. And the Minister of Highways has considerable duties here in Regina, as you know, that all ministers do, and we make no apology for a minister flying home to be with his family on weekends periodically. And I can say, as you will know, having been a minister of the Crown, as you will know, visits to the family, whether they be in Regina or in the constituency are just that — they are periodic, especially during some of the busy seasons of the year.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, when you're running up expenses of \$5,000 a month, which is greater than your salary, that I think . . . I think it is then time to review the use of the government aircraft. I assume that the \$62,000 wasn't all spent in restaurants down town. I say that part of that at least was incurred upon the executive aircraft.

When ministers are starting to accumulate expense accounts of \$62,000, it's time something changed. If they're using the executive aircraft that frequently . . . I assume that's the only way a person can run up an expense account of \$62,000. Nobody could eat or drink that much; you'd be dead if you tried. It's got to have been incurred, it's got to have been incurred on the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . At least they paid their own way, though. At least they paid their own way, Mr. Minister.

I say when you are running up expenses of \$62,000, then it is time the policy changed, because it is just simply too much of the taxpayers' money to be using to subsidize travel of people who are already well paid.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, the Minister misleads the House when he talks about expense accounts. It's not the flying, the flying and the expenses of the Minister of Highways — and I've reiterated that he lives in Wilkie on his farm near there, and it's a good distance. And one of the things that you people don't realize is how far some of the communities of Saskatchewan are from Regina.

There's very good reason for you not realizing that, because a good number of you never went any place but Regina. Okay? And the people of Saskatchewan have said to us on many occasions, whether it be the Minister of Highways or any of my other colleagues — and I don't know how many times we've had this said to us — that this is the first time in a good number of years, in a long time, that we've had ministers come to this function, to this community, to this thing which those citizens of the province feel are important to them and to their

communities. We do that.

For you to suggest to the House that the total expense of the Minister of Highways are to fly to is constituency are wrong. A number of those dollars are spent on that basis. There's no question, and we don't apologize for that. But I will say to you that the Minister of Highways and Transportation also covers a good deal of this province, and meeting with various groups around the province, and is a very busy minister in this government, as was the Minister of Highways in a former government.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, if you're suggesting that only a minor portion of the Minister's expense came through using CVA, then indeed we are owed an explanation as to where this \$62,000 comes from, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, what aircraft now comprise the fleet of aircraft that is used for executive travel?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Three Cheyenne aircraft, all of which were owned and operated by the former government as well — three Cheyennes, or the back-up of a Navajo, which you're familiar with.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You've three Cheyenne. What use is made of the aircraft that were used in northern Saskatchewan? So they still use it there? There was some executive aircraft used in northern Saskatchewan. Are they still there?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No. We went through that last year. The Cheyenne which was located and, in fact, was not part of the executive fleet before, but was very much used as an executive aircraft by your government and located in La Ronge, is now located with the other two planes here in Regina, used for executive travel, used for air ambulance services.

All three of them are used in that way.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, can you give me the number of miles — hours is the way it is actually calculated — give me the number of hours those aircraft flew in the last year? I'd also like to know the number of hours those aircraft flew in the three years in which you people have been in office.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I can give you the number of kilometres flown — 971,000 kilometres.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, can you give me then the kilometres flown by the aircraft in the two previous years? I want for the three years this government's been in office.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — In 1983-84, it was 851,000 kilometres; 1982-83, it was 615,000 kilometres.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's what I thought. The use of the aircraft has increased rather substantially — by 50 per cent almost since you took office. That is what I suspected, Mr. Minister, and I suppose it would be justifiable if you people were communicating more effectively. It's apparent that you're not. It is apparent, Mr. Minister, that any government which can sincerely convince itself that what we saw on April 10 is the province's most intelligent budget is not communicating very effectively. Any government which brings in tax increases of that nature, as regressive as those tax increases are, and believes that it's communicating effectively, is deceiving itself.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Order. What's this got to do with anything?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What this has to do is the only conceivable justification . . . The only conceivable justification for a 50 per cent increase in the use of executive aircraft is if you're

communicating more effectively. I suggest this government is not. This government is communicating a good deal less effectively than it did when it came into office, and it was no great shakes in 1982-83, but it's got continually worse.

Mr. Minister, I don't know what you're doing and where you're going when you're travelling 50 per cent more by government aircraft than you used to. It may be that you're, it may be that you are never using your automobiles, Mr. Minister. But for some reason or other, which isn't apparent from the effectiveness of your operation, you have increased the use of the executive aircraft by 50 per cent, and that represents quite an expenditure. That is an expensive way to travel.

And I say, Mr. Minister, that you and the Premier . . . We'll get to this when we get to his estimates. Yourself, and the Premier, and other ministers ought to curtail the use of that executive aircraft because that represents quite an expenditure of money when that aircraft operates as many miles as it is. I gather, if I heard that figure properly, I gather it's running almost a million kilometres a year. Is that what you said?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well I gave you the numbers, 971,000 kilometres.

I would say to the hon. member, and as I indicated before and as other ministers in this government have indicated to you, as far as you judging the way in which this government communicates, I'll tell you the judge of that will be the electorate of Saskatchewan when the time comes. And I have every confidence that you will see the results one more time. You will see the results again of what happens when a government does communicate, or when a political party does communicate, and so on. And we communicate with the people of Saskatchewan as a government. We go out to the communities, many of which were very, very seldom visited by ministers in your government, seldom visited by ministers in your government, and have been for three years now frequently visited by ministers in this government.

We make no apology, we make no apology whatever, for putting a priority on visiting the smaller communities and on visiting the further-flung communities of this province. We make no apology whatever for that. And in fact those are the people in this province that should be served by their government. It's well-known that a government such as yours that was so Regina-orientated and tied to this city . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You had a mentality that knew nothing beyond, north of Ipsco.

And all I can say to you is what we have made a commitment to people in communities all over this province, in organizations, in all kinds of community groups, that we will continue to visit with them, to take their organizations and the activities of their organizations seriously. We will continue to do that.

We will not apologize for using executive air to the benefit of those communities as they have ministers visit them. WE will continue to visit them on that basis. I will, the Premier will, as will all members of this cabinet.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, I have the list that you sent over to my colleague, the member for Shaunavon, yesterday. I did ask you for the cost of the trips, because the minister wouldn't provide the cost of the trips. He said you would have those. There's nothing in this book that would indicate the cost of the trips for the Minister of Highways.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, what the member has in his hand is a list of the trips taken, the authorizing minister for each of those trips, the senior official on board, and the destination, and so on — the same information that has been always provided in this House, and the same information that will continue to be provided by this government.

In terms of the total numbers, you have every access to the total numbers when it comes to

public accounts, whatever. And that has never been provided, as far as a breakdown, individual trips, and so on. And it won't be provided tonight wither, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUSNEY: — Well, Mr. Minister, we're talking about some \$62,000 of expenses that the Minister of Highways ran up in travelling expenses. All he provided me with or the taxpayers of this province with was some \$7,800 worth of travelling expenses. We're looking at some \$55,000 worth that we can't seem to find.

Now, Mr. Minister, I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of this province, would be interested to know where those other \$55,000 are. And what I'm asking you is what it cost for the minister to travel around, wherever it may be in this province or outside — what the cost was. You gave me the list of the trips that he made via the executive aircraft. What was the cost of those trips?

(20:30)

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, what I have provided . . . And the member has that. You want to go through a portion of the number that you float out, that you talk about that you found in *Public Accounts* and so on. That's all as it should be. It covers a good number of other things in terms of the various expenses of the minister which we don't have any responsibility for. The executive travel we do.

All I can say to you is that you will see from the list that I sent to your colleague from Shaunavon, and you can go through that list and you'll see the trips taken by the Minister of Highways, you can see the trips taken by the Premier, by myself, by every other minister here. And go ahead and find out. And you'll see the number of trips, and where they went to, and so on.

All the same information that was always provided in this House when you guys sat here; and the same information that we are providing to you now that you sit there.

MR. LUSNEY: — What you're saying then, Mr. Minister, is that the other \$55,000 that we're looking for, that the Minister of Highways spent in travel, we are not going to be able to find out — where it was spent and what it was spent on, what kind of travel, who may have been with him. And we won't know if the trips that he made with the executive aircraft amount to \$55,000.

Is there any way that we can find that out, or do you keep track of what the cost . . . You've apparently . . . You know what the cost is because it's in *Public Accounts*. Why wouldn't you tell me the cost of the trips of the Minister of Highways? You must have a breakdown for it because you've listed it in *Public Accounts*. So someone must have a breakdown.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, we provide you with the number of trips taken by each minister, and you have that list, very extensive list of who went where. You have that list. I gave it to your colleague yesterday, and I invite you to go through it and find out where the Minister of Highways went and so on.

And when you go through that, and I would invite you as well to go through it very carefully and see where all of the ministers in this government went around this province, and see the number of communities and organizations in the province that have been touched, and when you have a good clear look at that, you will know very clearly then why you guys continue to be in trouble.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, you seem to imply that somehow the majority of the trips that the minister has made were to various communities on government business and somehow dealing with the problems that people may have.

Well, Mr. Minister, I went through one month here, and that was through the month of July of '84, to see where the minister's trips were, and every one of them were Regina-Unity-Regina or

Regina-Saskatoon-Unity-Regina. That would mean another minister went with him to Saskatoon, dropped him off, and dropped both of them off, and the plane come back to Regina. So in the one month the only trips the minister made were home from Regina and then back to Regina.

And, Mr. Minister, I haven't checked all the other months or all the other ministers, but if that was the extent of the travel, or the cost of the travel, \$55,000 a year, while he has a public service vehicle also, with a credit card, and if we spent \$55,000 in that year for him to travel home and to Regina with the executive aircraft, I think that's rather an expensive way for the ministers to travel home.

And, Mr. Minister, this is why I asked you what the costs were of the minister's travel with the executive aircraft. I wouldn't want to accuse him of spending \$55,000 to travel home.

So this is why I would like to know the cost, the actual cost was of his trips with the executive aircraft, so the public can know where those expenditures were made. I don't want to mislead the public into thinking something that may not be true, but with all the information that I've got here — I'm looking at, just pulling a month from the middle of this book — shows me that the travels of the minister were home.

And I would hope that isn't all of it, and I'm sure that isn't the only place that he has travelled with the executive aircraft, but it sure would be nice — I would like to know, and the public would like to know, the taxpayers would like to know, how much was spent by the executive aircraft, and if there is some other money somewhere that we have to look for.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, I'm really pleased to hear that the hon. member from Pelly — I hope this is the new-found member from Pelly — that he doesn't want to mislead the public.

You've been misleading the public for a number of months, in terms of you've been saying that it's \$62,000 that the Minister of Highways has spent on travelling home. You've been saying that for a long time. It's just simply not true. That didn't stop you before. I don't know what kind of a great conversion happened to you today that you've all of a sudden decided that you're not going to mislead the public any more. I'll be surprised to see that happen.

I would say to you that there'll be no . . . The information that you have, I would invite you to check that list, as I've said, with all the ministers, all my colleagues. The Minister of Health: check the Minister of Health, see where he's travelled, the communities that he's gone to; check that list very carefully. Check all of our ministers very carefully.

I invite you to do that, and you will find out. You'll find out very, very quickly, as you realize the pace that these people have been, that all of them have been carrying on in going to communities in this province that had no visits from ministers for so long that they have now just come to realize that the government is more than just Regina and the marble palace, which is what happened to you guys in the first place.

The thing that surprises me about it all, and the thing that surprises me very much about you asking even these kinds of questions, and questioning why ministers are travelling around Saskatchewan, is that it shows me that you still haven't learned the lesson of April the 26th of 1982 — out of touch with the people, continue to ask questions which indicate that you're still out of touch with the people.

Well we have maintained that we will remain in touch with the people. We are continuing to remain in touch with the people. All of my colleagues are proud of the communities that they've gone to visit, and we will continue to visit those communities in all of the corners of this province.

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, maybe I made a grave error in saying that I wouldn't want to mislead the public. Because I certainly don't, but it appears quite obvious

from what you are saying that the minister's travels were certainly nothing more than going home for the weekend. Because all that he has spent travelling out of province on government business was \$7,800. He gave me that list the other day. Ad I quoted you the figures, but just glancing at this book from July . . . I'll go back. Here is a page from June, and on this page there's one trip: Regina-Unity-Regina. The next page: Minister of Highways again, Regina-Unity-Regina.

Well Mr. Minister, it appears very clear, then, by this book and by the trips that you have provided, the information you have provided here, that I would have to assume then that the other \$55,000 was spent for the minister to travel home from Regina to his home in Unity via the aircraft for \$55,000.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I would ask the hon. member . . . The Minister of Highways has a farm near Wilkie. Now if the hon. member for Pelly, if the hon. member from Pelly had been a minister . . . Now this is hypothetical. This is extremely hypothetical, I admit. But had the hon. member from Pelly ever been appointed a minister in his long term here — had he ever been one — I would ask him the question: would you have picked up your farm and moved it to Regina? What would you have done? That's the question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

What did the member from Shaunavon do in his short term as minister of social services? — Regina, Shaunavon, Regina; Regina, Shaunavon, Regina. Well that happens that the Minister of Highways goes to Unity which is in his constituency because that's where he lives. That policy has not changed. We don't apologize for our ministers going home to visit their families now and then. There's no problem with that. We have no question about it whatsoever, and for the hon. member to raise the questions . . . You can raise these questions. Sure you have a right to raise them, but to go on and on and on with the same numbers and \$55,000 and \$62,000 — they're not valid numbers. But go ahead and continue with it as long as you like.

I will just reiterate once again: the Minister of Highways and all of us in this government will continue to visit with our families, and will continue to visit the communities of this province, and will continue to be on top in the political polls in this province, and the electorate will decide at the next election, and they will decide on our basis . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Yes, and the member over there says, and he's a political pundit now, and he says, "Polls are for dogs." I can say that the polls that you people use, the polls that you people use and said, let's read this poll over carefully and go to the people on the Crow Rate issue — that poll was certainly for the dogs.

MR. LUSNEY: — Well, Mr. Minister, I suppose you can keep denying and denying, and that's the policy of this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Deny, deny, deny.

MR. LUSNEY: — deny, deny, and deny all the time. Well, Mr. Minister, I don't think anyone expects that the Minister of Highways or any other minister shouldn't go home for the weekend or whenever it is that he might want to go home, but he does have a government car with a credit card — doesn't cost him anything. He could drive home like every other member that's elected and is away from home and is expected to go without having to spend \$55,000 on an executive aircraft. I can understand if that minister has to go to a meeting or some function within the province during the week, then he would be using the aircraft. But to say that he should be entitled and ever minister there should be entitled to use the executive aircraft every time they want to go home — well, Mr. Minister, I think that is being a little extravagant with the taxpayers' money.

And I think that is really being extravagant, and come the next election, I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan will tell you that they don't appreciate someone driving home with the executive

aircraft just to visit his family, especially when they are also paying for a car and a credit card for him to be able to do that.

So, Mr. Minister, I know it's not going to help to prolong this argument. We're not going to get any figures out of you, even though the Minister of Highways said that we can get all those figures and numbers from you.

The other area that he said we might be able to get it from Executive Council. And I suppose I'll have to attempt this questioning again with Executive Council and see if the Premier's going to have any better answers. But if they don't, I think the public then will have to assume only one thing, and that we do have a very extravagant government, has no respect for the taxpayers' money, or how they spend it.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, just very quickly, just so the record is straight. The member has already begun the misleading again. I thought it was coming soon, but I didn't know it would be this soon.

On May 30 of '85 in *Hansard*, the Minister of Highways during estimates. Here's his answer:

Mr. Chairman, . . . On air trips within the province, you can obtain that information from the Minister of Supply and Services at his estimates.

At these estimates in Supply and Services are provided the information on trips within the province. You know what trips the Minister of Highways took in July; you were reiterating them here a few minutes ago. You know what trips he took in June. You know what trips in the various months. Go ahead; I invite you once again to look at them.

For all of us we're pleased and we're proud of the communities that we visit. We will continue to visit them and the people will be welcoming us there in the future as they have in the past three years.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Minister, I'm sure that Wilkie is pleased to have the Minister of Highways come back there every week by executive aircraft.

But Mr. Minister, when you say that the Minister of Highways said that I should approach you, the Minister of Supply and services, in your estimates to find out what trips he had taken, I had also asked the minister at that time to provide me with the trips he has taken, who accompanied him, and the cost of those trips.

He gave me some of those, the out-of-province ones, what the cost of the trips, the trips that he has taken, and I was supposed to approach you in doing your estimates to get the cost of the rest of the trips.

That, Mr. Minister, you are not providing. And I believe there is no use in questioning it any further. We will just have to assume what I have stated before, and carrying on with the questioning.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I want to ask some questions with respect to Turnkey Systems Development Corporation. T-u-r-n-k-e-y. Turnkey Systems Development Corporation. Has your department done any business with this company?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I don't find anybody here who knows anything about that company. You give us a little more information, whatever.

But I don't know of anybody here who knows anything about it. If there's a little more detail, or if the member knows of something on it, he can reiterate a little closer, I can check.

(20:45)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The company, as I understand it, will build buildings, according to a design, for you. In fact, they will provide those set of services. They'll build buildings on behalf of a client, and build a building with no intention of owning. They just build them for people. So that's the nature of the service being provided. Have you ever done business with them?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, Mr. Chairman, nobody here has . . . Their mind's not twigged by the name of that company. But if you have other information or something that you can . . . It may be a subtrade to some company that dealt with us or . . . I'm not sure. I really don't know, and it appears that the officials here don't know either.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, with respect to administration, with respect to the administration, the subvote number 1, the one we happen to be on, it's a growth industry, Mr. Minister. I note that it has increased by 14.5, and the explanation for that is not entirely clear. It says that in '84-85 a portion of the '84-85 vote was included in Tourism and Renewable Resources, but nothing about what might have been included in this. So I ask, Mr. Minister, why that branch has grown by 14 and a half people.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — It's the . . . We have consolidated in the . . . In our department the administration services for two other departments, Tourism and Small Business, Economic Development and Trade, have their administration services done in one unit, and it's in or duplication of administration services in other departments. Those departments administration services are done by our department, and we eliminated some duplication that was going on in the government. It's been a very effective system, and has worked very well — to the satisfaction of the other two departments, I might add. I believe that was gone over in the Department of Economic Development and Trade.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I guess the executive assistants that you didn't hide in that subvote 1, you got in subvote 2. There are more people in subvote 2. What's the explanation for that, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — This is another efficiency measure, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased that the member asked the question. Member from Regina Centre, I know you'll be really interested in hearing this. It's another efficiency measure. We have amalgamated the personnel branch of various departments. WE have nine units, and we can get into that in the Public Service Commission estimates. But the personnel branches that were formerly in other departments, Economic Development and Trade, Tourism and Small Business, Co-ops, our own department of Supply and Services, Energy and Mines, and Northern Affairs Secretariat, all are handled by the personnel branch in the Department of Supply and Services.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the personnel expenses have doubled, but other expenses have increased by threefold. I wonder why that is.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — What happened is, the moneys that were in the departments which I just mentioned, the money that was in those various departments for the other expenses, were rolled into this amalgamated unit. There were no incremental increases of any kind. They were just rolled into this unit.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, can you give me the total amount spent by this

department on advertising and communications during this year?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I will . . . The officials inform me they will dig it up, and I will send it to the member.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, this branch or division — item number 3, capital planning and management — undergoes more changes . . . There's more new faces going through this department than there are through the globe Theatre. Every year, Mr. Minister, there seems to be a reorganization, new directors, and more acting directors. I wonder, Mr. Minister: have we finally reached the stage where we can look forward to fewer management changes and more stability in this area?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — There's no question that we've reached a stage of stability, and I'm sure the hon. member will be pleased. And the people that are there and the administration as it's operating, I would think, will be there for a good long time as . . . Well, I'll just stop at that. I would say that the question as it regards to stability — certainly we have a very stable operation in that branch and in all others.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The figure of . . . In other expenses, 600,000 has been cut to 300,000. It is not, of course, matched by a corresponding drop in staff. I wonder, Mr. Minister, what you've chosen to cut out. I'd rather be spared the explanation that you are operating more efficiently.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I am informed the department once was responsible for staff housing in some . . . I guess it was in remote communities and so on. That was transferred to Sask Housing Corporation, and it's no longer a part of our mandate. And that's the biggest chunk of that reduction.

Item 3 agreed to.

Items 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Item 7

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Another growth industry, Mr. Minister, a figure that's almost doubled. Mr. Minister, why has that figure of renovations of accommodations doubled in a year in which restraint is nipping everyone else?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well the increase there is reflected in a commitment to provide appropriate facilities. We've got different government programs, different objectives. There are nearly 60 projects identified at this time, with more expected as a result of the changing needs in a . . . Well we're a dynamic organization, this particular Government of Saskatchewan, and we have changing needs and so on. But that's what the renovation is all about, as departments move to different locations, more appropriate locations, or whatever.

For example, I'll give you an example: that Tourism and Small Business, Economic Development and Trade, those kinds of very business-orientated departments, we felt the need to locate them in the business section of the city of Regina. And we did that.

Those are the kinds of changes that take place and we just feel the more appropriate locations then . . . Because obviously our priorities as a government are different than the priorities of the former government. That's obvious.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, are you able to give me a list of the renovations that you're planning on doing, the ones you just finished referring to us, showing us?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. As the member will know, this is the kind of thing that changes quickly as priorities change and so on in various departments. All of the other departments are our client departments. We are a very service-oriented agency that does the work for various departments of government. We'd be quite willing to provide the member with a list of projects which are planned at the present time, but I would reiterate that those plans are subject to change, could be on a weekly basis.

Item 7 agreed to.

Item 8

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I suspect this is the chickens coming home to roost in this section. You have an increase of \$12 million, a 50 per cent increase in a very high budget item. I ask you, Mr. Minister, for a breakdown of how you're doling out this \$34 million in patronage to your friends.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well I have a list here I'll send to the hon. member. It's a new lease space — is that what you were asking for? — new lease space and a breakdown of where it is and so on, two sheets.

Item 8 agreed to.

Item 9 agreed to.

Item 10

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There is a substantial increase in the expenses in this item. Why is that?

(21:00)

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. I can give the member a breakdown. The largest increase there is \$77,840 — this is of change — increased to a budget request of 288,840 for cost of printing the *Gazette*, so an increased cost there; \$5,660, an increase to a budget request of 14,560 for addressograph services; \$6,480, a net of miscellaneous increases and decreases. Those are the breakdown of the amounts that would add up to the change there of 89,980.

Item 10 agreed to.

Items 11 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

Items 15 to 18 inclusive — Statutory.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Item 17 and 18, which I readily admit I may not understand, have increased substantially. The percentage increase in number 18 is quite spectacular, actually. Mr. Minister, will you explain for my benefit why the increases in these amounts?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Under number 18, that's a global fund for informatics, provision of computer services and so on throughout the government. So it's a informatics global fund across government to get a handle on the move to computers and so on as many departments are very much into.

Vote 13 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Capital Expenditure — Vote 14

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 14 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1986

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 13

Items 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 13 agreed to.

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND

BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE (RESOURCES DIVISION)

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Provincial Development Expenditure — Nil Vote

SPECIAL PROJECTS FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Capital Expenditure — Vote 14

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Item 4

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What about Langenburg? Maple Creek is obvious; it's on the main line of the Trans-Canada and catches the tourists. I'm not sure, Mr. Minister, I understand why we're spending an equal amount at Langenburg. It does not strike me as being a community which would be the first stop or the last stop for any great number of tourists.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, this is the best example of what I was referring to earlier. The member from Regina Centre, a former minister in the government of Saskatchewan, says it's obvious that the Maple Creek expenditure for a tourist information booth is reasonable because it's obviously on the Trans-Canada Highway, an entry point into Saskatchewan.

There's the member from Regina, who was a minister, who did not travel around Saskatchewan very much and does not know that Langenburg is the first point of entry on the Yellowhead Highway Route into Saskatchewan, which is a major transportation road across this province, and the Yellowhead Highway Route, for anyone who lives north of Ipsco in Saskatchewan knows that the Yellowhead is as equally important as the Trans-Canada Highway.

Item 4 agreed to.

Items 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 14 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985

SPECIAL PROJECTS FUND BUDGET EXPENDITURE

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Capital Expenditure — Vote 14

Items 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 14 agreed to.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, before the officials leave from this department and I — as people in the House will know, this is a very large department, and there are a lot of officials who work in this department at all levels — and I would just like to say thank you to the senior people who are here in the House with me, and to all others in the department who prepared the estimates and prepared the budget prior to budget presentation, and who do the good and solid work for this department on the behalf of the citizens of Saskatchewan throughout the year, and I know a number of them who work in the various branches are disappointed that there were no . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . are disappointed that there were no really constructive questions as it dealt with their various departments, but I would say that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. The debate is over; we can't get into that now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'll resist my temptation to say all those wonderful things about the minister then; I'll just end it by thanking the minister and his officials for assisting us.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 33

Item 1

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — As minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, and in this particular role, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to the committee my officials in this department: to my right is Stan Sojonky, the chairman of the Public Service Commission. To his right is Dave Argue, the executive director of the Employee Relations Branch; immediately behind me is Trevor Roadhouse, the assistant chairman; and immediately behind Mr. Sojonky is Murray Bender, the director of the Administration Branch. There are various other officials whom I may introduce if the need arises.

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Deputy Chairman. Looking at your estimates for the current fiscal year, Mr. Minister, I noted right away that there's a reduced number of person-years for this fiscal year's budget on your estimates that are under review.

But I want to, for some time here, begin by asking you some specific questions pertaining to the top half of our province, Mr. Minister, particularly in northern Saskatchewan.

At one time we had the department of northern Saskatchewan which used to provide employment for a good number of northern residents in the northern administration district, Mr. Minister. And I might say that there was close consultation with people, with local governments, with various organizations. And those consultations were very sincere in many ways, which dealt with issues pertaining to our social and economic problems up North.

(21:15)

And at one time we had a good number of these northern residents employed in education, health, economic development, municipal services — I could go on and on. There's a good wide variety of government heads, branches, departments administered that were moved into the northern administration district and who administered programs and services, and co-ordinated policy to fit that unique environment.

People in the North, initially, were so isolated that the former administration recognized the problems of that remoteness, that isolation that people in the North were confronted with, and at one time we did have a government that was accessible to the people.

But at this point in time, Mr. Minister, there is a total, a complete blank in the minds of many people throughout the communities. There's a lot of confusion or a lot of bewilderment. A lot of people are disappointed and upset with respect to your policy for northern Saskatchewan; in fact, you do not even have a policy for the North. You, at one time, discussed a coming about a policy with regards to the economic self-sufficient strategy.

But getting to the Public Service Commission estimates themselves, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you at this point in time: how many people do you have employed in your government, people that are residents from northern Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we, in the Public Service Commission are involved in very many things, but the various departments of government will have their own contingent of employees, and as we go through the estimates of all the other departments — which, for the most part, we have done now in this House — you will see the number of employees in each department and the number of employees in each branch of each department. And it's not into the jurisdiction of this, of the Public Service Commission, to give a number of how many people are employed in any given location of the province, or whatever.

So I don't have that here. I don't have that sort of information for you. But just to go into the questioning, and very briefly — and I hesitate to get into it. I would very much welcome a discussion on the policies of the government in the North, and so on, but I don't believe that that's under the purview of these estimates.

But I will say to you that all of our departments of government have branches which serve the northern region of the province, as we have branches of the various departments of government which serve all regions of the province. And we don't have the breakdown. We don't apologize for breaking down what I used to call the jack pine curtain when I was — when you were in government.

We broke that curtain down and brought the northern part of the province into the rest of the province. We believe it's been successful. The minister responsible for the Northern Affairs Secretariat has been involved in that and in liaising with other departments in terms of . . . and co-ordinating what other departments do in northern Saskatchewan. And I know the member will bring the same rhetoric here that he brought in 1982, and in 1983, and now, and in 1984, and now into 1985. He'll bring the same thing here.

But the fact is the doom and gloom sort of attitude that's coming across again is not shared by

the people of northern Saskatchewan, and I don't want to get into it any more, Mr. Chairman, because that that is a topic for another day's debate.

But I would ask the member to come on with some questions as it relates to the purview of the Public Service Commission. We would welcome any questions that relates to these estimates.

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm very delighted to be able to be first in line here in terms of questioning your Public Service Commission estimates, and with respect to your statements just now, Mr. Minister, I thought it was your commitment at one point or another that you wanted to bring these northern people into the mainstream of Saskatchewan, the mainstream of the province.

And in so doing, Mr. Minister, it was my understanding that, you know — the programs, the services, the policies, the legislation that affects those people in northern Saskatchewan would be brought out into the open, and that there would be close liaison with those people living in the top half of the province.

And when it comes down to estimates, the people in the North would certainly appreciate knowing — would certainly appreciate knowing what consists, what affects them in terms of the Public Service Commission, and the hiring and the training policies of your government. And I want to get into specifics, specifics in terms of the province as a whole, Mr. Minister.

I want to ask the minister then: in terms of the native population, Mr. Minister, province-wide in your government, could you give me some information, statistical information as to how many people of native ancestry are employed with your government?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. Mr. Chairman, what the member's asking is in terms of the native people employed by the Government of Saskatchewan, and I can give you a couple of answers here.

This is under purview of our affirmative action branch, and I'll just give you some comparative figures. In March of 1981 — and you will remember your days — there were 2.4 per cent of the public service employees who were of native ancestry. In March of '83, two years later, it was 3.1 per cent. We don't say that that's . . . All I can say about that is that it's an increase, but it's not a significant increase, and I'll admit that.

We don't have the increase as it relates to two years later now in '85, but I will say as it relates to specific hirings — specific hirings, actual people; in 1983-84 there were 63 native people hired; in 1984-85, to the end of March 31st of the fiscal year, there were 112 native people hired.

So what I will say to the hon. member is — and I believe he'll be getting at the idea that we should be dealing more and more with this target group, as well as other target groups in the affirmative action group — I will say yes, I agree with that, and we will continue our programs on that basis. But I would say that we are pleased that those numbers are increasing since we've come into office.

MR. YEW: — Two point four per cent, Mr. Minister, and 3.1 per cent isn't a very aggressive figure as far as I'm concerned.

At one time or another we had 1,651 people employed with the government from northern Saskatchewan, from the top half of the province, who were directly involved in the implementation of various programs and services for their own communities. And the figures in those days certainly don't compare with yours. I'm sure that they were . . . And I have those figures somewhere in my files, Mr. Minister, but if I remember correctly, we had a healthy percentage of native people employed in government.

And at this point in time, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you how many of those jobs are in senior management positions?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well I would respond, the member throws out a number — a thousand and whatever, but I would say that the information I have in March of '81 — there were 346 people of native ancestry working for the government; 2.4 per cent of the civil service at that time.

In March of '83 there were 413 people of native ancestry working in the total public service. And so we had 3.1 per cent of them — 413. So I don't know where you get the number of a thousand-and-some, but I don't believe that that was the case.

MR. YEW: — That figure I quoted you just a moment ago, Mr. Minister, was a figure that was there in 1981-82 of various government agencies, including health, education, economic development, municipal services, resources. You can name all the different departments, Mr. Minister, and a lot of them were temporary, certainly — but a lot of them were permanent positions. And a lot of them, I might say, were in senior management positions.

And I want to get back to my question to you, Mr. Minister. How many of those 3.1 per cent people that you have under your employ are in senior management positions?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, I don't have that. I don't have that figure, but I would say to the hon. member, and I would agree with you that, and I think what you're coming at, I don't think there are many. I think there may be the odd one.

And I've said to you that it's a difficult problem as we deal with target groups and our affirmative action group. WE have, in fact, done something which was not done prior, and we have agreed to a plan for increasing and more aggressively approaching the target groups, and the target groups being people of native ancestry, women, and the physically disabled. And we will move on those three in a realistic way and in an aggressive way, I'll say.

The member says that he doesn't believe what we have done is very aggressive. But I will say that if you want to compare in numbers — and we have compared those — I will say to you again that the number that you just quoted just willy-nilly in the House here for '81-82 is not an accurate number in terms of the number of people working for the public service of Saskatchewan.

And I can't let you get away with it because it's not true. But I would say that the numbers I've quoted are the statistics that have been available for a number of years. And while we're not proud of the low number, we are pleased that at least it's on the increase, and not on the decrease.

MR. YEW: — With regards to the current employment of people of native ancestry in your government, Mr. Minister, I didn't get the figure that you have at present, province-wide in your government. What was the figure again?

(21:30)

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay, I would just explain to the member what takes place at the end of each and during . . . actually on an ongoing basis is a work-force analysis in terms of the various target groups. That's conducted with and in conjunction with the departments all across the government.

As I think the member can well understand when we're doing that sort of analysis it's a sensitive sort of area to be dealing with the various target groups. What we have is the last figure that I

can give you, and we're expecting, and I in fact was expecting the March of '84 any day, but they're not here. But I have . . . that's why I gave you the March of '83 figures which went up to 3.1 per cent. And the number that I gave before, which I believe is significant and I think the hon. member will agree with me is significant, is the number of actual hirings of people of native ancestry up to March the 31st of '85. So in '84-85, 112 people, up from 63 the year before, in fact, a 78 per cent increase year over year — 78 per cent increase.

And so as I've said to you before, I think there is more that can be done in this area. But we certainly are committed to carrying on on that particular trend line.

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, I don't want to be prejudice against any other group, but certainly you have . . . I'm sure you will agree with me and other members of the Assembly that native people account to the highest unemployment group in this province.

As well I just now finished writing a letter to a couple of residents in Saskatoon who are of native ancestry, and I couldn't help but quote an item that I'd mentioned earlier in this legislature that we're still at the lower end of the social and economic mainstream of society. And certainly that is and I'm sure that is a fact. We are at the lowest end of the social and economic mainstream of society.

I asked you questions about the number of people employed in northern Saskatchewan in government as compared to 1981 and '82. The reason for that being, there's such a high unemployment rate in the top half of our province; as well, there's a high rate of welfare dependency.

And certainly, you know, people in this Assembly have to understand that, you know, those people certainly are part of this province and deserve the same preference and priority as any others throughout the province.

And getting back to your affirmative action program, Mr. Minister, could you outline . . . if you could outline briefly to me what the program is; and if there have been any changes in policy, if you would explain them to us. And I'll leave that for now.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Just a quick outline of what our plan is. It ensures a results-orientated strategy to have members of target groups — including women, native people, and people with physical disabilities — equitably represented at all levels of the public work-force.

And that's important to recognize that because you did ask the question as it relates to senior management and so on. And certainly those are goals that we should be looking at. I share some of the concerns the member raises. Those are legitimate concerns, and it's legitimate that you should raise them, and this is the place to do that.

As the member from Cumberland will know, I represent a constituency which is very much in the northern part of the province and, as well, represents a good number of people of native ancestry. And I understand just what you're talking about in terms of position on the socio-and-economic scale.

So there's no question that the members of this government are committed to this type of plan as it relates to the three target groups which I reiterated, and will continue to work toward those goals.

MR. YEW: — In your government, Mr. Minister, you have a northern affairs branch and you also have an Indian and native affairs branch. Would you elaborate, Mr. Minister, in terms of the number of people you have employed in those area and the breakdown of the number of people that are employed from northern Saskatchewan? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Both, both departments. Those departments relate to the top half of this province, and I'd like to know

just how many northern residents are employed in those departments.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well I can't give you the breakdown as it relates to the Northern Affairs Secretariat, that department. That was something in the estimates of my colleague, the minister of northern affairs. But as it relates to our own department and our affirmative action branch, we have five out of 10 people employed in that branch are of native ancestry, three of them being professionals, and two in the clerical staff, all five full-time employees and so on. So five of the ten, 50 per cent, are of native ancestry in our affirmative action branch in the Public Service Commission, which is the only branch that I can really respond to here during these estimates.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Minister, are you in charge of the surface lease agreements that were adopted in '82, held by the Key lake mining operations as well as the Cluff Lake mining operations?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, even if I was, Mr. Chairman, I am not, in my role as the minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, responsible for surface lease agreements. But I, as a minister of the Crown, am not responsible for surface lease agreements at the present time. They have no relationship to these estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YEW: — What about in your capacity as the minister for northern affairs, Mr. Minister, or aren't you? Has that changed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Member for Cumberland, I believe that you're probably on the wrong subject here a great deal of the time. We're on Public Service Commission, and I'd like you to stay on your subject as it's very confusing for the minister.

MR. YEW: — Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the minister, who do we go to to get answers in regards to the surface lease agreements then in that case?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I will give this answer just for the information of the member. It has really nothing to do with these estimates, as you've indicated. But those are under the Minister of Northern Affairs Secretariat which his estimates are complete. And that's who you would go to.

But that's not just to say that you can only ask those questions during estimates. I'm sure the minister, as all ministers in this government, are quite willing to discuss these questions with you in their office or in yours, or whenever you'd like to visit with them. So I would say get in touch with that minister.

But as it relates to these estimates, none of these questions have any relevance.

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. In the overall civil service component, just how many people have you got employed under your government as compared to the days of the last administration, Mr. Minister. What is the difference? You mentioned a while ago that the numbers have decreased, somewhat decreased, and I'd like to know what the comparative figures are.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, just some comparative figures: in March of 1982, the total contingent in the provincial public service was, 15,496 — 15,496; in March of 1985, it was 13,899, a reduction of 10.3 per cent, a figure which we are very proud of.

MR. YEW: — So the figures that you have are down by 10 per cent — I didn't get the exact figure — 13-thousand-some-odd civil servants in your government, and out of that 13,000 — just for the record — there's only 112 people of native ancestry employed in your government. Is that correct?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No. The 112 figure I gave you were the number that were hired in this last year. The 112 people of native ancestry were hired in the last year. So there are more than that in the total public service.

MR. YEW: — What then, Mr. Minister, is the real figure, the total figure?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I just answered that question a few moments ago when I talked about the work-force analysis that must be done with the target groups. That work-force analysis, when it is done, it will be there. We don't have the figure as it relates to any of the three target groups for March of 1985. I don't have those, but I'm very confident that the trend line is on the increase, as I indicated.

So just to give you those numbers again: March of 1982, 15,496 people working for the government of Saskatchewan; March of 1985, 13,899, a reduction of 10.3 per cent with more programs to administer and doing it more efficiently.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the question of equal pay for work of equal value has become an issue in a number of jurisdictions. Last summer it was an issue during the federal election, I think endorsed by all three political parties. It was an issue, Mr. Minister, in Ontario during the spring election and, I think, endorsed by all three political parties.

The other day, Mr. Minister, I asked the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat what her position was, and as I said then, she came down on so many sides of the issue . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Order. You have to ask the questions to this minister on the Public Service Commission.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if as minister of the Public Service Commission you are prepared to give us any inkling as to where this government stands with respect to the issue of equal pay for work of equal value?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, this, the Public Service Commission, through our classification system and so on, has, I believe it's fair to say, in the past and will continue to work on the basis of equity and fairness and so on. As a job is classified, whatever job it is within the public service of Saskatchewan, it's classified as a certain position. It has nothing to do with sex. It has everything to do with classification and qualification.

And what else can I say, except that that's the way we operate in the Public Service Commission. That's the way throughout the public service of Saskatchewan. And we'll continue to operate on that basis — equity and fairness.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is apparent, Mr. Minister, is that you do not understand the issue of equal pay for work of equal value. Built into our social structure and into the workplace are the inherent inequalities that are a part of our culture. Women and men often do equal work, but women inevitably get paid less.

The goal, Mr. Minister, of equal pay for work of equal value is an attempt to ensure that where women and men are doing work of equal value, they will be paid an equal amount.

Women, Mr. Minister, make up 60 per cent on the average, 60 per cent of what men make. They inevitably occupy the lowest rungs on the economic ladder. Mr. Minister, if you take the salary of a position, the percentage of women employed in that position is almost an inverse proportion to the salary. The lower the salary, the more women are employed in it. Mr. Minister, and that, Mr. Minister, comes about not by any evil design of this government or the last, it comes about because of the culture, because of the western culture of the western world which has traditionally been a male dominate society.

(21:45)

Equal pay for work of equal value is an attempt, Mr. Minister, to iron out those differences — an attempt to ensure that where men and women do work of equal value, they will get equal pay.

For you to say, Mr. Minister, or for the member from Prince Albert to say that they got that in Russia, simply misunderstands the whole issue. And good old conservative Ontario, and good old conservative Ottawa, they also have that. And I don't know if Frank Miller will admit to having borrowed all those ideas from Russia or not, that the espoused, and he did.

Mr. Minister, without a great deal of waffling and with a great deal more understanding than your last answer suggested, your counterparts in Ottawa, Ontario and, I believe, Manitoba have endorsed the idea of equal pay for work of equal value. Mr. Minister, are you able to go as far left as Frank Miller?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — I don't want to get into discussion with the member about waffle or whatever something in his party or how far left or right he may be.

But I will say to the member this: we in the Public Service Commission of Saskatchewan will continue to focus on job content, the value of the work done, not on the sex of the person involved in the job, and that will be the case. And the discussion of the job based on that will indicate what the pay will be.

I would just have some information that I'm sure the member will be interested in, as it relates comparative statistics. Women in senior management, women in senior management in the Government of Saskatchewan — March of 1981, 3.8 per cent; March of '83, March of '83, a very significant change, up to 6.4 per cent, women in senior management. And in January of 1985, up again to 6.8 per cent, women in senior management.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Now some other comparative figures, other comparative figures that I know the hon. member is interested in — women in middle management. The women in middle management, March of 1981, 9.6 per cent; March of '83, 11.6 per cent; and in January 1985, 16.7 per cent.

Women in non-traditional jobs, Mr. Chairman, women in non-traditional jobs — and the hon. member mentioned that a little earlier in his preamble. In March of 1983, 15.6 per cent; and in January of 1985, 16.7 per cent.

So in each one of those categories — women in senior management, women in middle management, women in non-traditional jobs — there has been an increase, and a significant increase, since this government took power. We're proud of that. And that trend line, as I said to your colleague from Cumberland as it related to native ancestry, that trend line will continue to increase under this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, before I respond to that, can you tell me what percentage of employees of the Government of Saskatchewan are female?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. We don't have it right here, but I'll get it and provide it to you.

One other very important area that I forgot to mention to you, and as it relates to the number of

women and the percentage of women in the caucus of the NDP — which is zero, which was zero in the last government; and the number of women in the caucus of the Progressive Conservative party in the Government of Saskatchewan — five women. And we're proud of . . . and that will increase after the next election.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the trend of women in management; assuming your figures to be accurate — and given the track record of this government to date, that's no assumption to be lightly taken — but assuming it's accurate, Mr. Minister, the number of women in senior management positions has been growing in all governments; it has been growing in private business.

But Mr. Minister, that is not a figure that anyone should take pride in. I am satisfied, Mr. Minister, that there are more women employed in government than there are men. I'm satisfied that there are more women, and yet the number of women in senior management positions is very, very low.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know, and I wouldn't trust this government to give me that information.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that you owe this House and the public of Saskatchewan a statement as to where you stand on the issue of equal pay for work of equal value. It goes directly to the heart of the problem. Women's work is valued less than men, and that is not fair.

I ask you again, Mr. Minister, whether or not you're going to continue to dodge the issue, or whether or not you're going to tell us what stand this government takes with respect to equal pay for work of equal value.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, there is one other. The member asked for the total number of people, and I do have that now.

Comparative figures once again: women, as a percentage of the work force, of the total employees of the government — in March of 1981, 43.7 per cent; in March of 1983, 47.5 per cent; and in January of 1985, 49 per cent.

So, and that's in the public service which in total is diminishing, but the percentage of women in the public service is increasing.

So as I said — and I guess I did say to the member that I'm proud of the statistic that I reiterated, the statistics that I reiterated earlier. That's not to say that we're proud to the extent that we intend to stand pat. But we're proud of the trend line that has developed since we've taken office. And we're very confident in saying that that trend line will continue, and we're committed to having it continue.

And I must say another thing to the member: a good deal of these statistics which are pointing out here have to do with the work in our Affirmative Action Branch; and very particularly, they have to do with the good work done by our minister responsible for the Women's Secretariat, the member from Swift Current.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you about — before we run out of time — I want to ask you with respect to the conflict of interest guidelines.

It is over two years since the Premier first announced that imminently we would have conflict of interest guidelines. Since then, Mr. Minister, this government has stumbled from catastrophe to disaster because in part, perhaps, because it has no conflict of interest guidelines.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, if in the two years since the Premier first promised these — and if you like,

I will read from the *Hansard* where they were promised — in the two years since the conflict of interest guidelines have been promised — are you able to, at this point in time, give us those conflict of interest guidelines?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a *Conflict of Interest Guidelines, Saskatchewan Public Employees*, Public Service Commission, introduced in June of '81, when you were the government.

I'm sure you would have seen one of these copies at that time. Probably were involved in developing it. Maybe I'm giving you more credit than I should have.

But in any case I'm quite willing to provide a copy of this to the member. *Conflict of Interest Guidelines, Saskatchewan Public Employees*, introduced in June 1st of 1981.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I would appreciate seeing that. I would be interested in knowing when those conflict of interest guidelines became effective.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. I'll send it over and it's — I have a note on it that says, introduced on June the 1st of 1981.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — To put it mildly, Mr. Minister, you're in need of something more effective than this. My attention was distracted when you gave us the date of this, but I see at the top, introduced June 1st, 1981. As I said, my attention was distracted.

Since then, Mr. Minister, as I say, this government has fumbled from catastrophe to disaster with respect to conflict of interest. So if you haven't tightened this up in the last four years, you very badly need to do it because it has been a problem which, to put it mildly, has plagued this government.

Your Premier has admitted that. Your Premier has called for a strengthening of those conflict of interest guide-lines and bringing out new and more effective conflict of interest guide-lines. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, is there no such . . . we were told by the Premier that such a project was ongoing in May 5th, '83. We have been promised that in the fall of '82. When Mr. Van Mulligen — when the next MLA for Regina Victoria was banished to your idea of Siberia, Prince Albert, we were promised conflict of interest guidelines very soon.

In May of '83 we asked then where those revised conflict of interest guide-lines were. We were told that you were awaiting a court decision in Ontario. Now, Mr. Minister, you seem to suggest that no such project was ever on the go.

Was the Premier talking through his hat when he told us on May 5th, '83, that such a thing was being developed, or is the hour simply too late for the minister to find out what, in fact, is going on in the Public Service Commission?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well Mr. Chairman, the member . . . We have said that conflict of interest guide-lines would be coming forward when the court case in Ontario is determined, and that has not come down yet.

I would say, the hon. member, for him to stand in this House and tell us that the guide-lines which were put in place by his government — and then he says, oh, there's so many holes in it and so on. I mean, I'm not taking responsibility for having developed this. It's what is here.

When the court case comes down . . . It make s no sense at all to develop new guide-lines and have some of them shot down by a judgement of the courts. We're waiting for that, and we continue to work on our guide-lines. And we will come out with the final document after that case has been decided.

But as far as the guide-lines which we operate under now, they are the same guide-lines that have been in place since June of 1981. We recognize, as we did when we came to government, that there were holes in all kinds of programs and policies that were put forward by you guys.

It's a big job. You can't change it all in two or three years, and we've come a good, long way. And we'll have two or three terms more, and we'll come through it, and we'll have things in shipshape condition here.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, if it takes you two or three terms to come to grips with a problem which has plagued you as much as this one has, then that indeed is going to be a long two or three terms.

Mr. Minister, I suggest that your comments that you're waiting for the decision in Ontario is so much smoke and mirrors. I suggest, Mr. Minister, that's just simply cosmetics. The truth of the matter is that the answer you gave me the first time is accurate. You're doing nothing on it.

Mr. Minister, it's true that these were our guide-lines, but they worked for us because ours was a different government. The NDP was not in office for the sole purpose of feeding at the public trough, which seems to be the case with this government. We had programs, we had plans, we had a vision of what we wanted society to be. We had a vision of what we wanted, what we wanted the public service, and the role we wanted the public service, to play.

This government came in with no vision, no imagination, no goal in office except to feed at the public trough, Mr. Minister. That's why these guide-lines worked for us, because it was a different government. The people, both the members of the legislature and the public service who worked with us, were committed to those goals, unlike this government which comes with no goals, no vision, no thought but to enrich themselves and their friends. And that's why the conflict of interest guide-lines which worked for us have worked so badly for you people.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I thought we were having a cordial discussion here, but I must say that I must respond to what the hon. member says. The hon. member, a member of the NDP, who would suggest to this House, and to members of this House who know very well what I forget the exact terms that the member uses, but they say something about "feeding at the public trough," I believe you said.

I have a document here. Well I just could read a list. I don't know how long . . . Well I could read some of this list, Mr. Chairman. Let me start with . . . These are people who came to work for the government or whatever. Deanna Koskie, wife of Morley Koskie, in AG's department, sister-in-law to Murray Koskie, former NDP cabinet minister. Linda Koskie, clerk steno 4, OC appointment to the Provincial Secretary, sister-in-law to Murray Koskie. Morley Koskie, vice-president at SGI, brother to Murray Koskie. Ted Koskie, appointed EA to minister of consumer affairs, brother to Murray Koskie. Barbara Marie Kramer, appointed EA to the Hon. Mr. Vickar, daughter of Eiling Kramer. Howard Lucas, defeated NDP candidate in the '78 provincial election, appointed as an industrial relations officer. Kimberley Lusney, appointed clerk steno 3 to minister of finance, father is Norm Lusney NDP MLA. Dennis McKnight, EA to the minister of highways and received government contracts in '81. Gordon McNeil — I remember him well — defeated by the present member from Meadow Lake in 1978, given job with SMDC.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I want to hear it all.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Oh, the list is too long. And look at how long the list is, I don't know if I should read the whole list. I mean look at how long the list is. All of these lists. All of these names in here, and at the top of those pages, NDP patronage, the whole list.

(22:00)

Abells, Harvey, former organizer for T.C. Douglas and the CCF, OC appointed to revenue, son-in-law to Auburn Pepper, former NDP MLA for Weyburn, Doug Archer, former EA to Mr. Brockelbank, married to Gloria, sister to Bill Knight. Just on and on. Curtis Bowerman, son of Ted Bowerman, former NDP cabinet minister, Curtis employed as a garage attendant for Highway Traffic Board. John Burton, former NDP MP. No, but the NDP, Mr. Chairman. Oh, I mean the list is so long it's ridiculous. But the way to spell hypocrite, Mr. Chairman, is a three-letter word: N-D-P. And you spell hypocrite with three words. And we've seen another example of it here tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You may clap if you like, Mr. Minister, but when the former government was in office, we respected and nurtured the professionalism of the Saskatchewan public service. We have not, Mr. Minister, destroyed it.

Mr. Minister, if you think that you have nurtured and encouraged the professionalism of the public service, I way, call an election in Regina North East because in this city the public service are influential. And I will tell you, Mr. Minister, why you've got so many problems with the public service and with this city is because in fact, you have destroyed the professionalism of the Saskatchewan public service. So Mr. Minister, if you think you're doing a great job with the public service, then call an election in Regina North East. I can tell you you're not going to.

Mr. Minister, I want, before the day runs our entirely, to ask you about bonus pay for senior managers. Have you a system of performance pay, or merit pay, or bonus pay, or whatever you might call it, for out-of-scope staff?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — There is a system in place for that, and there has been for a good period of time. The official with that information is on his way down, but I will undertake to provide it to the member if he doesn't insist that it be there, and if we can carry on with some other question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to the senior management resourcing branch, I gather from your annual report that the director is Mr. Jim Armstrong. I wonder if you could give us — if indeed he still is the executive director — I wonder if you can give his qualifications and rate of pay. You may want to give me the latter in writing.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Well here's an example, Mr. Chairman, of just the kind of people that we have been hiring as we deal with the professionalism in the public service. Mr. Jim Armstrong is the director of the senior management resourcing branch, executive director. His work history? He was manager of organization development design, city of Edmonton; assistant commissioner of public affairs, city of Edmonton; director of parks and recreation, city of Edmonton; co-ordinator of current operations with the city of Edmonton. Significant career accomplishments: co-ordinator of the 1983 World University Games.

His education: A Ph.D. from the University of Birmingham in England, project planning; Ph.D. which he's working on, is almost complete, at McMaster University in medical ethics; an M.A. with distinction, University of Guelph, philosophy and culture; a B.A. and honours, University of Guelph, social and political philosophy; diploma, University of Guelph, in recreation administration.

This, I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, this type of a professional appointment, Mr. Chairman, contrasts very, very, very markedly with — what is this now? — Koskie, Koskie, Koskie, Koskie, brother-in-law . . . the qualifications, as I read them, is that they are brothers-in-law, or brothers, or sisters, or sisters-in-law. Those are the kind of qualifications. So I would say that those contrast.

So my point really, Mr. Chairman, is this. The former government hired these kinds of senior personnel by the political patronage of ministers — certainly not professional, nor by merit. And the Public Service Commission under this jurisdiction is rendering professional and non-partisan service to the taxpayers. And we're proud of that, and we will stand on that record, not only today, but over the last two or three years, and we will stand on that record into the future, and through the next election, and the next one, and the next one.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I saw an official enter. I assume that is the official who has the information with respect to the bonuses. If that's the case, I'll get it and ask you for the information.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Okay. The information I have for the member as it relates to the management series, the performance pay. In 1983 it was 1.26 per cent of the total payroll cost — 1.26 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What year is that?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — 1983. And the performance evaluation, the system whereby you arrive at who shall receive this performance pay is on a five-level scale: level 1, unsatisfactory; level 2, marginal; level 3, satisfactory; level 4, superior; and level 5, with distinction. Those are the five classifications, and it's all based on, as I said, performance.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What percentage, Mr. Minister, of the out-of-scope staff would receive a bonus of some sort or other?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, the 12.6 per cent cost, that amount was received by 275 people out of the entire out-of-scope group in 1983.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — And how many out-of-scope people are there approximately? What numbers are we looking at here?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Approximately 2,700 people.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So approximately 5 per cent of the out-of-scope staff got . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's not far off . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I thought he said 150 out of 275.

Mr. Minister, we seem to have an argument going here. Could you give me once again the number of people who got it and the total number of out-of-scope people?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Two hundred and seventy-five out of about 2,700 people. And certainly it's a number that's based on some restraint and so on, but it's based, once again — and the key word here is performance.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, will you give us the figures as to how many of the ministers' personal staff have received pay increases and what the amounts are? Can you give us that information either now or in writing.

I say, Mr. Minister, that a lot more than 10 per cent of the ministers' personal staff have got pay increases. Call it what you like. And if we ask the minister how do you justify a 16 per cent increase, we are told it is an increase in productivity, which I assume relates to the same thing as you are trying to do with this bonus. And a lot more than 10 per cent of the ministers' staff, of which we have information so far, have got pay increases.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister: will you give me the pay increases for the individual members of the

ministers' staff? Can we get this? Can we save some time and get this all over with at once, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — The ministerial assistant regulations and so on are not included in that number in the Public Service Commission. But I would say that the member talks about pay increases, and he once again . . . it is a misleading statement when he talks about the pay increases who went to some of the people on the ministers' staffs who received increments. And the member will also know, although he conveniently . . . I would say it's selective amnesia to be kind. But you conveniently neglect to mention that the increments are very much in order and it you're on a pay scale of so many steps, that those increments are very much in order in the classified service, and those increments are in order in the teacher agreements, and they're in order here in the ministerial assistants' staffs.

So I really don't know what else I can say to the member, except to say that most, most, and almost all of the increases that went to staffs of ministers were on the basis of increments. A few were on the basis of a reclassification to different duties, and that also goes on in the classified service and in the senior service and so on. So I don't know what the member's getting at. I know what he's getting at because I understand the politics of what he's trying to do. But in terms of the reality of and facts of the matter, bear no relationship to the politics that the member's trying to play with this issue.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Item 5

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A very sharp reduction in the number of people employed in that subvote. Why is that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're in subvote number 5, classification systems.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Sorry, Mr. Minister, I was asking about item 4, I may have got your attention after you had gone on to 5. But the question was directed to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Actually we've voted on 5, we're on 6 now, but if you wish to ask a question, go ahead.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the reduction there is a result of a decentralized program in the staffing and classification area — decentralization into nine human resource branches throughout the government where they can more readily serve the various departments right out in the various branches.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Where you can more readily run a patronage operation, Mr. Minister. This is the last time that I am going to raise this, but I agree with the comments of the SEIU. I agree with the comments of the union, that when you take classifications, when you take staffing and classification out of public service and put it somewhere else, you open the door for an abuse by patronage. You open the door for the misuse of classifications and reclassifications to award the faithful, and to penalize, Mr. Minister, those who are honest and professional public servants.

(22:15)

I say, Mr. Minister, that I agree with the comments which I think were made by the union in this regard, that the staffing and classification should remain in the Public Service Commission where it will be done on an impartial basis and not according to who is a friend of the minister and who isn't.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — No, well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My colleagues are tempting me, I must say. I can resist almost everything but temptation, and there is some temptation to tell the member a little bit more about this list which is long and thick. Well I'm sure that the people of Saskatchewan are all very aware — they were aware a long time ago — of those kinds of things.

What I want to say to the member is that the decentralization into the nine human resource branches is nothing to do with what you say and what you have suggested here.

And I'm not surprised to hear you say that you agree with whatever the union has said about it. Why would that surprise me? I mean Nadine Hunt and Larry Brown have been leading the charge for your party for I don't know how long, and they're the spokespersons for your party, and we understand that. We don't have a problem with that.

But I would say to you, Mr. Member, and to the committee, Mr. Chairman, PSC employees have been assigned to nine human resource branches and they report to the PSC as they've always done. The commission employees provide in-scope staffing and classification services from the departmental human resource branches.

Now as the central personnel agency, and this is the central agency that are here tonight, we will continue to do the following things. And I would ask their member from Regina Centre to listen very carefully.

These are the things that we will continue to do and are committed to do:

We will continue to uphold the merit principle in the public service. (There's no question about that. I gave you an example of merit versus ridiculous patronage that was the example from your party.)

We will continue to maintain The Public Service Act and the attendant regulations.

We will continue to uphold the merit principle and the personnel practices, continue to develop overall personnel policy for the public service and be the focal point for development of procedures.

We will undertake primary responsibility for labour relations, be responsible for service-wide training and development and new program initiatives, will continue to be responsible for monitoring and auditing all personnel activities to ensure that the appropriate level of consistency is sustained.

Mr. Chairman, and all members of the committee, I don't think the case could be made more clearly than what I made just with the one senior staff member which we hired, and there are many others, and there are several others, and we will continue to bring quality people to the public service of Saskatchewan and continue to resist the kinds of blatant, ridiculous pages and pages and pages of things that happened.

I even see one here by the name of . . . it was the one who was appointed EA to the Attorney General in October of '71 after being defeated as an NDP candidate in June, '71. His name was Ned Shillington, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

Item 5 agreed to.

Items 6 and 7 agreed to.

June 6, 1985

Vote 33 agreed to.

HON. MR. MCLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to thank the chairman of the Public Service Commission, and the senior staff that are here for the help that they gave me tonight and in preparing the estimates, and people throughout . . . the very professional people who work in the Public Service Commission at all levels for the work that they do throughout the year. So I would say thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I also wish to thank the minister's officials for the assistance they gave us this evening.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:21 p.m.