

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you, an honourable gentleman sitting in the Speaker's gallery. I'm referring to Steve West, who's a member of the Legislative Assembly from Alberta, for the Vermilion and district constituency.

And I might also say, Steve is a personal friend of mine and a colleague who practised the art and science of veterinary medicine for a number of years before he came the PC member for Vermilion in the last Alberta election, a very fine gentleman doing a very fine job for the people of Alberta in his constituency.

And I would ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to join with me in welcoming Dr. West to the Assembly here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, a delegation from the R.M. of Sliding Hills, headed by their reeve, John Gorchynski, and accompanied by their administrator, a man well known to every, I believe, every member of this legislature, the former hon. Adolph Matsalla, who is the administrator . . . or their retiring administrator of their R.M.

And I would like you to all express a real welcome to the delegation, and I'd ask them to stand, please.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Collection Agents for Sask Power

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Tourism and Small Business, and it deals, Mr. Minister, with your government's decision to dump the Saskatchewan drug stores and other small businesses as collection agents for SPC. This anti-small-business decision will mean, and I'm sure you know, lost revenue for many retailers involved, as well as lost convenience for SPC's many customers.

Mr. Minister, surely you're aware that as collection agents, small-business people were able to draw many customers to their stores. And I want you to answer the questions that the minister took notice of yesterday, and I want to know: why did your government dump them with less than a month's notice? And I also want to know why your government didn't consult with those business people before you made that decision.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very evident that the question that the member is asking should be directed to my colleague, the minister in

charge of Sask Power. They made the decision to change. I heard the minister in the House yesterday explain that in areas where there is an access to a bank or a credit union, that arrangements would be made.

I hear the members on the other side of the House mention to the minister the other day about an overpayment to the Moose Jaw Times-Herald, or something of this nature, at one hand saying: SPC, watch your costs; cut back on any excessive costs. And when the minister comes forward with some type of an explanation and a type of new agenda that will, in his words, save about \$200,000, it seems that the members opposite are against that.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the members opposite: which way do you want it? Do you want SPC to be spending more money, or do you want them to be saving money? That is the question. I'd like the member to address that.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, your responsibility is to protect and to look after the business community, and you sit around the same cabinet table with the Premier and with the minister that made that decision.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — I want you to answer to this House, when \$200,000 worth of revenue is pulled from the hands of the small-business community, you sit there and say nothing; you justify the decision. I want to know how you can justify it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm very pleased that the member asked me the question of what we are doing in regard to small business in this province. And I will indicate to you, and I will indicate to you some of the initiatives.

I heard him ask the minister in charge of Sask Power yesterday: what are you doing for small business? Well I'm pleased to tell you what we're doing for small business. I will tell you that this government has brought in, and the Leader of the Opposition can pay attention to this, a regulatory reform commission that has stricken over 1,400 useless regulations off the . . .

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

Mr. Lautermilch: — Final supplementary. Mr. Minister, you have not answered the question. I asked you how you justify your cabinet and your government's decision, as the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, the taking of \$200,000 of income from the small businesses, that you as minister are supposed to be protecting, and which clearly you aren't. We want an answer; we don't want a speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I'd be more than pleased to answer. I will tell you what we do with the decisions that

we make at the cabinet table. This government has decided, in the interest of small business, to peg the interest rates in this province. That's what we did to help small business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — This government instituted business resource centres, street-side centres where small businesses can come in and get the help that they need to run their businesses correctly. Those are the things they we do. Those are the kind of decisions made at the cabinet table of the Devine government.

I know he doesn't . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. Next question.

Licensing of Saskatchewan Power Corporation's Vehicles

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). And, Madam Minister, your government keeps claiming that SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) has to cut expenses, whenever possible, so these commissioned collection agents had to go.

My question to you, Madam Minister, is: can you confirm that SPC fleet of vehicles, which used to be licensed through SGI's head office so there would be no commissions, are now being licensed through a private insurance firm, McAra/Olson, where there will be commissions? Can you confirm that?

And if you can confirm that, Madam Minister, why do those commissions cause your government . . . why do they not cause your government the same problem as the commissions being paid to Saskatchewan drug stores and Saskatchewan small-business men and women?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm nor deny whether or not SPC is still getting their licenses from head office or from a private insurer. I'm sorry.

Proposed National Beef Stabilization Plan

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture and it deals with the announcement earlier this year that the government would phase out the Saskatchewan beef stabilization plan and join the national tripartite beef stabilization plan. While we certainly, in principle, support the idea of a national beef stabilization plan, we feel there are some shortcomings to the plan. A couple of the main ones that the beef producers are concerned about would be the cost of production formula that isn't reflected in the national plan, and where the administration offices are going to be, whether it's going to be done from Ottawa or some place in western Canada, and preferably in the province of Saskatchewan.

I was wondering, have you convinced the federal

government and the other provincial governments of these shortcomings, along with others, and will you announce the terms and conditions of entry into the national beef stabilization program in this legislature before you commit Saskatchewan producers to the national beef stabilization plan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is accurate in terms of the broad support for a national stabilization plan. The pork producers have joined, basically across the country, and certainly in the province of Saskatchewan, with about a five-year phase-in of the federal plan and a five-year phase-out of the provincial plan.

The beef one is a little bit more complicated. In the last ministers of Agriculture meeting in Quebec City about a month ago we made two agreements. One was that we set up an agreement that we would work towards a fair set of programs in Canada that would respect our international obligations under GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) and OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) principles.

Now while that was nice in theory, and we all wanted to work towards that, it was recognized that in the interim we have some provinces joined the national program and some haven't, and because of some of the concerns that you have raised in terms of various provinces provide different kinds of income to their farmers — there's top loading and bottom loading and various kinds of cost things that they do with respect to grain, and we have some tax advantages, and so forth.

We agreed that by November of this year we would put all the provinces together and then we would strike a method whereby we could all join the program, knowing that there would have to be probably a little bit of water in everybody's wine to get everybody on board and then move towards the gradual consensus that we agreed that we should have as a national body and as a country.

So we're in that process now, and each province is looking at different ways that it can support its producers, yet we want a national plan. Each province defends its own way to protect their producers. So it's to find that balance and that compromise that would allow us all to work towards a national plan but to get us on board so in fact we don't have major provinces, producing provinces, outside the plan altogether.

Mr. Anguish: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, two shortcomings that are of particular concern are the cost of production formula, and where the administration offices are going to be for the plan. And certainly producers don't want the administration offices to be in Ottawa or Toronto or in Halifax or Charlottetown; they want those offices to be in western Canada, and preferably in the province of Saskatchewan.

And my question to you, Mr. Minister, is: what representations have you made to the federal government and to the other provinces in support of those, at least

those two shortcomings? What have you done on behalf of Saskatchewan producers in making that representation known?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — One of the most difficult problems, as I'm sure you're aware of, is the arguments about cost of production. And when we deal with provinces like Quebec and Ontario versus, say, the West, they strongly support cost of production formulas, say, in the province of Quebec, that said that their costs are higher; therefore they have to have a higher stabilization and higher subsidies. And I say to them, we have some comparative and competitive advantage here in western Canada.

We could make the same argument for, I suppose, some place, you know, in the Northwest Territories. We could say the cost of production is very high; therefore, we need very high subsidies and we should encourage cattle production outside the major areas where, in theory and reality, we know that they should be.

So what I'm saying to you is: we've got to be careful with this argument about cost of production. Because once we put it in and lock it in, then somebody can drift along outside of Montreal and say, my costs are very high because of real estate and urban pressures; therefore I deserve more subsidies — and all the beef and the hogs get produced in Quebec as opposed to in the West where they should be.

So we've got to be careful with that. We're trying to deal with it, to make sure that we can get as much basic fundamental economics in this national program so that the beef and the cattle are produced here where we have the feed grain supplies.

With respect to the administration, I agree with you. The more administration we can have here, as opposed to central Canada or eastern Canada, the better it is. We have, as well, had some pretty interesting discussions about where that should be. The federal government, obviously, is most comfortable with the administration around Ottawa. The provinces are more comfortable in the regions, so that debate continues.

Mr. Anguish: — Well we do have a cost production formula under the Saskatchewan beef stabilization plan and I think that Saskatchewan beef producers are quite happy with that cost of production formula. And what they're saying to you, I'm sure, because they're saying it to me and members on this side of the House, is that they don't want you putting them into a national program that is not as good as the provincial program they're already in even though, in principle, they support the national program.

My question to you is that before you disestablish the Saskatchewan beef stabilization plan is: will you assure beef producers that you will report, through this legislature, a detailed comparison of what producers would receive under the Saskatchewan plan as opposed to the national tripartite beef stabilization plan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just remind the hon. member, we can have a cost of production here and farmers may like it here. But if you allow the same sort of formula to apply across Canada, you are going to get tremendous incentives to produce beef in other parts of the country because they'll wade in with their cost of production, which is much higher, which encourages them to have more subsidy and therefore, as we saw in the pork business, frankly they stole a whole bunch of the pork productivity in production from the west into the province of Quebec and in Ontario and so forth. So it's a two-edged sword.

When we have that formula, we can be comfortable with it here. But if we say those are the rules and then they applied the same rules, obviously you get treasury fighting treasury. And we don't want the Quebec treasury taking on the Saskatchewan treasury when it comes to livestock production.

So I would say that we're familiar with those. We want to be careful when we state these are going to be the rules because obviously you know that other provinces can play by the same rules. You have to be sure that you are going to make sure that this province and other jurisdictions are going to play fairly when you start to put those rules into place.

Grants to Buffalo Narrows Pharmacy Ltd.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I direct my question to the minister in charge of Tourism and Small Business. And it has to do with your government's heavy financial support for a company called the Buffalo Narrows Pharmacy Ltd. which received a number of government grants to open and operate three small drug stores in northern Saskatchewan at Buffalo Narrows, La Loche, and Ile-a-la-Crosse. In just over three years this company has received more than \$300,000 in grants and other payments from your government.

Now the company has pulled out of Ile-a-la-Crosse. But your government says it won't have to give back any of the money Saskatchewan taxpayers gave it — money specifically to open and operate the three drug stores in northern Saskatchewan, and one is now closed. Can the minister tell us how, in a period of government restraint, this one small company was able to collect more than \$300,000 in government grants and payments?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I recall when I was the minister of Health in the government, that there was a request brought by the member opposite and many of the people in that area for pharmacy services of the north-west side of Saskatchewan, mainly Buffalo Narrows, La Loche and Ile-a-la-Crosse.

And there was a company that was willing to come in there and start a pharmacy and a dispensary, which they did do. Now there were certain grants that they were available for, and I know that they accessed those. I'd have to take notice of just the exact amount and where the grants came from and get back. I don't want to mislead

the member or the House. I think it's only reasonable that one would look at where all these grants came from if they . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. The member's taken notice.

Mr. Thompson: — New question, Mr. Minister, to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Most certainly they would be willing to come in with the type of financial assistance that you gave them.

But, Mr. Minister, in 1984-85, Public Accounts show the Department of Tourism and Small Business provided \$120,000. In 1985-86, Public Accounts show the Department of Tourism and Small Business provided the company with \$60,000 in northern economic development grants, while the Department of Health provided more than \$30,000 in operating grants. A letter you sent to me on August 5 — and this is a letter I received from the minister of Health, Mr. Minister, now — shows that the Department of Health, that they gave them another \$30,000 in the past two budget years.

Can you explain how this small company was able to collect more than the \$300,000 in taxpayers in a period of restraint, especially when these pharmacies created only three new jobs in total?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said to the member previously, there's an awful lot of figures and grants here, and I will look into those and report back to the member. I think it goes without saying though, if the member realizes, having represented that area for a long time, that there have been many businesses in the North, if we look back in the last 10 years, that had considerable seed money and then failed. So I'd like . . .

Threatened Railway Work Stoppage

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier. Mr. Premier the movement of Saskatchewan grain and other commodities is being threatened at the moment by the possibility of a work stoppage as a result of a dispute between the two railways and their employees. The Premier will know, Mr. Speaker, how devastating to our farmers and others in Saskatchewan a work stoppage in our rail system would be, and Saskatchewan agriculture obviously cannot stand that additional problem.

I'm sure the Premier is following the situation closely and I wonder if he could tell the House: what is the nub of the issue that is dividing the parties in their contract negotiations? As of today, how far do they remain apart in their respective positions? And what useful assistance is being offered to the parties, or provided to the parties, by the Government of Canada to bring that dispute to a settlement without a work stoppage?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that question would be best answered by the Minister of Labour for Canada who is probably involved to some extent in the negotiations. I

haven't been privy to the negotiations. I can say that I have written to the Minister of Labour advising him how serious it is to have a strike, and I can read the letter, but I won't at this time, but I have done that.

I have talked with the Deputy Prime Minister about it, Minister McKnight, and they are all fully aware of the fact that we cannot have a sustained strike in this country when it comes to the movement of grain, because not only farmers, but many, many people in the whole food business have a livelihood that depends on transportation.

So we have made solid and continual representation to the ministers at the national level with respect to the details of the negotiations. I can only say that the best person to contact would be the Minister of Labour for the federal Government of Canada.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Speaker, because of the gravity of this issue for Saskatchewan, because of the gravity of this issue for Saskatchewan, I wonder if the Premier would undertake to contact counterparts in the federal government to determine for this House a detailed report on where this situation stands. Hopefully that information could be available by tomorrow.

And in terms of the representations that the Premier has made to the Government of Canada, has he also indicated that in the event that the negotiations should fail, that the province of Saskatchewan would be anxious to see the Government of Canada assume its responsibilities and be prepared to move with legislation if that is the only possibility of resolving this matter, and keeping the grain moving for our farmers.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — To address the last question first, I would certainly, and I have recommended to the federal government, that they take whatever action is necessary to keep the grain moving. I've encouraged them to do exactly that, to take every effort to make sure that we don't have a strike.

With respect to the negotiations, I'm sure we could have a report this hour and then we could have a report another hour, and another day, because it's a fluid situation. There are two or three issues that the people are bargaining about, and it is a fluid situation. I can certainly attempt, if you like, to get an update as to where the negotiations are.

I'm not so sure that either side will provide us with a great deal of statistical evidence, but if there's something that I can get from our federal counterparts that would provide any insight, we could. At the same time, I don't want to inflame the situation by speaking about something that perhaps we don't have all the information about.

Disturbance at Pine Grove Correctional Centre

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that we'll give the Minister of Justice an opportunity finally to be recognized, as he's trying to do today.

My question concerns the disturbance at the Pine Grove Correctional Centre for women which took place on

Sunday night. One of the problems that I've been trying to impress on the minister for the past several months is the extent of the overcrowding that has been taking place at Pine Grove. A facility that's designed for 52 people has had occupancy up as high as 80, and this of course creates a real problem, not only for the inmates but for the correctional workers who work there, and for their safety.

My question for the minister is: what do you plan to do about it, and when do you plan to do it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I referred to the hon. member's question when we were dealing in estimates, and yesterday as well, Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question from the hon. member from Saskatoon Fairview . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I must . . . Order, please. Order, please. I think that the minister first of all has to address the question. And I don't feel that the reading of a notice of a previous question . . . that may or may not address it. So I ask the minister first to address that question.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with regards to the question posed by the hon. member from Saskatoon Fairview, I undertake to the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have been looking at the overcrowding situation; we have been looking at perhaps building some half-way houses in the province to cover some of that situation, and we will deal with it hopefully in those terms.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I took notice yesterday of a question by the hon. member from Saskatoon Fairview. Among those questions that he asked was: was the disturbance caused by the fact that the inmate at Pine Grove was the mother of the two young children who were killed in a house fire at Vibank last week.

The answer to that question is no. And let me further add this to it. A week or so ago in this House, with such indignation, the members opposite criticized the Minister of Social Services for a statement he made. I think you obviously should apologize to this House, but also to the mother or a person who has just lost two children in a fire. To then on province-wide television somehow suggest that she was in jail at the time of the fire, it's tough enough for a mother to lose two children in a fire without also being accused of being in jail at the time when she wasn't, when she was home with her children who unfortunately died. And I think that is a poor way to deal with questions in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, the minister feigned a good deal of indignation there which I don't think he felt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — He knew that I asked him to confirm whether or not that was the fact, and he's confirmed that that wasn't the fact. And I'm glad to hear it.

But while we're on the subject, let's talk about the lack of

any kind of meaningful training or educational or recreational facilities at Pine Grove, again a prime cause for tension because of the boredom and the frustration felt by the inmates there. I'd like to ask the minister: when are adequate training and educational and recreational facilities going to be provided for the Pine Grove Correctional Centre?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the same question was posed in estimates the other night. I indicated to the hon. member that in fact the Pine Grove inmates are now able to go to the men's institution to study carpentering and to study motor mechanics. There is also a part-time secretary there.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a second question yesterday from the hon. member, that somehow the disturbance was caused by overcrowding. The disturbance in this situation was caused by the fact that four inmates had about a month earlier taken some people hostage. That was dealt with. They were dealt with by the court and the court extended their sentence.

The institution further indicated to them that they would serve 20 hours in lock-up. These particular four people along with four others decided that that was being unfair to them, and as a result they once again took the law into their own hands. They caused some damage to the facilities there.

Now I would suggest to you that you should not say that is the cause of a shortage of people working there or an inadequacy of space. People that do that, that take hostages, that do not respect the law, that are dealt with by authorities, I think we should stand in support of the authorities and not stand always in support of the criminal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Human Resources, Labour and Employment Ordinary Expenditure-Vote 20

Item 1

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

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I have with me today, seated to my left, the deputy minister of the department, Phil Richards; the assistant deputy minister of Human Resources and Employment, Judy Moore, to my right; the director of administrative services, Pat More, my extreme left, I guess; the assistant deputy minister of the department with respect to labour, Gerry Meier, directly behind me. We also have in the Chamber, Janet McGregor, director of the women's . . .

women's director; Carol Klassen, assistant director, occupational health and safety; Dave Argue, executive director, policy planning and research; Rick Pawliw, director of youth services; and Leah Siebold, the employment equity co-ordinator.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, we have a new department here which is composed of five divisions: the labour division — which is more or less self-explanatory, and covers the former department of labour with the exception of the safety services branch which has been moved to Environment. In addition, we have the Indian-Métis affairs branch which deals with the aboriginal people of Saskatchewan. We also have the women's division which deals with women's issues. We have the senior's division which was formerly in the department of social services and has now moved into the Human Resources department. And we have the youth and employment division.

So we have five divisions or branches of this new department. It has been interesting in the past six months or eight months to get this new department started. It has been quite a challenge for my staff. You can see that we have a good mixture of both men and women in management in this new department. And we have been able to get the department rolling. We hope to do more in the next few months. Initially, in the first eight months, we have spent time organizing the department from an administrative point of view, and we expect to take some new initiatives in many of the branches in the next year to come.

With that, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to answer the questions of the opposition. And we expect that today should be a fruitful day, and not . . . there should be not be too much acrimony in the Chamber.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Chairman, I'll be directing my questions in regards to the division, the new division that was changed from Indian and native secretariat to the . . . I suppose a division . . . I don't know precisely the new name they may call it.

First of all, a bit of historical background in regards to the establishment of the Indian and native secretariat by the PC government in 1983, and its disestablishment in 1987, this year. The whole process of this establishment and disestablishment, to me, is a re-creation of the traditional colonialism that we thought we were getting away from in the 1960s and the '70s. That, in fact, this period in history from 1982 to '87 marks a period of the return of colonial policy as far as provincial relationships go in regards to Indian and Métis people in this province.

One must look at the history of the province of Saskatchewan in regards to the policy development. In the late '60s the Liberal government created a bona fide department, an Indian-Métis department. At that time they were intent on trying to resolve some of the outstanding issues in, especially, the socio-economic realm. A lot of the people during that period in time saw a tiny bit of progress being made, especially in regards to the establishment of the supernumerary program and trying to get Indian-Métis people into at least the civil service of the system. And I think they utilize words such

as "shadow positions", and so on.

But when you look at it in '87, and you turn back the clock back in '83, one looks at the PC approach to the problem. Some of the reaction during that period in time, in the late '60s, was that we were trying to create an Indian affairs at the provincial level. And many people were dissatisfied with that approach.

Then in '83, without any consultation, or with very little consultation of Indian-Métis people, the Indian and native secretariat was established by this government. And when you look back at that Act which was basically, again, for the socio-economic development, one looked at key phrases in there and basically it was one where people could only give advice but not be involved in the real decisions, you know, that affected their lives.

The Indian and native secretariat, the PC approach, became to be not only a provincial Indian affairs motto, it became to be a poor Indian affairs motto, basically because it did not only have real departmental status, it had a sub-status. It became only a secretariat. A secretariat does not have the same impact as a department.

But to make things worse, in 1987, again without the consultation or with very little consultation of people, of Indian—Métis people, you not only bring down the stature of the relationships out of your dealings with Indian and Métis people, you now make it into a subdivision. You make it into a part of the division of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, which gives it a very different view.

At least in the other prior approaches there was recognition that the Indian and Métis issue was not only one of Human Resources, Labour and Employment — that we were not only a cheap source of labour in this province, that in fact there was also the substantial issue of self-determination, Indian government and Métis self-government that was missing by the downgrading of the significance in regards to the PC approach.

When I mentioned at the beginning that indeed this 1987 approach, when you look at the historical development of federal and provincial relationships with Indian and Métis people, one has to look at it with extreme suspicion; that when I said that it was a colonial approach, I meant it with the deepest sincerity. When it was formed at the initial stages in '83, there was a reluctance to deal with the provincial Indian-Métis organizations. There was a lot of rhetoric in going to the grass roots level. The facts that I will provide for you today will show you that that has not indeed happened.

The approach that I saw in the early 1980s, when you first came in, and in relationship to this '87 approach that you've taken, is one where you used the same old colonial strategy of divide and rule. And you've tried to do it, as I will point out later on, in your economic development approaches and also in the funding systems that you have taken away.

(1445)

So this whole era of the PC form of colonialism at a time when we have recognized certain basic principles in Canada, and even its recognition in the constitutional talks — although very little had been done — is that the 1987 downgrading of your approach to making Indian-Métis people just a division of Human Resources, Labour and Employment is a reflection of your own contempt that you've shown and that you've practised in your relationships to Indian-Métis people in this province.

My first question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: in light of the developments, and of course being part of this developmental process yourself, what did you see in this new division that you have created as just a division? In what ways is this new division to be a more effective strategy in dealing with the issues of Indian and Métis people? Could you tell me that?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, the member opposite refers to a colonial policy, and if there ever was one, and I expect there might have been at some time in the past, certainly our government has done everything possible to avoid that type of a policy.

Our government has placed a great emphasis on economic development. We have done a great deal to help Indian and Métis people be self-sufficient, self-reliant, and help themselves. And we will do everything possible to assist your people in finding ways of helping yourselves to become self-sufficient as you once were. And that has many elements. It has money for economic development, it has education, and it has changes in the way the province and the country of Canada deal with Indian and Métis people.

Now, it's examples of the changes that have been made to allow your people to run their own affairs. The first example that comes to mind is the Lebret Métis farm, which is in my constituency. And this is a large tract of land north of Lebret which has been given to your people, to the Métis foundation, to run for the benefit of your people.

And this was not unanimous in my constituency. There were those people who felt that it should be sold. And I took a very strong position, before I was minister, that that land belonged to the Métis people of the area, and that land should go back to be used for their benefit. And I said that we had to do what was fair. So I did not do what maybe was popular among all of the people, but we did what was fair.

And when you look at the community of Lebret, it is taking a while for the people of Lebret to realize that this is a fair and reasonable thing to do, but gradually the attitudes are changing. And they're changing their view from government dependency to self-sufficiency. And this was not totally expressed in Lebret in the last election, but we did the right thing anyway. And you can hardly say that the Lebret Métis farm was any form of patronage when we gave the Métis farm to people who do not ordinarily support me politically. But we did it because it was the fair and correct thing to do — an example in my very own constituency.

In addition, the federal government and the provincial government are co-operating with the treaty Indians to move toward self-government for your people. And you know very well that at Ochapowace reserve, which borders my constituency, and is in the constituency of Indian Head-Wolseley in the Qu'Appelle valley, that this reserve is now, at this very time, taking over the operation of their finances. and this year they will receive \$1 million which the Department of Indian Affairs would have ordinarily spent on that reserve for services - for roads, for education, for all the other things in administration of that Ochapowace Indian reserve.

And the federal government is at this very time giving the band of Ochapowace reserve the million dollars and saying: here, you operate your reserve, and you spend that money as you see fit. You pick your priorities. You pick whether you're going to spend it on roads, or education, or welfare, or administration, or economic development within that reserve.

That is a first example of how the future will be with respect to Indian people. And you will see Indian people deciding for themselves how they were going to spend the money that used to be decided by officials from Ottawa and, to some extent, provincial officials. So you are going to see changes. We are making changes, and you want to talk about the old ways of colonialism, then I suggest you are living in the past. We have to look at the future. And future is a partnership in this province between Indian and Métis people and all of the other citizens of this province so that we all work together for the benefit of the province and we will all benefit.

With respect to Indian and Métis employees, for example, with the provincial government, you raised an indication that this government was not doing very much in that regard. Well on the contrary, first of all you have to take into account that there are qualifications for serving in the civil service and that in recent years the educational level of Indian and Métis people has been increasing at a very good rate.

And therefore, from 1981 to the present, we've been able to double the number of Indian and Métis people working in the civil service. In 1981 it was 2.4 per cent. Today, or in June, the most recent statistics we have, it was 5.2 per cent in the civil service. And these are the people who are qualified to work in the civil service, and I think you will have to admit that a doubling during our administration of the number of Indian and Métis people working within the civil service is a very good record.

In addition, you raised the question of self-government. And I think since we may be here for some time, I'll go into that later because I know you will want to speak about that more specifically. But certainly that issue is not dead as I've given you examples already of some self-government having started already as we speak.

The question you are asking is: how will the new Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment benefit Indian people, and why are they included in this particular department? Well this department generally covers groups of people in our

society that have some special needs — that need some special attention; that need some special assistance: people who have peculiar circumstances that need to be addressed by the government, other than the circumstances of the public in general.

And so in this case we have Indian and Métis people who need some assistance in their education, in their educational directives, the directions. Indian and Métis people need some assistance in acquiring jobs within the government, jobs in general, because there is a certain network of people out there, citizens in general, who have over generations acquired skills in how to look for a job, how to acquire a job, who to talk to.

And there are special needs. And I think you will agree that this department that we now have that looks at the special needs of senior citizens, which includes Indian and Métis people; that looks at the special needs of women as a group, half of society, which includes, I presume, half of Indian and Métis people; that Indian and Métis people specifically, that the Department of Labour where Indian and Métis people are workers like anyone else, that is a very logical place to have the Indian and Métis branch in a department called Human Resources, Labour and Employment.

And you will acknowledge that unemployment is a considerable problem among Indian and Métis people, more so than it is in the general population. So it seems to me it is a logical place, a department that pays particular attention to particular needs, that the Indian and Métis people of Saskatchewan should be in this department.

Mr. Goulet: — You mentioned that one of your key goals in regards to this . . . to the working relationship with Indian and Métis people, in regards to this new division, was economic development. Why is it, Mr. Minister, that you have cut the budget of the Indian economic development program from 3 million to \$1 million?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well this situation cannot be taken in isolation, of course. As the Indian and native . . . or Indian and Métis affairs branch of the provincial government, we are really only a tip of the iceberg of the whole area of Indian and Métis affairs. And I do acknowledge that the federal minister is much more powerful, has a greater responsibility in this area, and a considerably greater budget.

And so what we do with economic development in Saskatchewan is we try to supplement and use the money in the Saskatchewan budget as seed money. And recently, in the last few years, the federal department has put much more money into economic development. The federal department has budgeted \$375 million for Indian and Métis economic development and, you know, recently have given over to the Saskatchewan Métis people \$9 million for economic development — a considerable sum of money.

We have budgeted this year \$1 million for economic development for treaty Indians, which are primarily a federal responsibility, but we wanted to provide some local assistance. And in addition we have a new half

million dollars for the Métis people, which never existed before, which can be used to complement the \$9 million that the federal government has put into this.

All told, we have spent \$7.7 million on economic development since we changed from paying money for Indian administration and local and provincial Indian politics to putting money into economic development. And when . . . I know you weren't part of the government, but I know that you were deeply involved in the NDP in the past and followed that closely. And I think you will find that the provincial government did not put money into economic development, but instead it was used for administration.

And that may be money, and it may be \$3 million, but I submit to you that economic development money is lasting money. Administration money is operating money that is spent from day to day and there's nothing to show for it. And what is there to show for the money that the NDP spent on administration in the old Indian department? There's nothing left to show for that administration money. Maybe there are books and records of account, and things of that nature, showing how the money was spent, but there was really nothing physically there.

(1500)

Now throughout the province you have Indian projects all over on Indian reserves, and we're trying to get some developed into the urban areas. And you have these projects that are in operation; you have sand and gravel companies; you have construction companies; the list goes on and on as to Indian economic development projects that are ongoing.

Mr. Goulet: — You make a fairly big deal, Mr. Minister, about your one and a half million dollars for Indian and Métis economic development in this province. That figure amounts to \$15 for every Indian and Métis person in this province. You're expecting an economic development fund of \$15 per person — \$15 per person. You make a big deal about this \$15 per person. But that's what that one and a half million amounts to.

You've just been through question period where your government just gave \$300,000 for one person in getting a pharmacy going in northern Saskatchewan — one person. But yet for all of the Métis people in the province, as you state, you're only going to give 500,000.

Also the strategy is a lot more than meets the eye. One of the approaches of this government, as I mentioned earlier, was a divide and roll strategy. They took . . . my contention is this. There was \$3 million in the Indian economic development program. You took \$500,000 from that budget and put it under a native economic development fund, a provincial NEDP. Your strategy is one where you figure that Indian-Métis people will be fighting over the pittance that you're giving them throughout the province. When you look at the aspect of even Weyerhaeuser — you give Weyerhaeuser \$8 million to build roads in northern Saskatchewan so that they can drive their trucks through the bush. You give them \$8 million, just building roads, and yet a lot of

Indian-Métis people will lose their lives travelling the roads of northern Saskatchewan. The roads have gone downhill in the past five years.

When you look at the impact of your policy, it is not only one of trying to play your dividing role strategy, it's one of demeaning people at such a low rate. You talk a great line about what the previous ... you seem to imply that the previous NDP government had a department or something. I must remind the minister, if he looks at the historical ... since the NDP came in from '71 to '82, that there was no such thing as an Indian-Métis department, or an Indian-Métis secretariat, or an Indian-Métis subdivision of human resources, labour, and employment department. There was no such thing.

You asked me whether or not the NDP provided grants to Indian-Métis organizations. You will have to know that during the period in time when the NDP came in, the policies to help Indian-Métis people formulate their own self-determination was the essential strategy of the NDP. They put money directly to the establishment, for example, of the Gabriel Dumont Institute under Métis and non-status Indian control, that very budget which you cut by 20 per cent this year. You're slowly tearing apart every major development that took place in the past 15 years.

You ask me: how much on education? There was a budget put out during that period in time, and by the time '82 rolled around there was approximately four, five, six million being spent on education alone, from both federal and provincial funding systems. If you look at all that has happened within ... something that was controlled by an aboriginal organization. There was definite development. In a period of a few years, I will remind the minister, that when aboriginal people do the initial formulations of self-government, whether it's through education, there is tremendous development.

In a year, last year for example, the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College had approximately, through their Saskatchewan Indian Community College and Saskatchewan Indian Federated College system, they had about 700 students, both from the federal and provincial system. And that came out as a result of providing dollars to Indian-Métis organization so that they can directly control the funds and do their development ... that is real self-sufficiency.

What you propose, Mr. Minister, is to take that money away from the Indian-Métis people. You took \$2 million alone from the Indian economic development fund this year, and that's the fact — two-thirds of it. If you took two-thirds of the economic development money that you give to all the businesses in this province, it would be an extremely tough situation. If you cut agricultural production in this province by two-thirds, we'd be in a worse mess than we already are in the way that you operate this province.

The very basis of self-sufficiency, and I mean real self-sufficiency, where you put, number one, resources wherein aboriginal people, wherein Indian-Métis people, can make a strong, strong economic stand is something that you have taken away from Indian and Métis people.

I will ask you a question, Mr. Minister, in regards to this Indian economy: how do you expect the 70 bands and about 100 Métis communities to be able to do proper economic development with \$1.5 million? Could you tell me that?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the member opposite that the money that is spent by my department for economic development is different than other money spent by the government in economic development, in that all of it is paid out in grants, not loans, not forgivable grants or anything, but in outright grants as seed money to assist Indian and Métis people to establish businesses and create economic development on their reserves, in their communities, and throughout Saskatchewan.

The member opposite is suggesting that somehow we have abandoned Indian and Métis people. I'm sure the member opposite is familiar with La Loche, Saskatchewan, as an example. This is a community in which last year the provincial government spent \$13.2 million in a community of about 2,200 people for health, education, social services, municipal government, and all the needs of La Loche, Saskatchewan.

The provincial government spends a considerable sum of money in many, many ways. And certainly when we continue to spend in health and education, and the costs of operating a community like La Loche at \$3.2 million last year, certainly that is far from abandoning Indian and Métis people.

Education is not specifically my department. However, this branch monitors all matters with respect to Indian and Métis people, and we feel that we are doing a very adequate and honourable job — in education, for example, where the provincial government spent on education and training \$40 million last year on Indian and Métis people.

And you have to keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that treaty Indians and the education of treaty Indians is a federal responsibility, and they spend a considerable sum, in addition, on a per capita basis. This government has treated Indian and Métis people very well. I'm not saying that we won't try to do better in the future, but we feel that we have treated them very well and fair with respect to money.

We also think there is room for improvement in assisting Indian and Métis people in education, in the education of administering their own affairs; in the education of production, of producing goods that they can sell. The members opposite have a great — and I think it's not too strong of a word to say that they have a great hate for Weyerhaeuser corporation. I can just see the looks in their eyes and the looks on their faces when they mention that word Weyerhaeuser corporation. It is a focal point for their anger. For no reason, Mr. Chairman, for no reason at all.

Maybe they do not know that when a paper mill is finally completed in Prince Albert, in addition to the Weyerhaeuser pulp mill, that half of the wood used there

will be what we call in southern Saskatchewan, poplar — but I suppose the technical term in the paper business is hardwood. And this aspen, which will be half of the lumber used there, or the wood used, will be a new market for trees that are now either going for firewood or rotting. They're not being put into any substantial use. And I believe the member will be familiar with the west side of the province where the Canadian Shield runs up higher, there is less of the pine and there is more of that type of lumber.

And therefore I have met with, as the Minister of Labour . . . and you ask the benefits of having the Indian and Métis Affairs branch in this department. As Minister of Labour I met with Weyerhaeuser executives from Saskatchewan and Canada-wide, and we discussed future employment possibilities, labour situation, and the possibilities for Indian and Métis people.

(1515)

And there are good possibilities there for economic development, where Weyerhaeuser will be buying on contract — not from large operators, but from small operators. They're prepared to buy small lots of trees — ready cut, ready for their paper mill — of the aspen variety. And they don't necessarily have to come out of their lease. They're prepared to deal with wood lot operators, with people who own land, and it's not suitable for agricultural purposes but grows trees very well. They're prepared to deal with these people — buy a two-tonne truckload per week, or whatever kind of a contract they can make.

And that is a very good opportunity for the Indian and Métis people of northern Saskatchewan on the forest fringe to make contracts with Weyerhaeuser. And I think rather than the leadership — as indicated by the members of the opposition — and rather than the leadership of the Indian and Métis people trying to suggest that Weyerhaeuser is some sort of an enemy of theirs, the potential for them to sell trees to Weyerhaeuser and earn income and earn their own living is phenomenal.

And I think the leadership should encourage the people to jump on this opportunity. It's going to be coming up in the next two or three years as soon as that plant is completed. The leadership — that's what's important, Mr. Chairman, the leadership. People are only as good as their leaders.

And the member opposite, I challenge him as a leader of Indian and Métis people, and other leaders, to lead their people into economic development and into self-sufficiency and to explore these possibilities — to go and see Weyerhaeuser corporation and say: how much timber will you need? How much could we supply? In the economic development side, then, we in our department are prepared to assist them in the purchase of trucks and in the purchase of saws.

And surely the member opposite cannot suggest that lumbering is demeaning — surely he cannot suggest that. So I challenge the member opposite, as a leader of Indian and Métis people, to show example, to lead his people into the 21st century.

Mr. Goulet: — I'm glad that the minister brought in the issue of Weyerhaeuser, and I would like to respond by pointing out the PC government's relationship to Weyerhaeuser, as compared to the PC government's relationship to Indian-Métis people.

I will point this out by first talking about the land issue. Outstanding treaty claims in this province are estimated to be anywhere from one to two million acres. And that would approximate the size of the P.A. National Park in this province. When you look at the amount of land that was given to the control of Weyerhaeuser wherein land claims could not even proceed in that area — for example with La Ronge and Peter Ballantyne Band having close to 300,000 acres outstanding — they could not proceed with the land entitlement claim without first going to Weyerhaeuser and giving them a 180-day notice.

The other thing too is that on file at Weyerhaeuser is supposedly a letter which outlined what areas were permissible and what areas this land entitlement could clearly go to. In other words, a PC government, in only one-and-a-half year's negotiations, have given pretty well a give-away situation for Weyerhaeuser which amounted to the tune of land which is larger than the area of all the treaty reserves combined in Canada.

That in fact when people get a little bit uptight about the PC government and the sweetheart deal that you made with Weyerhaeuser, it is because you have not lived up to dealing effectively with the outstanding treaty claims in this province. You go out of your way to make a legalized document with Weyerhaeuser that gives them — they don't have to pay no money down. If they don't make a profit through the 20 per cent, they don't have to give anything — pay anything back. But yet when it comes down to Indian-Métis people and you having to deal with them in a straightforward manner, what you do is stall and stall and stall; that in fact Indian bands are talking about taking this provincial government to court in regards to a land entitlement issue; that in fact the La Ronge band late last fall started and proceeded with litigation in regards to the outstanding land entitlement issue.

Maybe you are saying to me, yes, we are against Weyerhaeuser. But it's not Weyerhaeuser per se that people are against, it's your policy that people are against; that in fact when you give away more land than all the treaty Indians in Canada in a one and a half year agreement with Weyerhaeuser, and in five years you cannot do anything with Peter Ballantyne band or La Ronge band in northern Saskatchewan and many other bands in the South, then people get a little bit perturbed about the situation.

I am glad that you mentioned Weyerhaeuser, basically because it shows that you bend over backwards where it comes to big business, but when it comes down to Indian-Métis people, you cut and slash and beat them up. That's the basis of your policy. And that's the reason why a lot of people bring up the Weyerhaeuser issue because it shows very clearly the unequal treatment that the PC government has when they compare their relationships between big business and the relationships with Indian-Métis people.

With Indian-Métis people you will call economic development grants, grants. You call big business development, economic incentives. There's even a difference in terminology. But the same is still true, that there is a great big unequal treatment in regards to the amount of dollars that flow to large-scale corporations versus the amount that goes to Indian-Métis corporations.

The other fact that you brought in regards to the Weyerhaeuser deal that a lot of people are worried about is this. People have access . . . Indian people have access to hunting in Crown lands, and there's a lot of Crown land in northern Saskatchewan, especially. But in light of that, the Weyerhaeuser agreement has a clause in there which would provide for the closure of access to some of these roads into the hunting areas. While the roads are there to exploit the resource, to make Weyerhaeuser rich, the same roads may not be there for somebody to go and get firewood to heat the home of their grandmother or to cook a meal for their children.

And that is the unequal treatment that people talk about, and that is why Weyerhaeuser becomes a favourite topic, because it is one agreement that you have just done in the past year and it's fresh on people's minds. No doubt, with your policy in the past five years, there will be another Weyerhaeuser next year.

We talked about Pocklington, Manalta Coal before, but there always will be another one. But when it comes down to Indian and Métis people, your strategy is to give tiny little seeds of economic development which you know in many cases are bound to fail because they do not provide the necessary support services to make a tough economic development strategy an effective one.

And that's the essence that people are talking about. People bring up these issues of Weyerhaeuser not only in relation to land, not only in relation to the inequality of the amount of money given, not only in the fact that the corporation, the private corporation, introduces new laws and new regulations that may in fact infringe on treaty rights. That's the reason, Mr. Minister, that people bring these up. It's not because of some innate hatred of Weyerhaeuser, as you seem to imply. That just is not the case.

If Weyerhaeuser would have come out with an affirmative action strategy on employing Indian and Métis people in northern Saskatchewan, a lot of people would have said, yes, that Weyerhaeuser is doing something in regards to the employment of Indian and Métis people in our area. Instead, what you see, Mr. Minister, is this — that the employment strategy of the PCs which was reminiscent in this year's budget, in '87, the same wording applies. What you say in the Weyerhaeuser document is the same thing that you said when you brought in your budget. And the key word that you use there is Weyerhaeuser will encourage Indian-Métis people to be employed.

(1530)

The government in this year's budget said, oh, we encourage. Well to me, that's the most discouraging word that I've heard in this year's budget and in also in relation

to the Weyerhaeuser agreement, because it signifies a word to mean you're going to do nothing, or very little. Just a little tiny seed to make people feel that you are actually doing something. Your seedling approach to economic development is, to me, a real slap in the face to the women, the children, that are forced into welfare situations on a daily basis because of the policy of this government.

I would ask you, Mr. Minister, in light of the information that I've given you on a comparative view of Weyerhaeuser, its treatment on land, the issue on employment, and the issue on regulations: do you feel at all that there is an unequal treatment between the way you work with big business corporations like Weyerhaeuser and with Indian and Métis corporations?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, first of all, I don't mean to be nasty about this or anything like that, but the member knows, you know, that there are millions of trees in northern Saskatchewan and I'm sure he's never — he will admit — never seen any money growing on those trees.

And the question then is: who pays the bills in this province? And it's agriculture and business, mining and forestry, the oil industry; that's what pays the bills in this province. It's big business and small business; agriculture. It's a lot of people working, and a lot of big and small businesses that pay the bills. And to have an attitude that there's something wrong with this business, whether it is big or small, that this business and agriculture is not important or not desirable, is a self-defeating attitude, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

And clearly the member opposite knows that the first corporation of the world, the Hudson's Bay corporation, the oldest corporation in the world originally came here and his ancestors did business with that big business corporation and felt that it was very good business at the time. As a matter of fact, it still can be, you know. There are more beaver in Saskatchewan now than there were when the Hudson's Bay Company came. So there is potential for this kind of business and all kinds of business.

On treaty claims and the land claims situation, I could tell you that I am very much committed to getting those claims settled as fast as possible. And you know, the members of your party criticize me for being blunt at times — like to have a little fun, tell a few stories and laugh a little because I use direct words.

But I'm using direct words to you now. I mean that. I have no patience for fooling around, negotiating for ever and ever. I want to get this problem solved so we can get on with life in this province — your people and all the other people. And I'm serious. And I say it to you bluntly: I have no patience for foot-dragging and time-wasting on land claims. And we're trying our best. And since I've taken over as minister, we've tried to push it along as much as possible.

However, we are hindered by many things when it comes to land claims. And the first hindrance is that the country has been preoccupied with constitutional talks about

self-government. And some parties in the self-government discussions and debate have found this to be an emotional debate; some have found that they still possess hard feelings and some ill-will. And it's taking a little time for the parties to get over this. And so that has distracted from the land claims.

And we on the government side, as the Premier committed us in Ottawa when we last met, was that when we get back to Saskatchewan, regardless of whether a constitutional deal was signed or not, we will get down to the business of solving the problems. And that's what we would like to do.

But some of the hindrances in trying to solve the treaty claims, of course, are the complicated matters of law, the matters of regulations, of conflicting interests. And we try to settle this without too much conflict, without too much controversy.

If we can convince people with conflicting interests that they should take other interests and move to other parts of the province, or do their business elsewhere so that the land can be turned over to the Indian band, then that is a better way of doing it than simply having the government grab the land and having a controversy.

And your people will get that land that you are entitled to. You have that commitment as long as I am in office. And I hope to have that accomplished long before I ever retire from politics.

But the second problem is the politics. And there are some . . . You know there are some internal politics among the bands, among the band members, among the chiefs. And that tends to delay things from time to time.

But what's even worse, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is the partisan politics that gets involved in this. And I sometimes wonder about the advice that the members of your party . . . you remember now that you are a leader of the Indian people, and you're a member of the NDP party and at some time . . . There are times when I think you have a conflict; you have a problem in deciding who you should serve, your people or the NDP party.

The problem arises that the NDP party does not wish to have these matters settled. They would rather have these matters dragged out in court, and the party gets very much involved. And you referred to the Lac La Ronge band. I'm not going to comment on that because there's a lawsuit before the courts on that.

I don't know if your new leader has told you this, but the lawyers for the Lac La Ronge band, the people that are suing the federal and provincial governments and will drag this out in the courts for years and years rather than negotiate it out and solve it, are Mitchell Taylor Romanow and Ching. I'm sure you may be surprised to find out that your new leader, your potential new leader, is acting for the Lac La Ronge band. And here you have probably the Leader of the Opposition involved in the courts in a land claim. And here you have members of your party involved in acting as legal counsel for the Lac La Ronge band. It's questionable then whether they really want it settled in a hurry, or whether they want to go to

court, and how they go about this process.

So I submit to you that you have a conflict within yourself. It's not a legal conflict but a conflict of whether your party is trying to serve your people or whether these claims could not be settled if the politicians from your side did not meddle with the land claims.

Now that's something you'll have to consider. But that's one of the problems that is holding up land claims is the NDP party's politics and their meddling, their partisan meddling, in Indian politics.

The next matter that you raise is the amount of money that's required for economic development. And I'm prepared to listen to your suggestion as to what is necessary, how much money it would take. You know that the department of northern Saskatchewan spent millions of dollars in northern Saskatchewan and it didn't seem to solve the problem. Now if it was a matter of money, if money could solve this and it could get the economy of northern Saskatchewan rolling, get the Indian reserve economies rolling, then if we had a particular sum that would solve that, with that particular sum I think we could probably go and borrow from the people or from the banks or from whoever has the money, enough money, run up the deficit and get this problem solved for once and for all. But I would need some guidance from you as to how many million dollars would solve the economic development problem. So I am prepared to listen to what you think should be spent on economic development.

We get back to Weyerhaeuser. I don't think you really dislike Weyerhaeuser; it's just your party's line of approach that you should dislike Weyerhaeuser even though they can do good for the Indian people and the Métis people of northern Saskatchewan. You personally know that they can. And you may know, you may know that on the construction project right now at Prince Albert, 14 per cent of the construction workers there are of Indian and Métis origin. Weyerhaeuser corporation is trying their best to assist Indian and Métis people in finding employment in the North.

And I think you should really stand up and acknowledge that Weyerhaeuser corporation has had a good record at 14 per cent, that you're getting in the range of the Saskatchewan average as to the number of Indian and Métis people there in Saskatchewan as compared to the total population, and 14 per cent is in that range, you know.

You and I know that the statistics vary a bit as to how many Indian and Métis people there really are in Saskatchewan, but you know that 14 per cent is in a close range. And in contrast, look at the problem we're having at the upgrader in Regina where it's total union, and I can't get Indian and Métis people into the unions with enough seniority to get jobs there.

And this is quite a problem for us, and we've tried to have special people there to try to get Indian and Métis people in on the biggest project in Saskatchewan — the upgrader in Regina. And you know there are a lot of Indian and Métis people in Regina, and you know that they could use

jobs out there. And we are having a difficult time getting them in on the upgrader because of the structure.

At Weyerhaeuser the structure is different; there are union workers on site and non-union workers. And you know that, for the most part, your people do not have seniority in the unions, and that's a problem for them on a big construction project. And on the Weyerhaeuser site, it's approximately half the workers are unionized and half are non-unionized. And that has allowed that project to bring in Indian and Métis people to the extent of 14 per cent.

Mr. Goulet: — I'm glad that you did raise the issue of employment and so on, but I would like, first of all, to reply back to a comment that is very reminiscent of the strategy of the PC government. Whether statements in the past five years have been made in this legislature by members from across in regards to native people on the lowering of property values, I find your . . . the tenor of your statements to be highly paternalistic.

The extreme paternalism that is again made by off-the-cuff remarks such as AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) and native people — off-the-cuff remarks. The same paternalism is the same paternalism that I hear coming from your mouth, Mr. Minister.

You see, you are implying that I could not think for myself; that I could not be able to differentiate between party policies and also Indian self-government and treaty claims; that I could not know the difference between Métis self-government and the governmental structure of the province of Saskatchewan. I find that type of attitude not only paternalistic, but something that is bordering on racism.

(1545)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — That, to me, Mr. Minister, shows your contempt for aboriginal people when you can make a statement to say that Indian or Métis leaders are guided by the NDP. Indian and Métis leaders, Mr. Minister, can make decisions for themselves.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — They don't need the PC or the NDP to speak up for them; that in fact Indian and Métis people formulate their own positions in the strongest, most forceful way, and you know that. And to think that you can stand here and state that I do not know, or other aboriginal people do not know, the difference between party policies, is an outrageous piece of paternalism in Saskatchewan's history.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I will ask the minister on that very issue of whether or not Indian-Métis people were able to distinguish between NDP policy and their self-government. Name me an Indian and Métis person in this province that cannot distinguish that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Chairman, or Deputy Chairman, I don't really know the member opposite. I acknowledge he can think for himself and speaks well in the Assembly. I really don't know what the member from Lakeview had to give him as far as advice, but certainly it has changed his whole tone. And I wasn't listening that close; I don't think the member opposite called me a racist. I heard him talk something about racism. It seems to me that when citizens of this province discuss the problems of Indian and Métis people, that simply because they may not necessarily agree, or because they may have differences of approach, that people should start using words like racism. I think we have to be realistic and look at the problem that is here. I am far from a racist. I am a problem solver. And I'm sure the member opposite will admit that there is a problem to be solved here; that Indian-Métis people need assistance in becoming self-sufficient, and that economic development is important.

I have approached you in a matter of respect, and you accuse me of being paternalistic. I've acknowledged that you are a leader of Indian and Métis people. Are you not a leader of Indian and Métis people? Are these not your people? They are my people, as being citizens of the province of Saskatchewan. But I would consider that the members of my German Lutheran church are my people. I am one of them. I have given you respect, and I believe you are a leader of your people. Are you not a leader of the Indian and Métis people?

Certainly you have to hold yourself out to be a leader. And I give you that respect. A leader of your people, I mean nothing demeaning about it. I challenge you to lead your people, even if you insist on following the socialist ways. I still challenge you on leading your people to a better life.

Mr. Goulet: — I sense again, Mr. Minister, that you seem to imply that my statements — and I made these statements — of the racism, the fact that the budget, you know, promotes racism before. I'll remind the minister that the member from Regina Lakeview wasn't here to guide me to make whatever statements that I wanted to make.

The member, for the record, Mr. Minister, is for her to state that the policy of the PCs in regards to employment of Indian and Métis people has been very poor in the Weyerhaeuser agreement, had also implied that the policies of taking away a lot of the experienced Indian-Métis women from the department on affirmative action in hiring of Indian-Métis people in government, the employment equity program.

The precise statement, for the record, she wanted was on the issue of contract compliance. When the NDP government was here we made sure that large-scale corporations operating in northern Saskatchewan would have to hire Indian and Métis people, it was part of the contract compliance, part of the affirmative action strategy of the NDP government.

There was approximately 60 per cent of the people from northern Saskatchewan hired in the Key Lake mine. After the PCs have been in power for five years, the record of

the Key Lake mine is hovering around 20 per cent, because you refuse to even, you refuse to even follow the law in regards to that affirmative action lease agreement which states that there should be 50 per cent. You refuse to even follow your own laws. It's not only a question, Mr. Minister, of the fact that you want to work with contract compliance; it's a question of not even following the law of contract compliance in the form of the affirmative action lease agreement in the Key Lake agreement.

I'll have you know, Mr. Minister, in regards to your implied paternalism again, that I can think of that very clearly in my head. I have thought for that in the past five years since you've come into this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — The minister laughs. The minister laughs. He figures that putting Indian and Métis people out of jobs in the Key Lake mine or in other areas is a laughing matter. The minister laughs. He laughs. That in fact, he does not have a solution to the issue that I'm presenting. Weyerhaeuser, and I'll show you . . . one other member says that that's a lie.

Last year when the Weyerhaeuser agreement came into place, Indian and Métis people, a native woman, presented you with the need for an affirmative action lease agreement in regards to Weyerhaeuser. But did you comply to that? No, you wanted to make sure that in the long run very few Indian-Métis people would be working there.

An Hon. Member: — So he could blame it on the unions.

Mr. Goulet: — Now you turn around, Mr. Speaker, and you blame the fact of Indian-Métis employment on unions. Take a look at Key Lake. The union was there. The union backed up the affirmative action lease agreement. The union backed up the idea that there was 60 per cent employment for Indian-Métis people in Key Lake during that phase. But in 1984 the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour also presented you with a brief and pointed out the fact that you were not complying to the affirmative action lease agreement at Key Lake. Mr. Minister, you were in charge of dealing with Indian and Métis issues in this province. The issue of employment is indeed an issue that a lot of people want to see resolved.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, what is your strategy for development in large scale development? Are you going to have affirmative action lease agreement strategies which the law of Canada provides for, and which the law of Saskatchewan provides for?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the member opposite that the reason I was laughing was because he was taking advice from the member from Lakeview. And I don't think the member opposite should take advice from the member from Lakeview, and nor do I advise that he not support her in her leadership bid, you know, if that's what she's trying to do. And I thought it was rather funny that he was taking advice from her when she was running for leader. So she's not your leader yet. You don't have to do what she says, you know. I don't think she will be your leader.

The question really here, Mr. Chairman, is: if the member opposite, as the critic on Indian and Métis affairs, could give us a figure on how much we should be spending on economic development, we could take it into account. But in the absence of him being able to give us a figure, we will have to stick with the amount that is currently in the budget and see what can be done next year with respect to how progress is made in economic development and how much money the taxpayers of Saskatchewan could allocate to this sum.

With respect to your complaint about Key Lake, this is the first time that that has been brought to my attention by any members of your party. And I will look into the matter on Key Lake and try to see why the numbers are down, if they are down. And I will look into that matter. The real question is: how do you explain, if our government has no desire to assist Indian and Métis people, if our government has no desire to take firm action . . . And affirmative action, I suppose, is useful, but it is very much a quota system, and I think a quota system would be paternalistic.

But very much so, we're prepared to take firm action. Tell me, that increasing the number of Indian and Métis people working for the government in the civil service from 2.4 per cent to 5.2 per cent, if that is not firm action and if that is not for the benefit for Indian and Métis people. But tell me that — you know, how that is wrong. And tell me how much money should be spent on economic development.

Mr. Goulet: — I'm glad now that the minister is asking me the questions. Maybe I should be the minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — In regards to the issue that you raise on the question, on the issue of employment. A lot of your economic development approaches require a consideration of numbers or quotas, as you say. There is no such thing as affirmative action without any numbers. You need affirmative action with numbers, otherwise the historical record of systematic and institutionalized discrimination is such that the record will be down to 5 per cent. You need employment at about 15 per cent in this province. When you look at the facts of 2.4 to about 5 per cent employment of people in the civil service, that was done mainly in the period of the New Democratic Party. Most of that increase was done in that period.

I looked at your specific strategy, the affirmative action strategy that was started and continued through the employment equity program. I looked at the employment equity program, and many of the questions in regards to employment equity need to be asked. But before we get into that, I will ask you why it is that you choose to do away with the employment equity program which would hire more Indian and Métis people, women and the disabled, in the civil service. Why did you do away with that? Can you tell me?

(1600)

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, the argument of the

member opposite is self-defeating here. He is suggesting that the employment equity branch was not doing a good enough job, and then he wants to know why we did away with it. Well first of all, we didn't do away with it; we've moved it to my department, to this department. And all the better, because this department has responsibility for Indian and Métis people, has responsibility for women's affairs, and so it's logical that it be moved to my department. But his argument is self-defeating. He's saying it's no good; why did you do away with it?

Well I'm not saying it was no good. I'm saying that it can be improved and should properly belong in the Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment. And the member opposite suggests that the improvement in the number of Indian and Métis people working for the provincial government took place under the NDP. The figures I gave were from March of 1981 to June of 1987, so it seems to me the election in 1982 was on April 26, so that it would have been about one-month period of time that the NDP would have had to double the employment of Indian and Métis people in the civil service, and we would have had to have done absolutely nothing for six years thereafter.

And I don't think anyone is going to accept that in one month the NDP doubled from 2.4 per cent to 5.2 per cent the number of Indian and Métis people working in the civil service of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, now if you simply extrapolated that 100 per cent increase over all of the months, you can see that very, very little of it would be during the NDP period.

There was a doubling of the number of Indian and Métis people working for the provincial government in the civil service in accordance with the figures that I have available to me, since this government took office. And the members opposite don't like to hear that, and want to diminish that and won't accept that. And that does not matter because the people of Saskatchewan know that that is correct. That is the information I have, and unless someone has not calculated correctly or didn't add right, that is the fact.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Minister, the many of your statements, you know, to date show that there's a lot of factual evidence that is lost, you know, in regards to your own statements, so I will have to go to some very specifics. In regards to the employment equity program, how many people were let go when they moved to your division?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question, those people were employed in the Public Service Commission, and how many they had or how they had them allocated is not within my knowledge. I don't know how many people were reshuffled, retired, or laid off as a result of the change-over to my department, because those people did not work for my department.

At present in our department we have one person engaged in this activity, and because it's fairly new to our department we're just getting it rolling and we expect to have more results in the next year or so, because we're going to put a greater emphasis on it now that . . . I'm not saying that there wasn't a good emphasis before, but I'm saying that now that it's under my jurisdiction I am going

to keep an eye on it. And I certainly couldn't keep an eye on it before because it wasn't under my jurisdiction, and I don't know how many people were working at it.

And the question is: are you saying that it was doing a good job before and should have been left as it is? Or even if it was, I'm submitting to you that we will do a better job having it in the department with Human Resources, Labour and Employment where the department also has branches with respect to women, has branches with respect to Indian and Métis people, and that's the appropriate place for it to be.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Minister, the reason why I asked you a specific question is because you say you have facts, and then when I ask a question you don't know the facts. You seem to throw around facts which you don't know anything about.

An Hon. Member: — Figures.

Mr. Goulet: — Figures. I don't know where you take them from.

I will remind the minister that in regards to the employment equity program, five women lost their jobs. Five women lost their jobs. The evidence also shows that out of the five women, three were Indian and Métis women. One had been transferred elsewhere, but was still being paid through that department. So in actuality there would have been two, but the record shows that she had been there and had worked. What that showed me when I talked to the woman, here were people with tremendous amount of experience and knowledge.

One person, an Indian woman I talked to who had 18 years of experience, knew the system thoroughly. She was the most expert in regards to employment equity. She knew about not only the policies from the previous government, she knew the Liberal program of the '60s. She had such tremendous knowledge about the pros and cons of each one of these different programs that had developed through the years. So you knew what was effective and what was not effective. Her other two colleagues which I've talked to, were also highly effective in not only doing the administration work, but also the field co-ordination along with it. These are the types of people that this government decided to take it out on. They have decided to just eliminate them. Highly experienced staff were eliminated.

You say you are trying to employ Indian-Métis people. This particular case shows very clearly that that wasn't the case. That wasn't the case when it came down to the woman either. That is the factual record that is there.

I've also pointed out the other one in regards to Key Lake, where it goes from 60 to 20. I also pointed to the fact that you didn't want to do anything about the Weyerhaeuser thing except create short-term jobs for six weeks and so on, and then you . . . and in your last statistics of 14 per cent. But out of that 14 per cent that you talk about in Weyerhaeuser, my bet is very few of them are long-term permanent jobs.

And I will tell you this much also. One of the key things in

affirmative action strategies has been to put in managerial positions. How many of those 14 per cent are in managerial positions, I would ask? And I would say that is probably a small percentage of that 14 per cent that are in that capacity, but I would say that it is probably more of a short-term economic strategy, and not a long-term permanent job approach in that Weyerhaeuser agreement.

You will like to present me facts, Mr. Minister. Could you put on the table for me the facts that you have in regards to the employment figures of Indian-Métis people in this province, and also in regards to Weyerhaeuser, and also in regards to Key Lake, and many other corporations? Can you provide me with those facts, Mr. Minister, since you didn't seem to know them when I asked a specific question?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — With respect to the total employment figures for Indian and Métis people, they are being updated right now and will be available on August 31. All right? So I can't give you the most up-to-date figures on that. If you'll send me a memo, or if we're still in estimates and you ask after August 31, I can give you the most current figures on that.

There is a reason that they can't be ready until August 31, as far as the most current figures. With respect to Key Lake, I indicated to you that we would check and see what the circumstances are there.

On Weyerhaeuser, I've already advised you that 14 per cent of the construction workers there, and I don't believe they've hired very many people in the mill because the regular staff stayed when it was sold, but of the construction workers, 14 per cent are Indian and Métis.

You deal with unemployment and the employment figures, and I can give you the figures that I do have available. These are the figures for native people in the employment of the government: March 1981, 2.4 per cent; March 1983, 3.1 per cent; March 1985, 3.4 per cent; March 1986, 5 per cent; March 1987, 4.2 per cent. You will note that at that time the government did reduce its work-force. However, we have made a full percentage point gain since March and we are now at 5.2 per cent in June. That is the spread I had given you earlier, and that gives you the continuous progress that was made from March 1981 to now, June of 1987.

For physically disabled people: March 1981, 0.7 per cent; March '83, 1 per cent; March 1985, 0.9 per cent; March 1986, 1.3 per cent; March 1987, 1.4 per cent. So by March of 1987, in our term of office we had doubled the number of physically disabled people working for the provincial government. It slipped just a little from March to June and we are now at 1.2 per cent. These are the most current figures I have available for physically disabled people working for the Government of Saskatchewan.

With respect to women in management in the Government of Saskatchewan, I think this is the key figure you wish to have, not how many women or what percentage of women ... what percentage of civil servants are women. I think it was over 50 per cent, is it not? Yes, my officials indicate it's in the 50 per cent range

or slightly over 50 per cent of civil servants are women.

(1615)

But I think the key figure that you would really want to know is that the percentage of women in non-traditional jobs, or as it stands today, the percentage of women in management and professional positions in the civil service of Saskatchewan is 21.3 per cent. And you can see that we are doing our utmost to give women a fair chance to be promoted and to take over management positions, and women are moving up.

I do acknowledge that at the very top levels we would like to see more women. And we see many, many women in the civil service with potential, moving up through the provincial civil service. And my new assistant deputy is a good example of that, someone having started with the government some years ago — I won't say how many years ago; some years ago — and having worked her way through the government, acquiring management skills, and is now the assistant deputy minister of this new department.

So you can see that our record has been quite good with respect to employment equity, if you compare it to only five or six years ago, and your party is the party that speaks long and loud on the merits of these issues. And I submit to you that our party, the Progressive Conservative Party, which does not speak as long and loud, but has acted, and we have acted very fairly for these groups of people, my department is proud of the progress that has been made, and we will continue this kind of effort. And now that we're responsible for employment and the affirmative action type programs, we will do our best to continue in that regard.

I do not know what the people in the Public Service Commission were doing before I took over this function and this responsibility; that is not my responsibility. I do not know what they were doing or how successful they were or if any of this success can be attributed to them. I can tell you that the people in my department are trying to get this up and rolling and showing further improvement, and I expect when we are back next year and the year after, you will be satisfied with the improvement that is made year after year.

Mr. Goulet: — One of the specific things, Mr. Minister, I've noticed in the past, since '81 to '86, has been an increase in the incarceration rates of Indian-Métis people. It has jumped from 61 per cent to 64 per cent. What that indicates to me, Mr. Minister, is that because you lack a solid social and economic development program, and because you have been cutting back in the past five years, that indeed the rates of incarceration tend to increase. And that's what sociological statistics usually point out.

I would like to know, Mr. Minister, what you are going to do in regards to dealing with this situation? What type of goal are you going to have in accordance with the Department of Justice to be able to resolve, you know, some of this issue? Do you have any ideas about this issue, and what would you do about it?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Chairman, this is where you run into the line of using terms like paternalist, paternalism. The question is, what is the government going to do to change this situation? And the government will do what the Indian people and the Métis people think will help assist the situation.

And what we are doing is, for example, most of the crime problems are related to alcohol, and we have spent a great deal of effort in assisting with alcohol treatment. We are building a new Whitespruce centre for youth and alcohol problems in the Yorkton area. There is the New Dawn centre which is . . . and there's co-operation with the federal government. The federal government is assisting, realizes that this is also the problem. There's the New Dawn centre at Fort Qu'Appelle, very close to my constituencies, four constituencies more or less joined there in an area that has many Indian reserves.

We just opened a new centre in Regina. I was at the opening. It's a very good centre for alcohol treatment. The problem is not so much a matter of economics as life-styles. And many people in our society — and it's not limited to Indian and Métis people — have problems with drugs and alcohol. We're trying to help with all of those people as in any way possible. And the leadership of the Indian people have many ideas and have come a long way in trying to help solve these problems. So we will continue to work in co-operation with the leadership of the Indian and Métis people.

And this is where you haven't really raised the question of where are we going on self-government. You raised it earlier and I think I should give you some information on that right now.

We are meeting with the treaty Indians and we have a special government committee to meet with the committees designated by the chiefs. And we have started a process of negotiations with respect to how the province can co-operate in self-determination for the Indian bands in how they can do. As an example, the Ochapowace Band that I've described, manage their own money, their own affairs, decide whether the money should be spent on education or whether it should be spent on roads or whether it should be spent on recreation.

And then Indian . . . We are not paternalistic, and don't use terms like "colonialism." We are going in the direction of saying: here, you decide. And you can hardly criticize that, can you? I think that is the solution.

The people of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan, cannot solve all of the problems of the Indian and Métis people. It has to be internal and there has to be co-operation between the government, all the citizens of this province, and the Indian and Métis people, and the leadership has to be there. And that's where I've already thrown out the challenge to you, and other leaders, is to use this leadership wisely.

I've recently read some of the treaty documents from 1874, the original treaty, and I was impressed with the wisdom of the Indians who signed those treaties. You may say they made a bad deal. But at the time — you have to

consider that we're talking with hindsight — at the time those Indian leaders who did not have a formal education, but they had a great deal of wisdom and they were trying to look after their people in the best way they felt possible, in the terms of 1874, and that's the treaty I was looking at in my area of the province, southern Saskatchewan.

And yes, they did not take into account inflation and things of that nature. But I'm sure you will appreciate that federal government spending has taken into account inflation. And when we're talking now of a total sum of, I believe, the provincial government spending in Indian and Métis affairs, I believe it's \$375 million per year, we have taken into account inflation.

And your leaders of a hundred years ago did show great wisdom, and that's the kind of leadership you need now. When you combine the education that your leaders have now, with the wisdom that their ancestors had, we can solve most of these problems. I'm not saying it would be easy. I'm not saying it will be done immediately, but if we go on to a settlement, a solution mode rather than a confrontation mode, I think these problems can be solved.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, over 10 years ago, 1976 if my memory serves me correct, the province entered into an agreement with natives, the Saskatchewan federation of Indians, to be precise, to settle Indian land claims.

That agreement should have been unnecessary. The Queen, in the right of Canada, had entered into an agreement with them about a hundred years before that, which has never been honoured. Nevertheless, passage of . . . there had been a century pass, the province entered into an agreement with the FSI (Federation of Saskatchewan Indians), which provided a formula for the settlement of land claims, established the broad terms in the number of acres that they were entitled to. Then the process was to begin in settling those land claims.

I think I'm correct in saying, Mr. Minister, that since you've taken office in 1982 not a single land claim has been settled. I wonder, Mr. Minister, how it is that your government can justify to itself ignoring a contractual and legal obligation to native people which plainly seems to be what they're doing?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We were making some progress on treaty entitlements, and I have to correct you there. There have been settlements since our government took over. Fond du Lac was settled, at which time they received more land than the 1976 formula that your government agreed to had implemented. So Fond du Lac was settled actually for more acres than that formula would indicate.

I was at the Star Blanket Indian reserve, No. 83A. Now No. 83 is in my constituency, and so is 83A. The Star Blanket band, or the Star band, received the residential school which they took as a selection in Fort Qu'Appelle. That was their choice, so they've received some further settlement there. I think they still have some entitlements coming to them, and that hasn't been satisfied in full.

We are working on . . . we are fairly close on two other bands right now, Lucky Man and Canoe Lake — just a few technical problems, and I think those can be settled. You've heard, I've given a commitment that I have no patience for dilly-dallying with this problem that has gone on for years and years, and I would like to get them settled as fast as possible. And as we get into further discussions with the treaty Indian bands on the follow-up of where we go from here after the constitutional conference, we are dealing with three main areas with them — treaty land entitlement, Indian self-determination and self-government, and economic development. And those are somewhat tied together.

But the 1976 formula is a good guide-line, but I've been trying to convince the bands not to insist on exact acres because in many cases they have not chosen land that is of great economic value. And I know it is of significance to them. They indicate that that particular piece of land is of historical significance, but they have not taken or chosen pieces of land that are of great economic value. And in some cases they would be better to take less land in acres of more value — of more economic value. Rather than insist on the specific number of acres, they should look at the quality.

Mr. Shillington: — I take it though, Mr. Minister, that the '76 agreement you regard as binding on the government, and it's your intention to settle these, reasonably speaking, and as quickly as possible. Is that what I understand to be your position?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We haven't really checked on to what extent it would be binding on the government. We are proceeding with the 1976 formula as a guide-line, then working out an individual agreement with each band. And if the band is satisfied, then there's the settlement. And if they're not satisfied, we continue the negotiations.

And in some cases where there seems to be a legal dispute, the band takes legal action. And I won't go into the details of the Lac La Ronge situation. As far as we're concerned there, they have been settled; but they have a dispute with the federal government as to whether they're entitled to more land or not. And your colleagues would know probably as much about it as I do; they act for that band.

(1630)

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the sympathy with native land claims which you feign isn't shared by the Premier. He seems a bit more honest. I want to quote, for your benefit, an article done by Earl Fowler of the *Star-Phoenix* on May 12, 1987 referring to the agreement:

Premier Grant Devine, who declined an invitation to address an assembly taking place at that time, said in an interview he does not regard the agreement as binding. Devine said land claims could be best settled through flexible negotiations. He said the province is willing to provide assistance in resource and economic development.

The Premier indicates he doesn't regard the agreement as binding at all. Instead he's offering them something as vague and indefinite as resource and economic development.

Mr. Minister, the Indian land claims in this province has totally and completely stalled. If you were honest, you'd admit it. Your government has neither the will nor the desire to deal with this problem. Indians are considering legal suit, Mr. Minister. Your government has just done nothing on the subject. If you have some sympathy for it, which I may say you haven't been very vocal in expressing, if you have some sympathy for it, the Premier clearly does not.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, that whatever you say, you haven't any intention of honouring these agreements. You know that, Indians know that, and that's why they're considering legal action against the province. You've done nothing, Mr. Minister, apart from the settlement of Fond du Lac, which represents a minuscule portion of this problem. And the rest of it, Mr. Minister, as you well know, has totally and completely stalled.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out to the member opposite that his party was elected in 1944, and that wasn't long after 1930 when the province received its resources and the obligation to make available unoccupied Crown land in treaty settlement.

The position of our government is that we do owe the Indians' various bands land in accordance with the law and the resources agreement of 1930, and that we will pay to the Indians every acre of land that we owe them, or if they wish to take something else in lieu of land, if they wish to take something of economic value that will give them a lasting income, we are prepared to be flexible about it. We will not hold them to land that they have chosen which may not necessarily be of much economic value. And if they're prepared to take some other form of compensation, we are prepared to consider it.

But I take the position very clearly, it is not a matter of sympathy. I would not give land to anyone out of sympathy. This is a question that we, in law, and morally, owe the land that was agreed to in the treaties. Now it's to be negotiated and worked out as to how it's to be delivered.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the fact is though that you're going nowhere with these claims. Frustration has reached the point where it's boiling over, and they are considering . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's one thing I find so charming about the member from Weyburn, every line is a new one — every line is a new one.

Mr. Minister, the process has stalled. You have neither the will nor the intention to do anything with these land claims. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can point to any accomplishments at all in this area?

Mr. Minister, you say you don't regard the 1976 agreement as binding; I'd be interested in knowing the

basis for that. That was an agreement which was entered into by the Queen and the right of Saskatchewan. It was regarded as binding by her representatives, and it was regarded at that point as a binding contract by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. On what basis, Mr. Minister, do you now tear up the agreement and say it's not binding — instead you offer it as economic development?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well whether the agreement is binding or not is really a moot point, because if we can reach settlement with the bands, and if they're satisfied, and if they may believe it's a better deal than us following strictly what might be the letter of the law, surely we can settle for what we think is fair and what the bands agree is fair, rather than the letter of the law. And the question then arises, you know, was your decision in 1976 a wise decision? That is the question: was it a wise decision?

But we are making considerable progress. I've indicated . . . To my knowledge, in the 10 years prior to your defeat, your government settled one land claim. I've already indicated to you that Fond du Lac was settled; the Star Blanket reserve made progress; Lucky Man band is very close to being settled—and I say very close, as that the land has been set aside, everything has been done except there is a dispute over the one technical point. The band will be meeting soon to decide whether they will accept the settlement or not, and they will have a meeting and a vote and decide. So that one is to the voting stage where the band has to decide now if they're going to make the final settlement or not.

In addition, the Piapot band received a section of land out of the Lebret Métis farm towards their settlement. Flying Dust is very close to being settled. Peter Ballantyne is making progress. We are constantly working on this situation. I would like to move faster on it but, as I've indicated earlier, there are forces working against settlement. And we will move as fast as possible with the commitment that the Indians have, that they know they have — that there is no need for them to get involved in five- to eight-year legal battles. It would be simpler to spend a year or two in negotiation, and we will settle with them, and it won't be necessary to tie the matter up in the courts for five to eight years.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, if the natives, the Indians agreed that you were offering them a better deal and you agreed, that would be one thing; you'd then have a new agreement superseding the old. But they don't agree. They recognize the obvious, Mr. Minister, that economic development is too vague to mean anything at all. An acre of land is an acre of land. A promise of economic development in the future, they know full well what that is — it's hot air.

I want to quote for you, Mr. Minister, Chief Crowe's reaction to this better deal of yours:

Devine said land claims could be best settled through flexible negotiations. He said the province is willing to offer assistance in resource and economic development. This position is unacceptable to Chief Roland Crowe, head of the

Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, who Monday accused the wildlife federation and some native politicians about spreading false information.

Mr. Minister, this new and better deal is not satisfactory. They know full well it will never amount to the price of a bottle of milk. You'll do nothing except promise economic development which won't happen. A promise of 1 million acres of land is something definite. A promise of economic development is nothing at all. They'll never get it, and they know it.

Mr. Minister, I ask you again, how you can pretend to tear up an agreement entered into in good faith by the province's representatives and by the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations)?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, I think time will be the test. This government has another four and a half years, or at least four years in office, and we will see how progress is made over those four years.

The members of the opposition will spend those four years trying to frustrate settlement of treaty claims, and this government will spend the four years trying to accomplish something in the settlement of the claims. And should there not be too much political interference from the NDP party, I expect progress will be made in those four years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I would like to remind the minister that we are the ones that are posing the question as to when he will be resolving these outstanding land claims issues, and also the economic development questions.

I would like to look at the issue, Mr. Minister, in regards to the health question. The treaty people when they move off the reserve, sometimes have a problem in getting help from both the federal and provincial levels, because basically, because there's always talk about the jurisdictional problem and the one-year deal, you know, that has been made.

Are you moving towards a more specific type agreement which will at least provide temporary assistance? Whether it comes provincially or federally is beside the point. But are you working towards a specific mechanism that will resolve this question? Because many people are left there, you know, with health issues or social welfare issues that are . . . their problems are not being resolved. What type of negotiations are you doing at the present time to resolve this so-called jurisdictional hassle?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I met with the federal minister yesterday afternoon, and meetings of that nature go a long way to resolving some of the jurisdictional hassles, as the member calls them.

There are two key things happening right now. First of all, the federal government does not have to have any kind of treaty amendment in order to deal with the Indian tribes of Canada on resolving matters of self-government with respect to issues between the federal government and the

individual band. There is no need for any constitutional amendment on that. They can simply go out and go to work on it, and that's what they're doing. And as I've given you an example, they're doing that already in the first band, the Ochapowace band.

Now the province has certain jurisdictions, and we have given a commitment to Chief Crowe that the province will work out the details of how we will go about co-operating. But the province will co-operate in our jurisdiction.

For example, we are working right now on child care agreements because the province has jurisdiction over adoption, over children in general. We are working on agreements so that the bands can then take over the administration of child care, rather than have our Social Services officials go onto Indian reserves and deal with the children on the reserves. So we will give the bands the responsibility, and the federal government is co-operating with respect to the necessary money involved. So we are just about there with some agreements on child care with some bands.

We will co-operate with respect to our jurisdiction, and we have formed a government committee to negotiate with Chief Crowe and his chiefs. It is composed of myself as chairperson and members of the government, so that they are dealing directly with the political people in charge. The negotiations are directly from the provincial point of view, that the minister, the elected members of the government and the chiefs and the bureaucrats will work out the details. But they've finally got themselves where we're sitting at the same table face to face — the leaders of the Indian people and the leaders of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Goulet: — Just a question in regards to an economic development issue, again, Mr. Minister. At the opening of the legislature this past year, at the throne speech, there was talk about a five-year plan on tourism — you know, a \$60 million plan. And you talked quite a bit about your intentions to involve Indian-Métis people in economic development.

(1645)

On a specific area like tourism, what have you done? What has your division done so far in regards to making headway into the tourism grant on dealing with Indian and Métis entrepreneurs? Have you done anything in this situation so far?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, the question is rather broad. I'll try to answer it as best possible. Specifics of tourism, of course, are the responsibility of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. There is a federal-provincial agreement on tourism where federal-provincial money is available to assist in the development of four-season resorts.

Some of the bands have made application for economic development money from the province of Saskatchewan and from the federal Department of Indian Affairs, and are in a position to access some of that money if they go ahead with their projects. I can't tell you exactly how far

their projects are down the road, but that money is available to all people.

But there is that \$375 million Indian economic development fund that the federal government has got, plus the tourism joint fund and the provincial economic development money. And they can access it in the same, or maybe even more so, than all other elements of society.

Mr. Goulet: — I want to get back on to the issue of land entitlement. And recently I read in the paper about the land entitlement claim that goes to Treaty 4, and I heard you mention, you know, the fact that it was signed in 1874, and so on.

Now there is this outstanding land entitlement at Fort Qu'Appelle. And I was wondering what you are doing to resolve this specific case in the light of the statements that you've made previously in regards to land entitlement.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The situation where the district chiefs of Treaty 4 are, I guess it's planning to take legal action. They haven't started yet. The legal action that they have announced they're planning on taking would be, I don't know . . . the report I heard would be asking for about one-half of Fort Qu'Appelle or \$60 million, is not really within the jurisdiction of this department.

I know you hear a lot about jurisdiction. Everybody passes the buck and says it's not my jurisdiction — but it's not. It is not a recognized land claim. It is a dispute between the federal government and the treaty Indians of Treaty No. 4, and is not a part of the provincial land claim situation where the province has to provide that land.

And you know, in the land claim situation, that land claims have to be established and proven and accepted before they are an actual land claim. That is a potential claim, but is not part of the province's responsibility; has some different circumstances surrounding it, outside of the usual land claims type situation.

Mr. Goulet: — But, Mr. Minister, because of the land transfers agreement of 1930, the land would have been transferred to the province, and of course there would also be the problem of municipal lands, you know, which I recognize. But I would imagine that although it is a specific dispute between the federal government and the Treaty 4 band, that there would still require decision making, especially in regards to the land question; especially also, how it relates to 1930 land transfers agreement. It would still involve you at some point in the future, is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well as we lawyers say, without admitting liability, I suppose at worst we could owe another 1,300 acres at some stage, but certainly the province would not have to ante up half of the town of Fort Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Goulet: — I would like to go back to the fact that when I look at the estimates, the staff cut-back has been from 32 to 25 positions — that there's been a cut-back of seven positions on page 55 of the estimates.

I would like to know, Mr. Minister, how many people

were transferred; how many people are indeed working in native affairs secretariat.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — At present we show 24 and a half, and that's not a half a person, but you realize there are some part-time jobs. So the total number would total up to 24 and a half.

Mr. Goulet: — Okay, there is a loss of seven staff. I am wondering how many of those positions are people of Indian ancestry.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I don't know if I have the information, but I didn't follow the question. Are you talking about how many of the ones that left were of Indian ancestry, or how many of those that remain are of Indian ancestry?

Mr. Goulet: — I'm talking about how many Indian-Métis people do you have working presently of that 24 and a half figure that you've got?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We're trying to count up for you. I'll take notice of that and then try to answer it for you right after we have dinner.

Mr. Goulet: — Could you also, Mr. Minister, provide me with more information in regards to the division? There was 32 staff last year. How many of them were of Indian and Métis ancestry?

And the first question I asked is: of the existing staff today, how many of them are of Indian and Métis ancestry?

The third question, Mr. Minister, is: how many Indian and Métis people do you have in the management positions — last year and also this year?

I would like to know a more specific question, you know, before the clock runs out for this part. Who was the person that was working for land claims?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, last year we had Marian Dinwoodie, Bill Calder, and Doug Drummond working on land claims. We'll try to get the information right after dinner on who's working on things right now.

The committee reported progress.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, if I might ask for leave to revert back to government motions at 7 o'clock to deal with item no. 1, Mr. Berntson, respecting the Ombudsman.

Leave granted.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.