

June 19, 1986

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

**Non-Controversial Bills**

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills, I present the 15th report of the said committee which is as follows:

**Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the Regulation of Traffic on Saskatchewan Highways**

**Mr. Shillington:** — As chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the Regulation of Traffic on Saskatchewan Highways, as being controversial.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Bill No. 62 — second reading.

**Bill No. 63 — An Act respecting Motor Carriers**

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills, I present the 15th report of the said committee, which is as follows: Bill No. 63, An Act respecting Motor Carriers, as being controversial.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Bill No. 63 — controversial. Second Reading.

**Bill No. 64 — An Act respecting the Registration of Vehicles and Licensing of Drivers**

**Mr. Shillington:** — As chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 64, An Act respecting the Registration of Vehicles and Licensing of Drivers, as being controversial.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Bill No. 64 — controversial.

**Bill No. 65 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Ambulance Act**

**Mr. Shillington:** — As chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 65 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Ambulance Act, as being non-controversial.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the second reading and consideration in the committee of the whole of said Bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

**Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Highway Traffic Act, The Vehicle Administration Act, and The Motor Carrier Act.**

**Mr. Shillington:** — As chairman of the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, I wish to report Bill No. 67 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Highway Traffic Act, The Vehicle Administration Act, and The Motor Carrier Act as being non-controversial.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in the committee of the whole of said Bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like at this time to introduce to you, and to all members of the Assembly, a group of students, grade 6, 7, and 8, from Grosvenor Park Elementary School in Saskatoon. They are 24 in number. They're accompanied today by Mr. John Barton and Mr. Warren Gervais.

I'd like to certainly welcome the students here and hope they enjoy their visit to the Assembly. I think as a stroke of luck they're able to see some of the proceedings due to our increased sitting hours today. Normally they wouldn't have been with original schedule, so I welcome them to the Assembly.

I hope they enjoy question period, and I'll have the pleasure of meeting with them at, I believe, 10:45 for pictures and then refreshments later. And I would ask all my colleagues to welcome this group from Saskatoon here today.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the other members of the Assembly, 19 grade 3 and 4 students from Rouleau. They're sitting in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher this morning, Mary Jane Sillitto, and chaperons, Debby Hamdorf, Dawn Duncan, Joan Clarke, and Sharon Leisle.

As my colleague from Saskatoon mentioned, it's nice that you could see the workings of the Chamber this morning. Normally we wouldn't start until 2 o'clock on Thursdays, but because of our increased sitting hours till the end of the week, you are now going to see the workings of the Chamber in question period. I hope you enjoy it. I hope you learn from it. I'll be meeting with you for pictures and drinks later on, and I hope to answer any questions about

anything which you see in the Chamber today.

I ask all members to join me in welcoming them.

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Bengough—Milestone, I'd like to introduce a group of students from Lang High School. They are 11 students, grade 7s and 8s. We would like to, on behalf of your member, welcome you to our Assembly, and unfortunately the sitting that we're sitting in this morning was only arranged late yesterday, and your member is at a previous commitment that he could not break. So welcome to the legislature, and have a nice day.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Inaccurate Home Pak Policies Sent Out

**Mr. Shillington:** — My question is to the minister responsible for the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) and it deals with the latest proof that this government couldn't run a candy store, much less a provincial government. Can you confirm, Mr. Minister, that between March 1st and June 15th, Saskatchewan Government Insurance sent out 16,000 inaccurate Home Pak policies to policy holders. They were inaccurate, Mr. Minister, because they failed to notify the policy holder that insurance coverage for damage to contents from sewer back—up is limited to actual cash value as opposed to full replacement costs. Can you confirm this 16,000 policy mistake?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I will confirm that that is indeed fact, but I'd like to pick up on a few comments he made before as it relates to this government being able to handle things and as we deal specifically with SGI. As I mentioned many times in the House before, the financial performance of SGI under this government for our four years will compare to your last four years like night and day.

We look at the auto fund; we look at the general side; we look at the ability to look into reinsurance contracts. Indeed it has been much better for the last four years under a Progressive Conservative government.

Dealing specifically with your question, yes, indeed that is indeed the case that there was a mistake made on their forms to do with sewer back—up, etc. But I would like to report to the House that through our officials at SGI, and in conjunction with the many agents for Saskatchewan Government Insurance throughout the whole province of Saskatchewan, we have dealt with the problem. We have been in consultation with the agents. Every policy holder that was issued that particular policy that had the mistake is being notified. They will have until June 30th to respond, if they do not by then, then their agent will contact them within the next two weeks, and then if there's some good reason why they have not signed the form acknowledging the mistake in their coverage, then they will be granted special time after that to get it if, indeed, the agent or SGI has not been able to contact

them.

So even though there has been a mistake made, one certainly that one cannot defend, I think, I would have to congratulate SGI and the agents all across Saskatchewan in the way that they're going to handle this situation, as unfortunate as it is, and we expect very little disruption if everything goes according to plan.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — New question. Mr. Minister, you referred it to the difference between night and day. I'll tell you, the rates are really a difference between night and day between this government and the last. Rates are a great deal higher.

Mr. Minister, you have put the agents and the public to an enormous inconvenience to correct 16,000 mistakes. Can you confirm, Mr. Minister, that SGI will spend up to \$100,000 on postage, staff, and computer time to send out and follow up on these 16,000 special notices to policy holders, not including the time and expense of the agents who have to try and clean up your mess?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that figure of \$100,000. I will not confirm that, I repeat, but indeed I outlined the process that SGI for their policy holders, through their agents, and through direct billing, are going to notify them. A form is being sent out acknowledging the mistake and asking the policy holder to send that back. I have no idea how much that is going to cost.

Once again, to pick up on his earlier remark on rates, I would like to remind the House that under the NDP in 1979—80—81, they had rate increases in the auto fund in the neighbourhood of 28 per cent, 20 per cent. Their rate stabilization reserve was negative. Under the Progressive Conservative government, when you look at the four years, auto rates for vehicles in Saskatchewan have gone down, and we have indeed a rate stabilization that is at such a level that the Public Utility Review Commission, which we have set up, is even looking at that because it's so high.

So for the member opposite to in any way infer that the financial position of SGI was indeed any good under the NDP is totally ludicrous.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, you're inevitably going to have a relatively large number of people who don't get the letter back. Do you seriously intend to cancel their insurance coverage, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll go over that one more time. When the error was made apparent to our officials at SGI, the number one thing, which is logical, is to inform everyone that got that policy of the mistake. That is being done by direct letter with a form in there acknowledging, for their signature, the mistake and to get the coverage straight. If that is not totally done by June 30th, then the agents themselves will be contacting their policy holders to find out exactly what is happening and

to get them to acknowledge it. If indeed that doesn't happen, if somebody has been away on holidays or for some reason cannot acknowledge the mistake, then there will be additional time granted.

And, Mr. Speaker, if indeed somebody does not wish to acknowledge the change in the policy, then I believe, with adequate communication, that there is no alternative but to cancel the policy and help out the policy holder in another way. But if they have been contacted, which we are endeavouring to do either through direct mail or through the agent or through an extended grace period, then if that person has been contacted and does not wish to sign the form, then I believe there is no alternative but to cancel that insurance policy.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, what do you intend to do about losses that occur in the meantime before this horrendous process of yours works its way towards a completion? What are you going to do about losses that occur between now and whenever you get around to these things?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, he calls it a horrendous process that we're going through. Does he have a suggestion of a better process to go through? As usual, the NDP have no indication of what they would do.

Number one, I think SGI is acting very responsibly on this. But indeed if the case is . . . and to my knowledge and what I am informed, that the only way that this clause would be enacted is if we had a storm like we did in 1983 in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina, where there was a huge storm and a one in 100 years, where this clause would actually be kicked into effect. So if indeed that happens before acknowledgement and before June 30th, then I guess SGI would have no choice but to pay out.

#### **SGI Procedure on Large Liability Insurance Claim**

**Mr. Sveinsson:** — New question to the minister of SGI. Recently in a settlement to a Regina dentist — as a result of that judgement one of your bureaucrats in SGI suggested that they would have to keep an eye on that particular court case, and it may affect the way your corporation does business.

My question is, does it mean they're going to harass claimants? Does it mean that liability insurance is going to rise in cost? Or are they going to settle with claimants as they should?

A recent example, the Townsend fire case, demonstrated that harassment within your organization is not uncommon. And I ask you, is that going to be continued to all claimants who, in fact, claim against liability insurance?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member brings in numerous points into that. For his information, liability rates have increased in the last six months or so, not only in our province of Saskatchewan, but right across Canada . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure he wants to hear the answer — but not only in our province of Saskatchewan, but right across Canada,

North America, and in Europe. And one of the causes for the increases in liability rates have been increased court settlements.

For your information on the case you have mentioned, SGI is indeed not holding the policy. It's indeed held by the Manitoba corporation. So the comment by our official at SGI was simply that this is part of the whole liability problem that we're looking at. It's been raised in the House; it's been raised in committee; it's been raised in my office numerous times — the high rates.

And this is part of the reason why SGI, as a general insurance company, has got to be very wary of what's going on in liability rates, because in a lot of cases reinsurance markets enter into, or other companies across the world would actually reinsure SGI. That's part of the reason why the rates are going up, and another cause is the high court settlements that have come in that have not hit Saskatchewan to a large degree, but indeed we have been hit with a few cases — and one is that one there — but indeed SGI does not hold that policy, rather through Manitoba.

**Mr. Sveinsson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the fastest growing areas in SGI is your special investigations unit which does from time to time harass some of the claimants with respect to insurance claims. I ask you: as a result of that statement by your public relations director, does it mean that claimants who do claim liability insurance will be further harassed in their determination to settle with your monopoly in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Well, Mr. Speaker. I would challenge the member opposite to read the statement of that official from SGI where he sees anywhere in that statement the word "harassment". SGI, in the general side, is working as a business, and there is a special investigative unit that is kicked into effect on numerous cases where there is some suspicion, and I believe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the member opposite would have . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. The member has asked a question. Give the minister the opportunity to answer.

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe the member opposite would have us believe that SGI is indeed the only insurance company in the whole world that has a special investigative unit. That is indeed not the case. One of the reasons that we do have a special investigative unit is for the protection of policy holders. If indeed there are some cases that are not totally legitimate, they are investigated.

If indeed, I take from his selection, that any claim that comes in should not be investigated for the protection of any other policy holder across our province, then that's the position he can take. I believe it is responsible. He can take an individual case if he wants, but his interpretation on what happened that indeed it's through the special investigative unit of SGI, the policy holders of Saskatchewan Government Insurance are being served and, I believe, serviced efficiently.

**Mr. Sveinsson:** — With respect to SGI, the fire commissioner of Saskatchewan recently stated to me

personally that if the policy of the company on large liability claims to investigate rather than compensate — to follow that through with a long—term investigation forcing claimants into court, in fact, to find settlement with your monopoly.

I ask you sir, is that your policy? Is it the policy of SGI to investigate rather than compensate, even in spite of the fact there isn't any evidence to investigate?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the member's getting his information on what he says is policy. On large claims SGI does look at it. If there is reason for suspicion, based on what they have found, then it is investigated — not in every case. That is not policy.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — The fire commissioner of Saskatchewan indicated to me it's not uncommon. In large claim cases, SGI investigates, not compensates. And I ask you. He suggested to me it was your policy. Is it your policy not to pay, and draw people into court, at their own expense, because of a long—time investigation by your organization?

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, let's take a case where there might be an unfortunate incident where there might be a large claim . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm really not sure where the member is coming from.

**An Hon. Member:** — He came from the Tory party.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order. It's your question period that's being wasted when the shouting is going on.

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my earlier answer, when there is a large claim against an insurance company — in this case SGI — whatever you wish — then for the protection of other policy holders . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You harass the claimant.

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, he calls it harassment, and I would like to see him prove that in any case. But I would think that in defence of all other policy holders — and there's hundreds of thousands of them around the province of Saskatchewan — if there is a large claim and there is reason for suspicion, then it should be investigated. For him to say that everyone is investigated, that is not true; but indeed, when there is reason to have it investigated, that is done.

### Public Consultation re Free Trade

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Mr. Minister, as you are aware, the Premier yesterday named three commissioners who will conduct a public, so—called, consultation program this summer as a major step in the government's game plan to make sure Saskatchewan voice is heard in the Canada-U.S. trade talks.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, do you think that it's a little late, after you have established and put the position of your government and your Premier that you are indeed free traders, to now to be going out with a pretence of consulting with the public?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government of Saskatchewan has been and, as I understand, the position of governments of Saskatchewan for the last 75 years have been that we, as a province that relies so heavily on trade, are in favour of enhancing our trade relationships, whether with the United States, with anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, we endorse and have . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I'm going to ask the member for Regina North East to control his talk this morning.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — We have for some time endorsed that concept, Mr. Speaker. Those negotiations are going on and will be going on for some period of time. What the Premier announced yesterday is an opportunity, while these debates are going on, while these negotiations and discussions are going on, the people . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. This, I think, has gone just a little too far this morning, with continual shouting right through the question period, and I'm going to ask the members for order.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — During that period of time, Mr. Speaker, while this particular issue is on the public agenda, we, as the Government of Saskatchewan, believe it is imperative that we ask, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan for their particular views on various issues — whether it's the trucking industry and what that does for them; whether it's the farm machinery manufacturer, what it does for them; or it's the potash industry, the lumber industry, whatever it's going to be.

People will have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, people will have an opportunity for their input into that particular negotiations, to go along with the Government of Saskatchewan on those particular programs. The members opposite, in government for 11 years, seldom, if ever, went to the people and asked what their view might be on a given program here or there. I believe it's a proper way to go.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplement. A supplement, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, the position of your government is becoming farcical. Right now we are in the midst of the trade talks, and they're going on. You have committed to people of Saskatchewan and Canada that you're free traders, and I ask you: do you not agree that the public of Saskatchewan should have been consulted prior to your commitment by the Premier and yourself as committed free traders?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, that the governments of Saskatchewan for a long time have supported and endorsed free trade, as have the people of western Canada. We make our living by trading in this part of the country. We have traditionally been

opposed to the protectionism that has been practised through the national policy in this country, of having to buy — having to buy more expensive manufactured goods, consumer goods, and in so doing, subsidized eastern industries.

Mr. Speaker, I'll give you an example: every time someone in Saskatchewan buys a colour television set, we pay \$75 tax to central Canadians by way of tariff; every time a women's dress is purchased, \$15 from this part of the province, this part of the country, goes east to protect eastern textile manufacturers. And the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker; the list goes on and on.

This part of the country for some time has endorsed free trade, support broadening our trade base, because that's the way we build new jobs in this province. You look at the member opposite — talk about somebody who's inconsistent. His leader, Eddie Broadbent, I'm not sure from day to day where he stands.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister: what kind of a signal do you think you're sending out to the rest of Canada, and indeed particularly to the Americans, when in fact by establishing a commission you indicate that you haven't done your homework. You don't know the impact. You're asking the people of Saskatchewan now to give their opinion on the matter. What kind of a signal are you sending out to the Americans who you're negotiating, when you're indicating you haven't done your homework?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — To indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't done our homework. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite would have you believe that at no time should you ever consult with the public — that's never been part of their strategy on anything. They believe in doctrinaire their position of their particular party that said at their convention will be the position of their government or will be the position of their party. They never bothered consulting with anyone.

What we are going to do, Mr. Speaker, during these consultation hearings, is have people who are directly affected by those particular trade issues advance publicly as to what they see, and the importance that they would see of those trade initiatives.

#### Expenditure of Tax Dollars

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Question to the Acting Minister of Finance in the absence of the Premier and the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Finance.

My question which I would have wanted to direct to the Premier has to do with the expenditure of tax dollars, and in particular the expenditure of federal tax dollars, and the reports yesterday . . . And I have here a report from the Toronto Globe and Mail and the headline is: "Mulroney staff spent \$811,000 on three trips."

Now, Mr. Minister, this trip which included a stay at the presidential suite of New York's Pierre Hotel at a cost of \$1,200 per night, I wonder whether, Minister, you can

indicate in terms of the Saskatchewan taxpayers who had to pay federal taxes to support this kind of foolishness by the federal Tory Prime Minister, do you support that as . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. Order, please. The member is referring to federal issues, and the ministers here are not able to answer questions dealing with federal circumstances. I think that needs to be left to the federal government.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — New question to the minister, and it deals with the expenditure of Tory government's lavish expenditure on travel and that sort of thing. And I want to refer, by way of background, to the expenditure of the Prime Minister in Ottawa — \$811,000 on a junket to New York.

I want to ask you about our Premier in this province and his lack of forthcoming on certain issues. I would give the Prime Minister at least credit for telling the public that he's spending \$1,200 a night on a suite . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Does the member have a question? Order. Order. The member has been making statements but not getting to his question. If you have a question, get directly to it.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — My question to the minister is this: in light of the fact that Tory prime ministers and premiers, whether it's Dick Hatfield in New Brunswick or Brian Mulroney in Ottawa . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I'll take the next question from some other member.

#### Structuring of Free Trade Commission

**Mr. Hampton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and perhaps he may have to take notice and give it to the Premier.

There was a new commission structured recently to tour this province to learn and to listen to the people with respect to free trade. I ask, Mr. Minister, that in the last four years there were several committees structured from your back—benchers and cabinet members that toured this province, that listened and learned with respect to agriculture, with respect to health, ambulance care, fire protection, etc.

My question now is: is the Premier now telling the people of the province, or is he telling his back—benchers that they are no longer competent, and therefore must go outside of his government caucus to appoint three people to do the job for him?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, there are times when you have legislative committees; there are times when you government committees consisting of cabinet ministers; there's times when you have commissions that don't represent either on of them.

With regards to the hon. member's question, if you could get your colleagues in front and at your side to be quiet, I'll try to respond to your question.

With regards to the question of the particular hearings that are going around the province: as you know — I would trust that you know — during the negotiations that will take place between now and over the next year or two years, whatever it is, between Canada and United States to try to work out a trading arrangement, that's going to involve some trade—offs. In any situation you're going to be trading off, and that's going to be the function of the chief negotiator for this country.

And those trade—offs are going to become a significant impact: how much is agriculture going to pay versus the textile industry; how much is . . . Those types of things are going to obviously be dealt with by Reisman when you come to negotiate a trade arrangement — and which becomes priorities here, there, or the next place.

And so that's what people are going to have an opportunity to do. To deny people that opportunity, I think, would be wrong for governments. I think your party would certainly support the right of the public to make input into that type of negotiations, or a right into the input into the price of agriculture products. There was most recently a bingo inquiry that I think was, for the most part, received. Those type of approaches by government, I think, are important, and I think the people want to have an opportunity to make that input that way.

As well, there's an opportunity by members to put an input, or people to get an input through their elected MLA, whether it's a cabinet minister or back—bencher, member of the WCC, member of the NDP, or member of the ruling Conservative government.

So you use all of those processes to come to the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

#### Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 25

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. This morning we have with us to assist us, Joe Leask, the secretary of the Native and Indian Affairs Secretariat; Bill Calder, assistant secretary; Al Higgs, assistant secretary; John Reid, director of economic development; Harold Danchilla, senior policy analyst.

#### Item 1

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I welcome the minister's officials with regards to the estimates before us, Indian and Native Affairs estimates.

Mr. Minister, I want to begin my questioning by asking you the number of staff you have in your department, their salaries and their wages increases, bonuses paid, if any, during the court of the last year.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'm sorry, there was noise around you and I couldn't hear the last half of your question. Would you please repeat that?

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I asked for information from you to provide me with a list of your staff, their salaries, wage increments, bonuses paid, if any, over the course of the past year.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I gather you're talking about the senior staff, are you? I'll send that right over.

**Mr. Yew:** — My next question to you, Mr. Minister, is related to the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. Mr. Minister, given the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat's responsibility to co—ordinate all government budget submissions into a native package of programs during the preparation of government estimates, could you, Mr. Minister, provide me with this information for the fiscal years 1983—84, 1984—85, 1985—86, and the current fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Could the member perhaps qualify his question. Are you talking about a report on activities or the financial expenditures?

**Mr. Yew:** — I'm talking about, Mr. Minister, the full government budget submissions into what I refer to as a native package of programs, related to social and economic programs.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, I want to advise the member, I have two of the fiscal years he asked for; however, I don't have the 1981 year he asked for. So I'll send what I have over, and if you require anything further because of what you don't find in here, I'll undertake to get you the balance.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. My second question to you, Mr. Minister: you claimed in your last two annual reports you have created some jobs in 1983 and '84 and also some jobs in 1984—85 through the Indian economic development program. Mr. Minister, I would appreciate having from you a breakdown which indicates whether these jobs are full-time, part-time, long-term or short-term jobs.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — We could provide a list of the projects for you which we did last year as well. The 1,500 jobs that were created which I've been using are full-time jobs.

**Mr. Yew:** — You've mentioned 1,500 jobs, Mr. Minister. Could you provide me with the breakdown of where those jobs exist. Are they permanent or are they short-term jobs? You know, it's pretty hard to assess the successes of the policies and programs of your department. You talk about 1,500 jobs — I'd like to know, and the people of the North, and the people in general in Saskatchewan, and the people of native ancestry throughout the province would certainly like to know where those 1,500 jobs are, and if they are part-time or long-term employment options.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The numbers I used are full-time,

permanent jobs. What I could do is send you a full extensive list of all the businesses that have started as a result of our fund, and the businesses have addresses beside them. I don't have a per business breakdown of the jobs on site at this time, but if you wanted to do any kind of an analysis, the information I can get you which I have with me should give you the basis for that. And if anything further again is required, I could supply that for you.

**Mr. Yew:** — Just following through with that question, Mr. Minister, what would be the average rate of pay for those jobs — approximate average rate of pay?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, I don't have an analysis of that. The jobs certainly wouldn't all be classed as minimum wage jobs. There's a good range of opportunities that were created in various ventures, individuals for instance driving a truck for a sand and gravel company as opposed to someone working in a restaurant. So you would have your range of salary very similar to any other community, I suppose, that you want to compare to, a white community in relation to a native community.

**Mr. Yew:** — Following through to that question, Mr. Minister, in terms of employment and unemployment, I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, your perception of what the unemployment rate is in the Indian and Métis communities?

(1045)

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I would suspect that the unemployment rate across the board would be 50 per cent or higher, although some of the areas such as northern Saskatchewan in your constituency, several communities would be probably around the 80 per cent mark, whereas some reserves would likely have unemployment lower than that, such as 30 per cent. So it varies a great deal.

However, to sum it in my view, we have a serious unemployment problem in the Indian and native communities. And it's something that we've been trying to address with our economic development program, as well as other work we've been doing — for example, with the mining companies in the North to hire local, and to acquire participation of Northerners.

However, we also have unemployment in southern communities in relation to natives. It's something that is a difficult challenge for any government. But I believe we're making progress in that regard.

**Mr. Yew:** — With regards to the Northern Affairs estimates we did the other day, earlier in the week, Mr. Minister, particularly I think we did it on Monday, I noted in your senior staff that there was, in terms of native Indian or Métis senior officials in your department, in the information you provided, I couldn't find one particular native person of Indian and Métis ancestry in that department.

Now in your department in front of us, the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, I'd like to ask you what percentage of natives do you have in that department?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'm pleased to say that it's 42 per cent.

**Mr. Yew:** — Forty—two per cent. Is that the total list of senior executive officials in your department, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well no, 42 per cent is across the board, involving all staff in the Native and Indian Affairs Secretariat. So it involves some field worker positions. It's across the board, unless you wanted a different analysis from me.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. No I was asking at the senior and at the executive level, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I don't have the percentages broken down because our Secretariat isn't that large. However, for instance, our director of field services, the senior person is a native person. And, as a matter of fact, my deputy seated beside me is Métis as well. So we have been cognizant of the need to bring people who understand the issues, and we've been quite successful in that regard. As well, we've been encouraging communities to put forth names of people to us who we could acquire for positions that become open in due course, and we're able to acquire some highly qualified native people for those positions. And we're very pleased with our percentage of 42 per cent. In fact, I'm not sure of any other government agency that has acquired that type of percentage previously.

**Mr. Yew:** — A moment ago, Mr. Minister, I appreciated the fact that you concurred with me that there is a serious unemployment problem in the North and in the province in general with regards to Indian and Métis people. The native communities are being confronted with a lot of hardships and very few opportunities. Can you tell me, Mr. Minister, ... can you indicate how you realistically expect to wipe out native unemployment with an effort of the limited magnitude we see before us?

Your government saw fit to announce, during the televised coverage of the budget speech, that funding for the Indian economic development fund was being increased by \$1 million, and I refer to Lane's, the Minister of Finance, budget speech of March 27th. However your government failed to address the fact that funding for the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat as well was slashed by 17 per cent this year — a cut of well over \$500,000. To be more specific, \$513,000. That's over half a million for 1986—87.

If the minister is listening, I could go on. So, Mr. Minister, when you work out the difference between the increases and the cuts and the adjustments for inflation, you really aren't paying much more attention to the needs of people of native ancestry. You clearly aren't breaking any ground and resolving the massive social and economic problems confronted by the native community. In fact, Mr. Minister, your paternalistic attitude towards native Indian and native people is clear.

Mr. Minister, you have decided to ignore all kinds of recommendations in support of the Saskatchewan Native

Economic Development Corporation. I want to ask you: is there any chance, Mr. Minister, that you will recognize the need to let native people participate in the decision making process, let them set their own priorities, and that you will in fact support SNEDCO, the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, you know, the member mentions a lot of issues there, and I think on these matters, as we have before, we will be disagreeing and agreeing to disagree because of our political differences.

For example, when you look at a budget of one department and analyse that and say, well, that won't cure the problem in northern Saskatchewan, you're absolutely right because there are a number of matters that all work towards increasing employment in the North. And I find it extremely difficult for you people in the NDP party to at one time say, well, we're concerned about unemployment in the North, and in the second breath, when you get to your convention in Saskatoon, you pass a resolution to phase out uranium mining which employs hundreds and hundreds of native people in northern Saskatchewan.

So you've got to get your act together and make a decision. Do you want real economic growth in northern Saskatchewan, or do you want to bring back the DNS? which certainly would have an admirable budget before us today, doing nothing for native people in northern Saskatchewan. But the politician could stand up and say, well, look at these millions of dollars that I'm spending on the bureaucracy called the DNS.

Well I don't intend to operate that way. Instead, the secretariat has been charged with a more important responsibility than the DNS was charged with. The responsibility that my officials have in the secretariat is to work with mining companies, with educational groups, with departments across the spectrum to determine the best ways to maximize employment.

Let me give you an example. You don't have to take it from me in the legislature because obviously my opinion may be biased. However I'm looking at a clipping from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* from June of this year, and the headline says: "Cluff Lake mining operation example of native commitment." And in the article it goes on to explain how successful the Cluff Lake project has been with educating Northerners, bringing them into the process, and working with northern people to train and to employ.

Now this wasn't done because I held the hammer as a government cabinet minister over the heads of the officials of Cluff Lake mining. This has been going on under our government because the companies are realizing that trained people will cost less if they can come in from local communities. Now that makes common sense, Mr. Chairman, and that's how we continue to operate.

In regards to Key Lake, I mentioned a graduation ceremony I was at last year which really exemplifies the difference between this government and the former NDP-DNS regime. I attended the graduation where

roughly 20 people from Buffalo Narrows and area were graduating from a special mining course that was co-sponsored by the mining company and our Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. And as they were receiving their certificates, at graduation, they also received job offers at the same time — every one of them. That means good planning. That's what our educational system is now doing in northern Saskatchewan.

So we've got a very difficult challenge ahead of us. And I think the member and I concur in that respect that we have many difficulties, a high unemployment rate. But we have also a tradition of governments assuming that they do more than Northerners. And if you look at the 11 years under your regime, for example, you can point to most communities and you can see the unemployment rate increasing over the total 11-year period under your administration.

Now that's not necessarily your fault because there were some complex issues working there. But I raise that to indicate that bringing back the DNS or changing its name to SNEDCO, will not solve the problem. The economy in northern Saskatchewan is in a sense fragile, however there's great and vast opportunities in tourism, in mining, in processing. You look at the wild rice business in La Ronge that is on its feet because of this government. It's something that we recognized. It's not to say we invented wild rice because we didn't, but if you give Northerners a chance to do things on their own, they'll flourish and prosper.

I don't feel we need the DNS back. I think things are improving and continuing to improve. However, I think governments also have to show a willingness to change and to change policies. I think with the two northern members, we have been thankful for your input, your suggestions on a number of items, but I think in a non-political sense outside of this Assembly, you would admit that there's extreme difficulties and difficult challenges ahead of us which we must address.

Our view is that the main way of addressing those difficulties is economic development. There must be economic development with participation of Northerners, and it must be done in an intelligent way. I would suggest that the DNS failed in that regard because everything was designed somewhere else, not in the North. And I think the activities between Northerners and mining companies today are an example of what could happen across the spectrum — co-operation and progress as a result — not through legislation, not through the heavy hand of government. Unless you have an example that proves otherwise, I will continue in that direction.

In terms of SNEDCO (Saskatchewan Native Economic Development corporation) that's been discussed for some time now. And I realize that the member is associated with AMNSIS (Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) and some of the individuals in AMNSIS who have done a great deal of work. They have done a great deal of work in that area to forward the concept of SNEDCO.

My understanding is, on the federal level, the federal



government has come back to the group and asked for a total business plan. We are reluctant to fund political agencies that intend to become economic agencies. We had some concern there because we've seen it in the past.

As you recall when our government took office, we removed \$2 million from the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) and instead began to use it for economic development projects on reserves. That's why we have the 1,500 new jobs that I spoke of earlier.

So I'm reluctant to finance political regimes for economic development purposes. However, I see a great deal of promise in some of these suggestions built into the SNEDCO proposal, and I've indicated that this government may be interested in participating on a business arrangement, perhaps, with the individuals in the communities that do set up new businesses. We may be willing to participate.

In terms of the economic situation in our budget, if you are talking about cuts, I don't think that's totally fair. I think you'll have to see the increase in funding in the native economic development program that we have — the increase by \$1 million. That should be taken into consideration when you're using your figures. As well, you will note that there is Indian participation in terms of that fund. We have a board of representatives chosen by the districts, and we value the input we've received from those particular districts.

**Mr. Yew:** — Just before I go on to my next question, Mr. Minister, I have a few comments I want to make in regards to the response you just gave me. But I want to go back to the mention that you made about 1,500 jobs. Did you provide me with that information yet, or will that information be forthcoming?

(1100)

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — We'll supply you with the copy of the list before the estimates are over; I'll just get it photocopied.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Now the 17 per cent cut I referred to was directly related to the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat portion whereby last year you . . . the department had allotted \$1.5 million as compared to 1.4, and I was doing some mathematics last night, and I find that there is a cut of \$513,000 which represent 17 per cent cut.

And also, Mr. Minister, I noted in your department you have cut four jobs, four—person year jobs as well, and this, Mr. Minister, indicates to me that you are putting a very low priority in an area that needs a tremendous amount of encouragement. The Indian, the Métis people, the native communities are the ones that are being confronted with the most severe hardships in this province.

I look at the Justice estimates we had before us just the other day and noted that there are now, not 63, but 64 per cent native people of Indian and Métis ancestry incarcerated in our provincial jails, and in the women's correctional centres and jails, that is up by 84 per cent — pardon me, it is now 84 per cent; that is up as well. That

indicates to me, Mr. Minister, that, you know, there are severe hardships confronting the people of my ancestry — Indian and Métis people.

And I'm glad that you concur with me that the problem of unemployment is very serious, particularly in the northern administration district. And I see before me, you refer to some news clippings. I can provide you, Mr. Minister, with some news clippings that tell me what your department has done. governments — in one clipping here dated April 5th of '86 of this year, the headline reads: "Government aid scares for Métis business plans."

I want to maybe read a quote off what the executive of the AMNSIS (Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) association said:

. . . established by the Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan, the corporation which is in question, SNEDCO (the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation), the corporation plan an array of activities, business investments, training opportunities and programs, and a trust company, to name a few, all calculated to bring more Métis and Non-Status Indians into the mainstream of society and the provincial economy.

We don't, Mr. Minister, always want to be dependent upon government. And I read another news clipping Mr. Minister, SNEDCO, the program we are referring to, again the headline reads: "SNEDCO funds cut because of bureaucracy."

Mr. Minister, these indicate to me that you are putting very little emphasis in that one particular ethnic group of people that direly need encouragement, support and some sound economic commitments towards native self-determination. I read also, Mr. Minister, you didn't mention FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations). I have some colleagues in FSIN that provide me with information, but seeing as how you read from clippings, I want to read you another clipping. The headline reads: "Royalties are sought — treaty Indians, real owners of resources". And I want to read to you, Mr. Minister, how the member for Estevan, the Premier of today, how he has also ignored the needs of the Indian, the Métis and non-status people of this province.

Sol Sanderson, the president of FSIN, stated in part, he said:

Premier Grant Devine makes a big show of allocating \$2 million a year to Saskatchewan Indians for a few economic development projects. "We're saying to the premier . . ."

And this is what I quote from Mr. Sol Sanderson, chief of the FSIN:

"We're saying to the premier of this province; 'Look, we don't want your \$2 million. We want our fair share of those economic dollars generated from those non-renewable resources'."

Coming out of the North and coming out of various

renewable and non-renewable resources in this province.

The native organizations, Mr. Minister, can succeed provided that a government, the provinces and the federal government, commit themselves. Another clipping I have here, Mr. Minister, indicates to me that SNEDCO, the program initiated by AMNSIS (Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) says that its economic plan will succeed. Mr. Minister, Tim Lowe, who is the administrator for the program said that:

... SNEDCO could be brought to life with about \$13 million. It already has been recommended for \$12.9.

That is a misquote there, Mr. Minister, the actual figure that the federal government has approved is \$9.1 million. Anyway, continuing, the article reads:

... \$12.9 million from Ottawa by the northern economic development program, (a program which was initiated by the federal government allotting \$345 million in the course of so many years for all the provinces across Canada) and 4.5 million by Regina was supposed to have been contributed, but it seems that there has been no commitment to date.

It seems like a lot of money. AMNSIS says that it seems like a lot of money. But AMNSIS pointed out . . . If the member for P.A.—Duck Lake would listen and stop getting ill-information advice from the member for P.A., he might get the question and the seriousness of this issue quite clearly.

AMNSIS pointed out an entrepreneur, Peter Pocklington, was able to get more than \$20 million in various breaks from the province for one bacon processing plant. The native people — Indian, Métis, and non-status people are saying, you are putting money in the hands of the rich, the wealthy, and the powerful, but very little effort and commitment into the people that directly need that type of funding, Mr. Minister.

You can give Peter Pocklington \$21 million, 11 million of which is a loan guarantee, and 10 million of it which is just an outrageous outstanding grant to a millionaire — a person well-off; a person that don't need that type of assistance. That is why this Conservative government is going to be ousted out of office in the next general election once the member for Estevan, the Premier of this province, gets the courage to call an election.

I look at other news clippings, Mr. Minister. You were the one that started throwing around newspaper clippings. I can read you two letters from two different mayors that were published, made public. And I'll read them to you, Mr. Minister. In a recent article in the *Star—Phoenix*, the mayor for Ile-a-la-Crosse said:

Mr. Sid Dutchak, the minister responsible for northern and native affairs, and the rest of his cowardly government . . .

If the member for Saskatoon Riversdale would give me an

opportunity to finish my debate. And if she wants to enter the debate, fine, I'll debate with her on native issues any day, any week, any time. She has probably not faced the hardships that I and my people have faced.

In terms of the letter, Mr. Minister, it says:

Sid Dutchak, the minister responsible for northern and native affairs, and the rest of his cowardly government will never be able to recognize the condition of northern people, especially northern native people. What they will recognize, however, is the need for more rape and exploitation of northern resources with proper restitution to us.

He goes on to say:

We approach governments with reasonable alternatives that we know will work, and they call them "grandiose."

That is what you said, Mr. Minister. He is quoting your response to some of the positive alternatives that Indian, Métis, and non-status people have placed before your department. You call them grandiose.

Furthermore, Dutchak believes that political organizations have not solved economic problems in any society. I certainly hope he is looking at his political, organized government (which you are), in which case I will agree with him, especially when I look at how much they've . . . (and that's an unparliamentary word here but) . . . and how much you have mismanaged our provincial economy.

I won't use the word that's printed in here . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If I said that word, then you guys will kick me out of the House. This is an important part of the estimates.

And then there's another letter here by a councillor: "Northern Saskatchewan still being treated poorly." Just one little quote here from one paragraph.

They can appoint, and that's referring to your northern development advisory board, the goldarn sounding board that you established with no authority, no mandate, no terms of reference, nothing — where you bypass the elected officials in the North, where you bypass northern organizations, where you bypass special interest groups such as the trappers' association, the fishermen's organizations, just to name a few.

He goes on to say, and this letter . . . The former letter was written by the mayor of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Napoleon Gardiner. This letter is written by Max Morin, a councillor in that same council. And in general he says:

They can appoint committee after committee and keep studying us. But things will never work because again our future is decided by the government in the south. The government hasn't made a commitment to the northern revenue-sharing (needs in our communities).

And then again, Mr. Minister, I look at another bunch of newspaper articles: "Welfare is claimed to be killing Buffalo Narrows Indians" — another mayor, a Leonard Larsen — another mayor, Mr. Minister. And it just goes . . . The course of your administration, now that we're into our fifth budget, into your fifth year of office, we still have not resolved any issues pertinent to resolving the hardships that confront the Indian, the Métis, and the non-status Indians in this province.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, the federal government committed itself to \$9.1 million to fund the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation from the native economic development agency which provided that 345 million. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, how does the province of Saskatchewan plan to participate in this major initiative?

(1115)

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — As I indicated before, we've indicated publicly that if there is some sense made out of the program, if the federal funding does take place, we may assist some establishment of businesses. In fact, we have some programs now. The Gainers plant which you're speaking of is available to native businesses as well, the same program that applied in the Gainers case. We would be willing to look at native business to see whether there's any provincial assistance which would be necessary.

However, I want to indicate to you that if you're accusing me of saying no to sending \$4 million over to a political organization, then I accept that criticism because I won't send it over. The taxpayers of this province have had their money given to various organizations in the past which didn't result in anything successful. And as a result I feel we were elected in '82 to be more cautious and have more respect for those taxpayers' dollars.

And I don't particularly see the relevance in you saying you've been through some hard times and therefore you can make all these silly accusations in the legislature. That has no effect here. If you come up with anything that makes sense, we will look at it.

Some of the comments you made . . . We know you're against the bacon plant; your party is against the bacon plant, but it's not because of any native issues; it's because you simply don't like free enterprise. We know that you're against uranium mining. We know you want to shut the uranium mines down. I think, with the exception of the member from Athabasca, the members on that side of the House feel they want to close down uranium mining. I don't know how that creates jobs when half of the people employed in the industry are native. When you look at the other issues, the paper—mill in Prince Albert, the opposition to that mill which creates many hundreds of jobs in northern Saskatchewan . . .

So you're getting back to quoting certain native leaders that happen to support your political party, saying that because these native leaders are saying that we're not doing a good job, we must not be doing a good job. Well I simply don't accept that.

You quote Mr. Sanderson criticizing our economic development fund. Well I think that quote took place some time ago. And it may be in your interest to speak to Mr. Sanderson, because I understand in recent days he's submitted his own personal application to that fund. Now some of you people had better make up your minds as to where you stand on some of these issues. It's easy to speak to the press, but to carry through with actions is another story.

In terms of some of the groups and consultation, I've gone through this in my Northern Affairs estimates. In terms of the trappers' organization, I haven't heard the dissatisfaction from the trappers' association that you've brought into the Assembly today — which indicates to me either you're out of touch, or I am, and I intend to look into that.

I've been consulting with the trappers' association. As you recall, one of the resolutions discussed at your NDP convention is to ban leg-hold traps. I was approached by the trappers' association regarding that resolution. My understanding is your party did not pass that resolution; however, it indicates the type of philosophy that you people believe in. And my understanding is that an NDP member in Ontario, or Manitoba in fact, tabled a Bill to ban leg-hold trapping.

Now if you really are concerned about Northerners and concerned about real issues, you'd better start paying attention to some of the issues and some of the directions of your party in regards to native issues.

The final thing I want to mention is that sharing revenue is something that I've heard and I've read in newspapers. When you ask someone to define what that really means, it's difficult to define, particularly from those who appear to be throwing around the term. The individual that you quoted, I'm not sure how he would define revenue sharing; however, sharing, in my books, means a give and take. And I'm not sure what he is prepared to give in this system.

We have a large part of Saskatchewan that's occupied by roughly 30,000 people — 30,000 people that in a general sense have an honest intent to move ahead and progress. However, it's my impression that some of the leadership doesn't always indicate what the people at the community level are saying. And for you to simply restrict your work in this Assembly to standing up and quoting two or three certain leaders that happen to be members of your party, I don't know why you would not look into a little more depth; I don't know why you wouldn't want to tell this Assembly what the communities are saying about uranium mining, or about some of the other enterprises.

What is the community of La Ronge saying about the rice processing plant that was funded by this government which put the wild rice industry on its feet in the La Ronge area? What is that community saying about us? What is the La Ronge area saying about the La Ronge gold belt activity which is creating hundreds of new jobs because of our Progressive Conservative policy on gold mining?

It would be more helpful if you brought in something constructive rather than quoting people and becoming a

puppet of certain leaders.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you, you referred to that 4.1 million. Did you say, or did you not say, that you would support the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation with 4.1, or that you wouldn't? You went on to say that you were elected to administer taxpayers' money in this province in an appropriate manner. I would like to ask you: was the answer yes or no?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — The answer was that we were elected to have respect for taxpayers and the money that they pay to government. Secondly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you can keep your associate quiet, I'll answer the second part of your question. The member from Quill Lakes appears to be talkative. I'm not sure whether he's ventured north of Regina.

However, the 4 million was the 4 million that I was asked for to simply dump into the SNEDCO fund to join the federal dollars that were coming in. My answer was no. My answer was that if the SNEDCO fund got on its feet and began to do economic things in the communities which were visible, if new businesses started, we would do everything in our powers provincially to assist those viable businesses and viable new enterprise which are the real job creators in our society.

That was my answer. But as far as throwing \$4 million of taxpayers' money unconditionally at the group that has done a great deal of work in this area, putting this proposal together, my answer was no.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much for making that clear, Mr. Minister. In other words, then, you have no commitment to the Indian, the Métis, and non-status people of this province of Saskatchewan.

I want to go back to the initial statement you made about looking after taxpayers' money in this province. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, you have mismanaged that money very drastically. You have now put this province in a deficit position of well over \$2 billion, of which every man, woman, and child now owes well over \$2,000 each annually — just on the interest payments alone.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order, order. Order. We are not discussing the deficit or anything of that nature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order, order. I would ask the member from Cumberland to keep on the topic of Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the ruling. I may suggest to the minister and the deputy chairman that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the member asking the question that I cannot hear a word of what he's saying. His colleagues are so noisy that I am unable to hear what he's asking me. I wonder if you can bring that to his attention.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Deputy Chairman, the minister responsible for Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat was the one that initiated discussions about uranium, about

the bacon plant in North Battleford, and about the management . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. There is no way that this question and answer can go on in a proper manner with this kind of noise, and I would ask the members to please control themselves.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In terms of looking after the public treasury, Mr. Minister, I was saying that you have mismanaged our economy. Rather than helping the people that direly need the help, you have allotted tremendous amount of revenue to other wealthier corporations.

I look before me at Manalta Coal of Alberta, where you gave them a \$145 million loan guarantee. You gave Weyerhaeuser a major agreement of \$250 million of taxpayers' money. I don't argue that. It may or may not provide jobs, but it did certainly one thing for sure, Mr. Minister, in the North, and the people in this province were not consulted, involved; there was no public involvement. And that is questionable, Mr. Minister, when it come to the terms of reference of that particular agreement.

And then in terms of Husky Oil, you gave them \$390 million loan guarantee again. And then you go on to indicate to me that you are responsible for taxpayers' money. How are you responsible for taxpayers' money when you put this province well over \$2 billion in the red? All we're asking for is a fair share — a fair share — of the revenues generated from the North.

Just last night I was listening to the news, Mr. Minister. In terms of uranium, you raised the issue of uranium, \$600 million was generated through uranium and through the uranium industry in northern Saskatchewan — \$600 million — and not to mention the other receipts like tourism, forestry, trapping, commercial fishing, etc., etc. There are billions — millions, perhaps maybe in the billion dollars coming out of our resources, our non-renewable resources and the renewable resources from the northern administration district. And you fail to commit yourself to \$4.1 million, which is absolutely ridiculous when compared to the money that you earmarked for the major multinational corporations in this province, and out of the province, Mr. Minister.

If you want to make a remark on that, go ahead.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, I don't particularly want to remark on that. I think we have obviously some deep philosophical differences in the way we approach job creation. Your approach is to utilize taxpayers' dollars to make work; our position is to create real economic development which creates jobs.

Let me give you an example. In the uranium industry alone, %6 million flows into Prince Albert in terms of wages from direct employment in the uranium mines. Those types of numbers exist in northern Saskatchewan as well, the communities all over the North. That's real job creation.

So when you're talking about sharing revenue, I think we

have to talk about the benefits from economic development. I'm sure it's within the interest of some people to simply ask government for \$4 million based on some — perceived on fairness somewhere. But I simply will not authorize that kind of a waste of taxpayers' dollars, and expenditures of that type will only take place in areas that make economic sense.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, on March 26th, 1984, you published a review of what was referred to as the native social economic development package in this province. I want to ask you: do you, as a minister responsible for this department, agree with the major conclusions of that report? Number one, it states in that report:

Government overall policy objectives in relation to Native economic development are not clearly formulated.

(1130)

And number two, Mr. Minister ... These are the recommendations from that report. Number two:

The current level of activity devoted to Native economic development in Saskatchewan is probably insufficient to produce any significant narrowing of the gap between people of Native ancestry and non-natives.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion:

Indeed the level of provincial activity devoted to direct Native economic expansion may, if anything, be declining somewhat.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I asked for the study, which you quote from, to be done to show us where the opportunities were and some of the pitfalls faced by governments in the past. And that was commissioned when I was a new minister and when our government was relatively new. I found it quite helpful in formulating new policies. In fact, the clause you quote from was recognized when we structured our Indian economic development fund. The \$6 million that has now been spent under that fund has managed ... we levered over \$21 million as a result of that \$6 million expenditures. And that leveraging took place because of bank financing that joined the government financing.

And we looked to some innovative approaches, and that's really what that study does. The study is a long-term study that I think government departments can learn from over the years as we go through a transition phase, allowing Northerners to do more on their own and not to be dictated to by an overbearing government agency such as the DNS was.

**Mr. Yew:** — I got part of your question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There is so much noise on that side of the House.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, was this: will the minister agree with this report and its conclusion, condemning the poor policies of your PC government?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, you know, the member should have taken the time to read the report he quotes from, and I'm not sure who writes his questions. But that particular analysis that you're reading from was done in a historic way, of previous government programming. And in fact there was consideration made of the federal programming that knits into some of the provincial programs.

So you know, I'm not saying that our programs are perfect. And that's why we do studies like that which we've released publicly. The fact that we ask for people to be critical of our programming, I believe, is a sign of a caring government. And that's why we did that. So I don't know why you're saying there's something sinister about being criticized, or constructive criticism being presented by a report. That report will continue to be used when we formulate our policies in the future, as we have been using it in the last two years.

**Mr. Yew:** — The report was commissioned by yourself, the PC government, in 1983. And the firm that did the report — I know you're aware, but for the record — was done by Thorne Stevenson & Kellogg. And the final submission was March 26th of '84.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, what have you as the minister done during the last year to correct the situations as outlined in this report and as brought to you in terms of issues by people of native ancestry? Can you outline some program initiatives, and as well, can you outline any funding initiatives? What have you done to resolve the problems as indicated in this report? And finally, Mr. Minister, can you tell me the precise cost of the study itself?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well that cost was dealt with in a previous budget. I can get the figure for you and send it to you. We don't have that with us. In fact, Mr. Leask, who is now with us, wasn't employed by us at that time and doesn't have any personal knowledge as well. We'll get that to you.

In terms of correcting matters, I look at it as a study that could be used to improve the situation, and I believe there's room for improvement. And we're constantly working with native people and the federal government to improve our programming, because certainly things are not perfect. However, we've been pleased with the progress made to date.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, we understand that the province has been negotiating self-government issues with the Métis for some 10 months. This process flows from the Saskatchewan position at the 1985 first ministers' conference. What accomplishments, Mr. Minister, and successes have been achieved today?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well along with the Métis leaders from Saskatchewan, I attended a constitutional conference within the last 14 days, and I think one of the major accomplishments we've reached is bringing the federal government together with us, understanding that there's certain fundamental issues that must be determined towards a recognition of the necessity to transfer more responsibility to native people to govern

their own affairs, and those involved jurisdictional issues who is responsible, whether the federal or provincial governments are, in relation to Métis aspirations. And the Métis leaders in Saskatchewan agreed with my position taken in Ottawa recently, and I believe we've made progress.

In terms of the tripartite negotiations that have been going on, I would have hoped to make more progress. However, many of the problems we ran into were connected with some of the issues which we brought to the constitutional table within the last two weeks, and I believe now we're on track again.

And it's a very slow process, but let me say in a general sense, this government believes that more responsibility must be passed to both Indian and Métis people to govern their own affairs, they own responsibilities, and we're seeing that happen now. On Indian reserves, for example, the federal government is passing more powers on to the Indian bands to govern their own administration, and that movement will continue, and I believe that that will be to the benefit of all native people in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Yew:** — Now, Mr. Minister, getting back to funding for native organizations for a time before I get into more serious questions regarding native self-determination, I want to ask you: in terms of the scholarship fund — we were talking about SNEDCO a moment ago — in terms of the scholarship fund, some 18 months ago a major contribution of \$615,000 was received by the federal government for scholarships for Métis people now in studies related to economics and human development. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, when and how does the province of Saskatchewan plan to participate in this program?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I actually don't know what the status is today; however, within the last 30 days, I met with our Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower who's responsible for that particular issue, and my understanding is that it's under present consideration. We have met with the aboriginal people involved in the issue, and I believe a response will be forthcoming shortly. However, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower is responsible for that particular question.

**Mr. Yew:** — Would you say then, Mr. Minister, that in this current fiscal year, that financing for such a program would be available?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — No, I can't say that.

**Mr. Yew:** — Again, I must say, you have very little priority on people of, you know, the people that are not at all in the social, cultural, and economic mainstream of society.

I want to ask you again another question regarding the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Foundation, Mr. Minister. The federal government committed itself at \$300,000 over the course of three years . . . Pardon me, this is related to native women's issues.

The Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Foundation has committed \$300,000 over the course of

three years to address equality and access. I wonder, Mr. Minister, what input you have in that respect.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — My understanding is the matter which you've just asked about is part of the SNEDCO (Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Foundation) proposal and has not been approved by the federal government. You can correct me. I may be confusing that with another funding issue.

**Mr. Yew:** — I met with a native organization just yesterday morning, Mr. Minister, and a commitment of 300,000 was made. That commitment is firm. The agreement is there. And I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, in terms of native women's issues, how much will you provide?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'm unable to indicate that because quite frankly I wasn't aware that the work had been completed on the federal side. We knew it was part of a general package that was proposed, but I was not aware of that. And obviously, when we know exactly what the federal government is doing, we'll be looking at it to determine our provincial position.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, once you have done your homework on that particular program or issue, and once you have established the policy, would you please provide me with a copy of what initiatives or input your government is prepared to provide.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Yes, I'll contact you and provide you with our position when it becomes appropriate.

**Mr. Yew:** — Getting right into the estimates before us, Mr. Minister, can you indicate to me . . . Can the minister also outline to me what impact we can expect as a result of reduced staffing within the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — We've realigned responsibilities internally. We don't think there's going to be a shortfall anywhere. Those positions were not all filled in the first place, and we simply closed the positions. I believe from the numbers there's a net loss of three — not four — one has been filled again, and everything is functioning as it should.

**Mr. Yew:** — I wonder, Mr. Minister, can you explain why you have cut grants to Indian and native organizations? Do you, as the minister, want to have these organizations collapse so that you will be free of criticism for all your inactions in terms of the native communities? And also, Mr. Minister, if an organizational funding is down, while ministerially your cabinet has gone, up from 24 down to 19, because of political pressures; and while there is so much political patronage on your part, I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: what then is your program — what is your program for people of native ancestry?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I could get into it with you as far as expenditures. However, I think you know what my response would be. I wonder if you could specify what cuts you're referring to. You're talking about cuts to native organizations. Could you give me one example that I could deal with?

**Mr. Yew:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I can give you the example of the cut-backs in staffing of the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. I could give you the cut-back in the estimates before us, of \$513,000. That's well over a half a million dollar cut-back. And I could also advise you, Mr. Minister, that you have not made any commitment towards jointly funding the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation for \$4.1 million, where you can just ridiculously give a millionaire like Peter Pocklington \$10 million grants. I just simply cannot understand the mentality of your government.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well I think that may be your problem. I don't think you can understand the mentality of our government. However, you had indicated in this House on your feet a few minutes ago that native organizations have been cut back. I simply ask you to tell me which one you're referring to, or did you make an error in that accusation.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I just outlined to you four different items that you had concurred that there were cuts and that you had not made any commitments. If you have no answer to it, I'll just go on to another portion of our questions.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I gather you won't correct yourself. You said that native organizations were cut, so that statement you made is incorrect. As far as the administration of the secretariat, I explained to you what happened there. There is a decrease in number of people, a decrease in expenditures, as well as some new initiatives. SNEDCO is one of them we haven't agreed to spend any new money at. However that's different from a cut-back. A cut-back means that you start somewhere and spend less the next year.

(1145)

So if you have any of those, I'll be pleased to address them; otherwise, I don't intend to get in an argument with you on the Gainers plant in North Battleford, which I know your party opposes; and I don't want to get into anything of that nature because it doesn't have much to do with our estimates. If there's anything further specific that you'd like to know, I'll give you the immediate and precise answer.

**Mr. Yew:** — You continuously put words in our mouth, Mr. Minister. We are not against development. Let me make that clear. We are for development that will create jobs, alleviate the high unemployment rates that your government has generated in this province. We are for development that will alleviate the high welfare dependency rates. And in particular, Mr. Minister, the estimates before us relate to Indian and native affairs.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, in your heading, in the heading of your department, it clearly states that your department is called Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, why call it the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat when in the province of Saskatchewan we have Indian, Métis, and non-status people? Why native?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well that's an interesting statement the member has just made because the name of the department was derived at by speaking to certain community representatives on the meaning of native and Indian. And if the department was called Indian affairs, it obviously wouldn't include the definition of Métis.

However, it's my understanding that Métis is part of the native group who are native to this country, and this is the first time I have ever heard this criticism. I wonder if the member . . . You perhaps would want to drop a letter to me to indicate your objection. I've never had that raised before. And you're saying that the Métis people are not native people. Is that my understanding of what you're saying?

**Mr. Yew:** — What I am saying is that in the first ministers' conference the provinces and the federal government recognized in the aboriginal constitutional talks, Indian, Métis, and Inuit. And I ask you, Mr. Minister, why try to — what's the word? — camouflage or smoke-screen the fact that we in Saskatchewan are Indian and Métis and non-status people? The first ministers' conference recognized the Indian, the Inuit, and the Métis.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well that's an interesting argument, and I'd be pleased to run your comments by some of the leaders of the Indian and Métis population in Saskatchewan and get their view on it. I've never heard the objection before. And in fact your statement to me is very novel. As you know, we don't have Inuit in Saskatchewan; we have Indian, non-status, and Métis people.

I haven't spent a lot of time worrying about the title of our department. It hasn't been a high priority. We have priorities of creating jobs for native people and economic self-sufficiency. However, if it is a legitimate concern that you as an elected member of an important northern constituency has raised, I intend to then take your objections today and consult with the Indian and Métis leaders in Saskatchewan to get their view and correct the situation if necessary.

**Mr. Yew:** — In finalization in my estimates, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: can the minister please advise where he stands on the issue of native self—government in terms of a land base for non-status and Métis people in this province, and in terms of resource revenue sharing with people of Indian, Métis, and non-status in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — In terms of the whole issue, those items are on the constitutional table and involve a determination of jurisdiction. I indicated earlier that this government believes that more responsibility must be passed to Indian and Métis people in terms of some of the other issues you're talking about. They do follow that course. For example, you can't discuss revenue sharing when you haven't determined jurisdiction. Who shares revenue with whom? And I've also stated to the native leadership as well that there's going to be a sharing of responsibility as well as a sharing of revenue, if we get to that point.

And I believe there's a great deal of opportunity in northern Saskatchewan for native people to be in control

of their own affairs and develop the resources that we see being developed in northern Saskatchewan, training is taking place. I think there's vast opportunities. However, it's difficult for me to specify what self-government would look like when I don't believe anyone around the constitutional table can really describe it in any consistency.

So there is a process taking place, and we're part of that process, and I believe we'll see some progress in that regard. However, our main concern is economic self-sufficiency and economic development for our native people in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Yew:** — If you believe, Mr. Minister, in resolving issues related to the Indian, and Métis, and non-status people of this province, why won't you provide a sound commitment towards building a sound economic base for people of native ancestry, a land base, commitments towards the constitutional talks, the first ministers' conferences held in Ottawa?

Just a moment ago you talked to me whereby you will not fund the Saskatchewan Native Economic Development Corporation for 4.1 when the feds can provide \$9.1 million. We need capital, Mr. Minister. We need capital, and we need sufficient and significant capital in order to begin being participants in the social and economic mainstream of society. We don't want welfare hand—outs. That is a waste of money, Mr. Minister.

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that our position, the New Democratic Party's position in terms of aboriginal people in this province and in all of Canada, as far as that goes, is this: in terms of native self-determination or in terms of Indian, Métis, and non-status people in this province, I want to read to you the study that we concurred with and the recommendations that we concurred with, and then we can get right down into estimates:

After years (Mr. Minister) of paternalism and assimilationist policies, a growing number of Canadians are recognizing the rights of aboriginal people to self-determination. Paternalism has not advanced the interests or served the needs of native people.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, please. Order, order, please. Order, please. We're having difficulty hearing the member from Cumberland making his statement.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Attacks on native culture and institutions have harmed native people and have brought them down within the mainstream of our society. It is important to remember that, in all groups within Canada, the native people did not choose the new order but had it imposed upon them. They were already here.

The concept of native self-government, Mr. Minister, should not be difficult for a people schooled in pluralistic federalism to understand. We find three levels of governments workable. A measure of self-government has been granted to universities, trade unions, and professional associations, among others. Our political culture is at heart against central control over all aspects

of citizens' lives.

However, Mr. Minister, national government control over aspects of Indian people's lives has been a fact of life throughout our shared history. The national government has always made economic and social decisions for Indian communities that other communities have made locally. Not only has this system of central control been unequal and unjust, it has been grossly inefficient.

Mr. Minister, other aboriginal peoples, such as the Métis, Indians, and the non-status Indians, have lived in a condition of less than benign neglect at the mercy of governments foreign to their communities and culture. The principle of equality demands that they receive a measure of control over their own institutions.

Our resolution, the New Democratic Party's resolution to that, Mr. Minister, is this:

That the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan will unequivocally endorse the principle of Indian, Métis, and non-status self-government for Canada's aboriginal people.

That, Mr. Minister, is our position. To this point in time, your government on that side of the House have not made any commitments, not have you shared in any of the compassion that we on this side of the House feel for the people of native ancestry.

You have mismanaged this economy so bad that it is, you know, the reason why your Premier will not call a general election. You are running . . . You can run, but you can't hide. One day your time will come, Mr. Minister.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, I only had a couple of questions I wanted to ask of the minister, and make a couple of comments. And I'll give you the questions first. And if you could just supply me with the land entitlements that are entitled to the seven bands: the big C Band, the English River Band, the Dillon Band, the Turnor Lake, Canoe Lake, Black Lake and Fond du Lac Bands. If you could just provide me, if they are negotiating — I know Fond du Lac and Black Lake, I believe, are finished — what outstanding land claims are there for the other five that I have named.

Also I would like to know . . . Mr. Minister, if you could give me an update on the negotiations between the small community of Sled Lake and the Red Pheasant Band who, I believe, are trying to get some land in that area, and there is some conflict with Sled Lake. If you could provide me with that, Mr. Minister.

I just want to make a few comments. I think that we do see a change on the reserve system and in local governments in northern Saskatchewan, where you see a lot of the new chiefs and council who now are prepared to take over more and more responsibilities. And I think that that is the direction that we should be going, is to give the chiefs and their council a lot more say, support — technical support and financial support — where needed.

I also want to say that the northern communities, and I give you one example — I don't want to take too much



time here — of La Loche, where you have a totally local community with the mayor and everything being of Indian ancestry. And all they need is technical support and financial support, and they're quite capable — and I'm just using the one town — they're quite capable of running their own affairs.

I just want to make another parallel, and I don't want to get into an argument over this, but you talk about our government not listening to Northerners. I want to say that we set up the northern municipal council to set up local governments, and I feel that that was successful. There's still work to go.

(1200)

I question the fact when you talk about Northerners having their say. When I look at the advisory council that you have set up — and I don't want to get argumental on this — but there's only two individuals from the west side; there's six individuals out of the 12 who are from the South. And I say that, if we wanted to get into the arguments over that, that there is a distinction there.

But if I could get an update on the questions I had and the Red Pheasant reserve. I don't have to have that verbally. If you want to do that in writing to save time with that, Mr. Minister, we can let her go.

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I'll undertake to get that information to you within the next week or two.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 25 agreed to.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Okay. Now that completes the estimates for Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. Does the minister have any remarks?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — I simply want to thank the officials who helped us today. I also want to thank the opposition for their questions. I want to make particular mention that I want to wish the member from Cumberland well since I believe this is likely the last estimates that he will be doing for northern affairs and Indian affairs, as he will not be running in the next election. And I want to wish him the very best.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to concur with the minister in terms of thanking him and his officials for the responses and the information that is forthcoming, the information provided, and also the information that is forthcoming. I will be looking forward to receiving it.

In terms of his wish for me, seeing as how he referred that this would be my last session, I want to indicate to the minister that I'm not that old as to . . . I've got a lot of ambition and a lot of consistency in me, Mr. Minister. You may be the one, in terms of your last term — speaking about last term in office — you may be the one. Thank you very much.

## Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Consumer and Commercial Affairs Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 4

**Mr. Chairman:** — We will now begin the estimates for Consumer and Commercial Affairs, and I would respectfully ask the minister to please introduce your officials.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have with me today, on my left, Mr. Kessler, my deputy minister; on my right, Mr. MacGillivray, the superintendent of insurance; Mr. Zukowsky, director of policy and planning; Al Dwyer, director of administration and personnel; and Ted Madill, chairman of the Provincial Mediation Board.

### Item 1

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we'll begin with the usual routine questions. Madam Minister, can you send over the names of your personal staff, and their salaries, and whether there have been any increases in the last year and, if so, what kind of increases were they?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Yes, I will. I have on my staff, Mr. Don Baron, who commenced services with me on December 1st, 1983. Mr. Baron's salary is \$53,000 a year, and he has had no increase in salary since starting. And then just the two secretarial . . . my main secretary and my secretarial assistants, and I'll send this over. I might also say that they, too, have not had salary increases.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — So you'd have one executive assistant and two secretarial, and I'm sure . . . You're sending it over and I think I'll be able to figure that out for myself.

Fifty—three thousand dollars a year is what your executive assistant makes. Is that the normal rate for executive assistants in the government? It seems . . . He started at 53,000; I can see why there would not have been an increase. That's not a bad salary to start at. Is that the normal rate that executive assistants are making these days, Madam Minister, or is this an exception?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — I think you have to look at the qualifications of Mr. Baron. Mr. Baron has a degree in agriculture; he is a former director of CBC; he produced one of the major CBC farm shows out of Toronto; he is a former CEO (chief executive officer) of Pallister Wheat Growers, and also a former editor of a nationally published farm publication.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Madam Minister, I agree, you need to look at the qualifications, but you need to look at the demands of the job and the job description. The Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs is not exactly the hugest and the most overbearing department in the government, and clearly, from the indications of some legislation that your government has brought in dealing with consumers, it's not actually been a department that's received a lot of priorities either.

Would you please, Madam Minister, provide us with the job description of this position and all of the work that it entails? Fifty-three thousand dollars for an executive assistant position in any level of government is a very, very large amount of money.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Well I happen not to agree with the member. The Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs is an extremely important department in government. We touch people's lives daily; we touch every person in the province. And to say that my department has not done a lot of work, we have, over the course of the last three years, done some very, very major pieces of legislation that impact on the total population of Saskatchewan.

I might say that Mr. Baron has never taken an EDO (earned day off) off, or whatever it is that they're allowed to. He's there on a daily basis. He is invaluable, not only to myself, but in his link with the department.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, I won't pursue this long, Madam Minister. I think the point has been made in your answer. But can you tell me the nature of your executive assistant's work? Describe it.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — He acts like a girl Friday.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — In other words, you're paying your executive assistant \$53,000 to answer the telephone and prepare letters for you?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — I think the member is being rather facetious. I don't think that a person of Mr. Baron's qualifications . . . I think it's a credit to the government to be able to attract people of that calibre; and to say that he is not worth \$53,000 a year is simply not true. He runs the office; he liaises with groups; he liaises with the department; he does a whole host of things. And I think you, as a former minister of Finance, know exactly what an MA does — ministerial assistants. And they don't sit around doing nothing. They are hard-working, diligent people.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I don't question that your executive assistant does a good job for me, Madam Minister. I have never questioned that of any executive assistant. I too have had executive assistants and I was then responsible for departments like the Department of Health, which probably gets more letters and correspondence — maybe equal to the Department of Social Services — and I can tell you that at no time were the salaries at this level for these people.

Maybe they were worth it, but I still say, Madam Minister, that if you hire a teacher — and I'm a teacher — as a clerk, you don't pay him the teacher's salary. And the argument you're making is, simply because of a person's qualifications, you ought to pay whatever the salary is without any regard for what the nature of the work is.

Madam Minister, I'm not going to pursue that any further. I think I've got the answer I want and so does the public, about the extravagance of your government when it applied to paying your political appointments and the frugality of your government when it applies to paying the

normal public service. Somehow there is no fairness in the process here. Some are picked and chosen to be favoured and some are not.

But I'll move on to my next question, and I simply want the information and I won't pursue it. I don't think there'll be anything out of the ordinary in it, but can you also provide me — and just send that over; we won't have to take the time of the committee — the salaries of your senior officials in the department and any increase they have received in the last year.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Yes, I'll send this over as soon as a page is free.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you. I'll wait for that and continue. Madam Minister, would you also provide the committee and myself details of your travels in Saskatchewan, in Canada, and abroad? And I'm sure that your travels have not been as extensive as some other ministers in your cabinet, but I would like to have that information. And will you include in that the trips, the dates of the trips, the destination, and the cost? I'm not going to ask for who accompanied you because I know, like your colleagues, you won't give me that, but will you provide me with that? If you have it with you, I'll take it now; if not, you can send it to me as other ministers are going to be doing.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Can I get something clarified from the member? You said my trips in Saskatchewan — like trips to Saskatoon and that type of thing?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes. If it will take a while for you to put that together, like the next hour or so, we can go on with that, and your officials can get it to me whenever it's ready so that we don't hold up the committee.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Well I think you have the information on the trips in Saskatchewan. That was supplied to you by the Minister of Supply and Services in the document he sent over the other day. Right. We'll get you that other information.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I have not seen that document yet; but if you assure me it's there, I will take you at your word. But I will ask you to send me your trips out of province and out of Canada. Will you undertake to do that, please?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Well I can indicate to the member that I haven't made any out-of-Canada trips. I went to two conferences last year; one in March — or this year — one in March, dealing with financial institutions in financial services. It was attended by my counterparts from across Canada. And then our annual conference on Consumer and Commercial Affairs was held last September at Hecla Island in Manitoba.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Madam Minister, thank you for that. Would you tell me whether in 1985—86 your department did any advertising as in the last fiscal year? And I know you have, so will you provide me with the amount that that advertising cost?

(1215)

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Yes, I'll send it over to you, but I would like to say that our department, our advertising expenditures for '85—'86 were \$155,816.39. The stuff that we advertised were things that have been developed in the department. We've done ads on how to operate a small business. We have started a new one called "Of Consuming Interest," and it's just the type . . . and that goes into a lot of weekly papers. And what it is, is questions that we get asked at the department on a fairly regular basis, and it's sort of an answer . . . a question and answer type column — like, what do I do if someone comes to the door, that type of thing.

Some of the major things we did this year, of course, a lot of it had to do with the bingo inquiry. There was a fair amount on that. And a lot had to do with the new film classification Act that we passed last year and implemented this year.

So we've done quite a bit. I won't go through the whole thing, but I'll send this over to you.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Will that information include any advertising on the tax on pornographic literature which you instituted last year but finally decided that you couldn't administer it? Was there any advertising on that particular Bill?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — No, there wasn't.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Minister, can I . . . since that is coming over I'll go to my next question. Can you tell me what your budget is for advertising for this fiscal year and the budget which we are considering, or is it included in information — '86-'87. Thank you.

Did your department pay for any polling that was done by the government or any portion of polling that was done by the government in the last fiscal year?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — No, we have no polling done in our department.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you. Madam Minister, I want to ask you some questions now about one of the major issues which has been I think receiving some attention by the public, at least as it applies to your department. That is the state of bingo halls and your bingo inquiry.

And first of all . . . And I'm not sure whether you've provided it before. If you have, I don't have it with me. So can you tell me: how much did it cost the taxpayer to have this bingo inquiry which you established over a year ago, received over six months ago, and tabled only a few days ago?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — The total inquiry costs were \$104,071.02. Three people on the commission — the chairman, Mr. McConnachie, received \$165 per sitting day; and the other two members of the panel received \$110 a day. And those rates have been established, from what I understand, for many years.

So the honorarium payments were around 29,000; the contractual services were about 13; advertising was in the neighbourhood of 10,000; and salaries of other

people, like the secretary to the commission, was \$27,800; travel and sustenance was around 7,000. If the member wants, I can send him over a detailed copy.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — You can send it now or later. Madam Minister, thank you for that information. I want to pursue this a little further.

This commission had many, many briefs submitted to it and many representations made to it, and we'll talk about that later. You've had six months since you received it to consider it and, Madam Minister, now that you have tabled it, you're indicating that you are rejecting out of hand many of the recommendations, at least . . . I have here a document which says "Draft response to the report of the Saskatchewan Commercial Bingo Inquiry," and the majority of the recommendations are rejected by your department. At the same time, you're saying that you are going to take another year to consult with the public.

I ask, Madam Minister: if you have rejected so many of the recommendations, what is it that you're going to consult further on when you have already gone through the process and received — am I correct in saying — some 5000—and—some representations? Seven hundred and fourteen? That even makes my argument that much stronger. What is it that you're consulting on when you have already rejected most of the recommendations out of that report?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — We haven't rejected any of the recommendations of the inquiry. What we have done in the department . . . And I might say, I haven't had it for six months because there was an extension because of the overwhelming response to the inquiry; there was an extension of the December 31st deadline. We haven't, Mr. Member, rejected the recommendations. What we have done is we have taken each of the 36 recommendations and have worked out ways they may be integrated into a workable criteria within the department on what we know about the gaming area. We have accepted many of the recommendations. I think they are workable in today's bingo market—place.

The problems that I had, and I've been very open about this . . . there were basically three recommendations that the department and myself have problems with, as do a large number of the public. The one was the recommendation dealing with the banning of the sale of Nevadas in bingo halls. I think we have to recognize that clubs that sponsor bingos and get a Nevada licence really look forward to the moneys that they receive from the sale of Nevadas, and to ban them, we don't think would be acceptable to the public at large.

The inquiry had designed a questionnaire that they sent out to hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of groups across the province, and 94 per cent of the people that responded indicated that they did not want the Nevadas to be taken out of the bingo halls because of the moneys that they are able to generate through the sale. So we are asking the public now — and we will have those replies by July 31st — whether they agree with that recommendation of the inquiry.

In regards to another recommendation that would have

adult recreational and sports clubs, trade unions, and political parties not be eligible for a bingo licence, that was sort of split on the things that they got back. I think it was about 51 per cent thought they shouldn't get one and about 49 per cent thought, well they do a lot of good things with this money. So what we're saying is: is there a better way, is there a way to do it? Maybe we can't cut it off.

I look at the Maple Creek Curling Club, which I'm involved with, and we built a new curling rink a number of years ago, and though we would be considered an adult sports club, the facility is there to the public to come in and enjoy and use the facilities. And yet our curling club has put a big dent in our mortgage solely on the bingo moneys that they generate on a weekly basis. So that is an area . . .

We don't want to cut off the people completely, but we have to find a mechanism to ensure that groups that do get licences actually are using the funds for the betterment of the communities, so to speak. So those are sort of dicey issues.

Calls that I'm getting at my office now are from clubs who say, look, you've got to extend that July 31st date. Our club has recessed for the summer and we won't be back till September and, you know, we want a chance to respond to this.

So there is a lot of interest in it. You know, we're talking about massive amounts of money. And even though the percentage going to charities has been going down, the total dollar value going to charities has really gone up.

So I think, you know, with the 714 respondents or groups that participated in the 11 hearings, I think that's an indication of exactly how widespread the concern and the interest in this whole area of gaming dollars and ways to generate gaming dollars.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well I don't agree with you that there is . . . I agree with you to this extent — there is a wide degree of interest in getting to this issue and to resolving the problems that are faced.

Your example of your curling club, Madam Minister, is one that I could apply across all of the province. And you have not, because of your continuous procrastinating, you have not dealt with the kind of problems that church organizations, service clubs in many cases, charitable organizations, are facing because of what's going on in this particular industry right now.

And I will just give you one example. This is an example of a . . . and it was directed to the bingo inquiry, and it was back in 1985, in September. It comes from St. Peter's men's club. And here is what they told the inquiry. And now that you have delayed it further without even some action, this problem has been exacerbated to the extent that many of these organizations are going to have to shut down. And that is a serious problem that I bring to your attention, and I know others have too. And here's what they said in their letter:

Our revenue has dropped considerably the last

four to five years because of the impact of big bingos. We used to provide full sponsorship to three youth—orientated minor league ball teams and six church basketball teams, where now we are token sponsors.

Our club supports many charities in the city of Regina, some of which are Marian Centre, Birthright, Bosco Homes, League for Human Life, Camp Monahan, Christmas hampers for the needy. As well, we sponsor two scholarships to grade 12 graduates, financially support the home and school association, and support the youth corps.

Our 1984 revenue compared to 1980, the revenue was down 75 per cent. If the present trend continues, it is inevitable that our support of most of the charities will have to be reduced or terminated.

And that's the problem, that by continuing to delay to deal with the problem, this is the problem that you're not addressing, and this is only one example of many.

Places where people used to go to their church in the community and go to the church basement to play their bingo and socialize, and therefore the organization that ran the bingo was able to get some revenue, those organizations are getting wiped off the map because of what's been happening in the last several years in this whole field. And so you could have at least taken some action to assist these people before they are totally destroyed.

Now I don't think you'd argue that the work of this organization is in any way work that's not important. It is extremely important. But what are you doing? What is your government doing by your inaction in saying, we're not going to help you out; we're going to let you go down the tubes. And that's really unfortunate.

Now one of the recommendations in your report was to establish a bingo authority. I believe in your comment and your response you said the government had already agreed that that was a good recommendation and you were prepared to go with that. Am I correct in that? You accept the recommendation of the authority, the gaming authority, and that you're prepared to implement?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — I think if you look at the draft response — and one of the primary recommendations of the commission was the establishment of a gaming authority. And we think from a department point of view that there is considerable merit in going that way.

Now you talk about an individual club whose revenues have gone steadily down. That is very true. But while their revenues have been going down, other clubs' revenues have been going up — those that have access to commercial halls. Unfortunately, I believe that the only way that the specific group that you refer to, to get their revenues going back up again, we would have to close down the commercial halls. There's fierce competition between the halls themselves. The clubs that are in the halls, on the whole, appreciate the funds that they are

able to generate through going in there one night a week, or one night a month, or whatever. They appreciate that opportunity.

(1230)

I would remind the member that I believe it was in December of 1981, under your administration, where I think one of the problems really developed. It was your government, through an order in council, changed the definition of charities to include anything that is for the betterment of the community. Well that's pretty broad. That's when political parties and trade unions were able to get bingo licences. And it's just proliferated since that time.

I wish I had an easy answer. One has to understand that just because a group gets a bingo licence, it is not a licence to print money, and you have no guarantee that your bingo is going to be successful. There are a number of bingos held where the sponsoring group actually realizes very little from the bingo, but does realize maybe 5, 6, \$900 from the sale of Nevadas.

Some groups, if you happen to get a lot of people in the hall that night, do come away with a tidy sum and put that money to good use, but I think groups have to understand that a bingo licence is not a guarantee that they are going to make money. It is gambling, and it's a risk. There is a risk involved, and they aren't guaranteed making money.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I agree. The group that comes in, the little Girl Guides — if indeed Girl Guides are one of the groups that sometimes take advantage of this bingo — are not guaranteed anything, but the operators are. Under the provisions that you have, the operators are always guaranteed. And I think that that's where one of the problems lies, and there are recommendations in your inquiry which deal with that issue. and you're going to take another year to deal with it.

Now I know you said you're going to get recommendations by the end of July, but surely, Madam Minister — and you didn't fully answer this question — you don't need further consultation to establish your gaming authority. And because you did not at least move in this session to establish a gaming authority, even though you get recommendations by the end of July, you're going to be able to do nothing because you're going to have to wait for another session of the legislature to get legislation in here to establish your authority. Am I not correct in that?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Well I suppose, too, there are things that we can do through regulations. I mean, that provision was transferred to the provinces in December. Legislation would be required to establish an authority per se, but there are ways of dealing with some of the problems that have been identified, and those things can be done through regulation. And it won't be a year. I can assure the member, it won't be a year until we make a definitive policy statement on gaming.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Do you have a timetable? I would hate to see us go on the uncertainty that the public, when it came to the inquiry . . . What is your timetable, Madam

Minister?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — I can assure the member that this particular subject has a high priority in the department. I would say that once July 31st comes, we would want to have rules and regulations in place for the busy fall bingo session. During the summer it sort of drops off, and their big times . . . or their busy times start in the fall again, and we would want to have things ready by that time.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I have no doubt in my mind at all that it is a priority in the department. I only hope it's a high priority at the political level of government.

I am pleased to hear you say that you will deal with it in the summer. I would urge you not to let your preparation for the election overtake this priority, which your department has established, to the extent that you will not do anything. I would urge you to keep your word on this and, in fact, act on it.

I don't just raise it because it's an issue that's been around. I'm raising it because I happen to know of many, many organizations that are hurting real bad. And I know you will argue, well, there's more money being made. Well, I agree. There's more money being rolled around, and there's a few organizations who are making a lot more. But the vast majority of organizations are making a lot less, and they have done as much work as any other organizations from the point of view of doing charitable things, helping minor league ball teams, doing community work, and so on.

And so I will take you at your word that you will act by July, and monitor it very closely and will remind you about that time if I see nothing happening. And I know I won't have the advantage of this House to remind you about it, but I'm sure there will be some other ways. And so will these organizations remind you, because they are in trouble, and I still submit you could have made some changes in this session to help them out. You chose not to do that; that's your right. But I don't think that they will appreciate it, and I certainly don't.

Can I ask you now about another concern, Madam Minister? The Consumers' Association of Canada, I believe the Saskatchewan branch, recently talked about fitness clubs and health spas in Saskatchewan, I think, at their annual meeting.

They indicated that they should be licensed and they should be bonded, and the reasons given were that clients of fitness clubs and health spas have no guarantee that the instructors are qualified and that the company is meeting any kind of a standard. Now it is well-known that some of these so-called fitness operations, if the people involved are not qualified, can do a considerable amount of damage to individuals' health, and I think it's obvious that's what the consumer association is concerned with.

What are you proposing to do in responding to this recommendation of the consumer association?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — There were several issues that you addressed in your question. I would say at the onset that our licensing mechanism does not include . . . or a

requirement of licensing is not the qualifications of the licensee. What we do is license businesses to do their thing in the province with the idea of having something there to protect the consumer. The type of businesses that you're referring to are licensed and bonded through The Sale of Training Courses Act. The Superintendent of Insurance has to approve the contract before that business can use it, and in the contract is a rescission right similar to what you would find in other Acts.

If there were to be criteria and qualifications set down for people to train others or to teach others, we know of no regulations in the province, or in Canada for that matter, that requires a certain level of training to be able to deliver, say, an aerobics program. But if those things were to be developed, that would be developed through the Department of Labour and not our department.

Our main concern is the protection of the consumer and the money spent by the consumer.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I guess that's why I asked the question. The people who sign up in these spas are consumers. Has your department — since it was the Consumers' Association of Canada, Saskatchewan branch, which directed the recommendation I think to your department — has your department considered the whole question of applying some minimum standards or getting the industry to establish some and then find some way to police it and enforce it. Have you undertaken a serious look at the thing and talked to the Department of Labour before some people get permanently damaged?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — We have just recently received that, I think about three, four weeks ago. I have had talks with the CAC, some of their members on this, and we discussed that at a meeting in Saskatoon. I would say that the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs would not get involved in setting standards of competency, policing, and that type of thing. That would be the Department of Labour. To my knowledge the officials have not met to discuss that issue.

You alluded the first time you were up that perhaps they should be licensed and bonded. I would just reiterate that they are licensed and bonded.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Madam Minister, a year or two ago there was a big issue made about your government granting a monopoly to the printing of Nevada tickets to, I think, a company called Mercury Graphics. Is that still the policy? Is all the printing of Nevada tickets done by one company, or have you changed that policy since there was such a loud protest?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — No, we haven't changed the policy. The tickets are not all printed by that particular company. Western Gaming Systems acts as a distributor of Nevadas, and they are doing the job of . . . In British Columbia, they set up a corporation to distribute Nevadas in the province.

(1245)

What Western Gaming does is keep a record; they collect the 2 per cent tax, that type of thing. They are doing a

function for government that we no longer have to do in the department. I would point out that it has been working very, very well. We still feel that there is about a 20 per cent slippage in the province, mainly tickets coming in from Alberta and Manitoba to some extent. But what we have really achieved is a complete accountability in the whole system, right from the manufacturer to the buyer, and it's working out very well.

They are in the process of putting in a computer system so that the RCM Police can phone from anywhere in the province and, you know, read off the code number and find out who was issued a licence, whether that ticket is a legal ticket to be sold in Saskatchewan. So from the department's point of view, it's working out very well.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Madam Minister, you have been involved with the Minister of Urban Affairs and, I don't know, maybe another minister, in the whole area of liability insurance and what's been happening to that.

Has your department made any inquiries, that you can provide me with copies of, about the increasing insurance premiums, to determine whether the public is not being ripped off and what reasons there might be to help your cabinet committee come about with the right kind of conclusions? Has some inquiry been done by your department into this very serious situation?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — I would say it is a serious concern, not only to us as government but, I think, to a lot of other people right across Canada and perhaps in the western industrialized countries.

The committee that has been struck within government is Consumer Affairs and Education, Rural Development, Urban Affairs, Justice, Economic Development and Trade, and Health, because these are mainly the areas where it impacts.

I think you can look at the whole explosion in the upper trend in liability costs. And what's really transpired is that the reinsurers now will not take a piece of the high-risk area. There are some types of insurance now that you just cannot get because companies cannot find a reinsurer for it.

We are working very closely with SUMA and SARM. I believe SARM has sent out a questionnaire to all their members seeking more information. Some of the stuff has come in. In some areas it has really gone up; in some places it hasn't gone up. What has gone up is the coverage has expanded, different packages have been added to existing insurance, and so it goes right from A to Z in what's happening.

This topic was discussed in Vancouver in March. We set aside a half a day, I believe it was, because all provinces are very, very concerned. In Ontario they've established an insurance exchange where all the insurance companies have pooled their resources. Indications are it's working out fairly well, and we're looking at perhaps establishing a Canadian exchange made up of all Canadian companies.

So there are problems; there are no easy fixes. We could

bring in legislation to put a cap on awards, that type of thing, but I think you'd have to look at the very serious ramifications of actions like that. I believe it's SARM . . . SARM, I understand, is negotiating with a large insurance company right now as getting insurance as a pool — pooling all their resources. So ways are being worked out to handle this problem.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — My fear, Madam Minister, is that some organizations will be able to accommodate their needs, leaving many other ones stranded, and the problem is wider than just say SARM or SUMA. It effects hospital boards, recreation boards, bussing companies.

I used the example in the House one time earlier this week of Moose Mountain bus lines — I think it was Moose Mountain — their insurance rate has gone up from \$26,000 to \$154,886 in 1986. That's an increase of \$128,886, and they say in the press release which they issued, in which when they were asking to have some routes abandoned because they said they couldn't afford them any more, is that the increase in the premium for liability insurance was greater than their profit last year.

I raised this in the House at least two months ago, urging the government to act quickly and expeditiously and saying it should have started acting many, many months ago before this, and nothing has happened since. You're still moving along very slowly. So I will simply make that point. I know that you are not, I believe, the lead minister on this exploration, or consultation as you call it, but it is without any doubt a matter that cannot continue to be ignored or neglected, otherwise there are going to be some organizations like this one who are going to — on one simple item, insurance — go down the tube. I don't think you or I would want to see that happen.

Madam Minister, I ask one more question, and I know it goes back two years, but I thought it was an interesting sum and I was curious about what it was for. In 1984-85, your department spent \$26,000 at the Ramada Renaissance hotel in Saskatoon; can you tell me what that was for?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — That was the Superintendents' of Insurance from across Canada, their annual conference was held in Saskatchewan — Saskatchewan hosted it.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — How many people would that have involved?

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — There was 320 people there. The registration fees generated some \$50,000, and the surplus was returned to the Consolidated Fund. That was an advance to get it started, I believe. So it was self . . . it was money—generating, actually.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 4 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1986  
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Consumer and Commercial Affairs**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 4**

Items 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 4 agreed to.

**Hon. Mrs. Duncan:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank my officials for being here to assist me this morning. The department has had a very full and productive year. We've had a lot of challenges, and the people in the department have responded extremely well. I'd like to thank the member from Regina North East for his questions and hope we do it again next year.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I join with the minister in thanking the officials for being here and providing the answers that were asked. I have received already most of the information which the minister undertook to send me, and I appreciate that. And we are now done with this particular department, but I will be most certainly watching the developments on the bingo inquiry recommendation, as I indicated to the minister, and reminding her as time goes on about the need for action.

The committee reported progress.

**SECOND READINGS**

**Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the Regulation of Traffic on Saskatchewan Highways**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, so I can inform the House and the members opposite, there were three Bills that were reported back from the Non-Controversial Bills Committee. As I understand, we will simply move second reading of these Bills, and they will either have amendments or the vote on them and some detailed discussion when they move into committee of the whole later this day.

So with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move Bill No. 62, An Act respecting the Regulation of Traffic on Saskatchewan Highways.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Minister, I wonder, in closing the debate on this, can you indicate whether this is the Bill that transfers employees from . . . 64?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Right.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

**Bill No. 63 — An Act respecting Motor Carriers**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, An Act respecting Motor Carriers, Bill No. 63.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

**Bill No. 64 — An Act respecting the Registration of Vehicles  
and Licensing of Drivers**

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 64, An Act respecting the Registration of Vehicles and Licensing of Drivers.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we're going to let the Bill go to committee. However we have some concerns with some sections of this Bill, and we're going to discuss it further in committee.

What this Bill does do is move some people from the Department of Highways and will be moving them into SGI, into a Crown corporation. That, in a sense, I suppose, would appear as though it's going to make the government a little smaller, and the government's going to go around then and say, well look, we've reduced the amount of people we've got in government. All they're going to do is move it into a Crown corporation and have the same amount of people just in a different area. Mr. Minister, I think there are some other areas there that we have some concerns with, and we'll certainly be objecting to them in committee.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I would just add to that, that as I understand the Bill — and there will be questions as we say, that we'll be asking in committee — but it undermines, a great deal, the Highway Traffic Board. And as I understand it, the suspensions of licence, which hitherto have been dealt with by the department and the regulatory agency, will now be handled by a Crown corporation, SGI.

If you use the scenario of an individual out in Moosomin or Shaunavon losing their licence, for whatever reason, that will no longer be an issue that MLAs will be able to argue in the same way as they can now. And instead of the individual coming to the government, they will go to a Crown corporation and see about getting their licence back.

We are opposed to that part of the legislation and will be reflecting that in our vote now, but wanting to find out more information when we get into committee on the Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Folk:** — Mr. Speaker, very briefly just to close debate on this. To react to the remarks from the member from Shaunavon — indeed, if he would have been in the committee this morning, these points were covered in committee, and it was explained quite extensively that in fact there's really no deviation from what has gone on, in fact, in the past, but rather this will actually be better for the motoring public because in fact the officials will still be dealing with the suspensions, etc., as they go on, but the Highway Traffic Board will be the appeal mechanism and in fact it is enhanced. So I'll look forward to answering these questions and concerns in committee.

Motion agreed to on division, Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.