

Eastview

The Assembly met at 9:30 a.m.

Prayers

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, with leave I would ask to proceed to move first reading of An Act respecting By-elections in the Constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting By-elections in the Constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of An Act respecting By-elections in the Constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill ordered to be read a second time later this day.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting By-elections in the constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act respecting By-elections.

Mr. Romanow: — Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Premier and the government and the members opposite for expediting the passage of this legislation so that the two members can take their places. I think that's in the spirit, obviously, of what the democratic decision was in Eastview and in Elphinstone.

As well I'd like to thank the Chief Justice, the Administrator, in the absence of Lieutenant Governor, and all of the members of the Assembly, and you, sir, particularly for agreeing to start the House at 9:30 this morning in order to facilitate this. Thank you very much, sir.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the By-elections in the Constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview

Clause 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting By-elections in the constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — With leave, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill be now read a third time.

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

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 9:45 His Honour the Administrator entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting By-elections in the Constituencies of Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview.

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 9:47 a.m.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you, Mr. Dwain Lingenfelter, member for the constituency of Regina Elphinstone, who has taken the oath and signed the roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

Mr. Speaker: — Let the hon. member take his seat.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you, Mr. Bob Pringle, member for the constituency of Saskatoon Eastview, who has taken the oath and signed the roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

Mr. Speaker: — Let the hon. member take his seat.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, some distinguished visitors from my riding this morning: Mr. John Schock, the reeve of the R.M. of Maple Creek, and two councillors, Jack McDougald and Calvin Siegle, drove to Regina to meet with a number of ministers.

I welcome you to the Assembly. I'm sure you have enjoyed the proceedings so far. This is not routine. It's probably an historic occasion for the party opposite, but I do welcome you to Regina and wish you a safe trip home, and I trust you will have found the meetings this morning fruitful. I'd ask all members to please welcome these guests.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sauder: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the other members of the Assembly, a group of students from my constituency from the town of Arborfield. There are 16 grade 9 students. They're accompanied today by their teacher, Mr. Delmer Friesen; chaperons, Mrs. Emily Penman, Mr. Bruce Smith, Mr. John Thesen, Mrs. Gerald Schroepfer, and I believe there's maybe some others with them that their names didn't get on here.

I would just hope that they will have an interesting and enjoyable time here watching the proceedings of the Assembly this morning. I would just ask all members to help me welcome them here to Regina.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the ceremony which we had today in the passage of the legislation, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce the family members of the two new members. They obviously wish to share on this very momentous and important occasion, as I believe our Clerk described it in the swearing in service in his office.

First of all, from Dwain Lingenfelter's family, if I may be permitted to break the rules this one occasion, the member from Regina Elphinstone. Dwain's children are with him, at least two of them are, Sacha, daughter in the east gallery; and Mathew, son. Are you there? If you could just stand. Yes.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Dwain's wife, Marie, and Travis are on the farm seeding, so it's a question of necessity both ways.

With respect to Mr. Pringle's family, Bob Pringle, the member from Eastview, I'll introduce all of them and just have them stand at the end to speed . . . I should say also a special word of mention to a number of people from Elphinstone new Democratic Party Association who helped Dwain, too numerous to mention, but are present as well.

With respect to the Pringle family, Mr. Speaker, present today are Bob's wife Gwen, his sons Darren and Dean; Bob's parents, Doug and Norma Duncombe from Carnduff; Gwen's mother, Beatrice Gordon; Bob's aunt, Kay McLean; Gwen's brother, Neil Gordon, and his friend Pam Kreis. If the would please just stand so that they could be recognized by the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — On behalf of all the members of the House, I welcome these family members, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for permitting me to do so.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, some guests seated in your gallery this morning, Mr. Speaker. We have with us 13 adult students from the Moose Jaw Job Development

Program. They're here this morning, accompanied by their instructor, Paula Green, who I note has with her the youngest observer in the galleries today; as well, counsellor Doreen Meadows, and program co-ordinator Bev Wenzel.

Following question period today, Mr. Speaker, these students and their chaperons will be taking a tour of the Assembly. I'll be meeting with them at 11 o'clock for pictures and drinks and to discuss the observations that they've made this morning.

I would ask all members to join me in welcoming these guests to the Assembly today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

University Hospital Cardiology Department

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of health and it deals with the cardiology department at the University Hospital.

Mr. Minister, I have a letter here from Dr. Lopez, the head of the cardiology department at the University Hospital. It's a letter that was written to *Univoice*, the University Hospital publication. And Dr. Lopez says in that letter that, without any doubt, the most poorly equipped cardiac department of any academic hospital in Canada is that of the University Hospital. He goes on to say:

In certain areas we lack the minimum requirements to practise medicine at a standard comparable to other university hospitals in this country.

Mr. Minister, will you now admit that your cut-backs are crippling Saskatchewan health care, and will you please tell us what you're going to do to correct the situation at the cardiology department in Saskatoon?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, while I won't take at face value what the member says because we learned some time ago not to do that, but first of all . . . and the second thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the cardiology department at the . . . or this particular doctor that the member refers to has written this letter, as she says, to the university publication.

They will say, many doctors in many of the units working across this country will say that they need better equipment, that they need more equipment, that as technology moves more quickly than medical schools or than governments are able to respond, that they won't have the kind of equipment that they believe that they need, as quickly as they feel that they should have it.

I will acknowledge that. I know that that's the case. But I will also say that we are working very hard, as is the University Hospital, and as is the College of Medicine in Saskatoon, to be sure that the proper equipment is there to train the people in the specialties that are necessary to be

trained in here in the province, and cardiology is certainly one of those.

Ms. Simard: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, one would think that the by-elections in Regina Elphinstone and Saskatoon Eastview would show you that you should take at face value what we say on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — The Saskatchewan Health Research Board has expressed to you in writing their grave concern about your lack of funding. Over 100,000 signatures were tabled in this legislature respecting your health care cut-backs and people who oppose your cut-backs. Now, Mr. Minister, when are you going to start listening?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, we've been over this ground several times, as you will know, in the House. The increases in health care funding have gone up in a percentage term about 68 per cent. Mr. Speaker — 68 per cent increases in health care funding. Health care funding has gone up in this year's budget over last. Health care funding in this province now is one-third of every government dollar that's spent in spent in the health care field — \$1.2 billion, Mr. Speaker.

The member will raise this particular issue today, and another one on another day, and try to pick out one spot in a very large and very complex system. It is that, Mr. Speaker. No one in this House, no thinking person in this House or outside of this House will suggest that the health care system is not very large and is not very complex.

Mr. Speaker, many people in that system, people in this Department of health, people in this government, are working extremely hard to be sure that the dollars that are spent, the very substantial dollars that are spent in health care, are spent as effectively as possible — a major challenge for all of us, all of us, I say, all of us who are elected to responsible positions. And we're working very hard at that and that will continue, Mr. Speaker. You have my assurance.

Pricing Structure for Sale of Canned Beer in Hotels

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for The Liquor Licensing Act, and it deals with some very serious concerns that have been expressed by rural hotels across Saskatchewan. You will know, Mr. Minister, that all across this province the hotel industry is experiencing some difficult times, and this is especially true in smaller rural hotels. And they're especially concerned about the changes you're considering but have refused to announce.

Mr. Minister, can you tell us what the pricing structure will be for canned beer sold through hotels? Can you tell us that today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member

opposite that I've had ongoing consultations and discussions with the hotel association. We have not come to a final decision as to the price of canned beer, but I can assure the member and the people in the Hotel industry that those consultations will continue, and as soon as a price is arrived at, I would be more than pleased to share it with the member and the people of the province.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Supplementary, same minister. Mr. Minister, the hoteliers appreciate the possibility of a competitive wholesale price on canned beer, and they haven't had any clear answers from you, and they want some answers to these questions, Mr. Minister. Will you be allowing open pricing for canned beer in the same way that bottled beer is presently sold? I think you have a responsibility to answer these questions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems rather strange that the people who were against canned beer seem now to be on the side of canned beer.

Certainly I can indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have not made a decision yet as to the price of canned beer. I've said that previously. I have been in consultation with the hotels association as late as last week, and there will be more consultations with them, and I'm sure we will work out a price that is acceptable and that will have the interest of the hoteliers and the consuming public both looked after in the not too distant future.

Mr. Lautermilch: — New question, same minister. Mr. Minister, first of all, let me point out that the members on this side have not been opposed to canned beer, as you've indicated.

I want to say, Mr. Minister, that hoteliers have expressed concerns that the liquor consumption tax is becoming a burden to their businesses, and I'd like to know if you have any plans to move this tax from the retail price to the price that hoteliers pay for their beer and their liquor.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, again we hear some strange things; certainly the NDP were on record opposing canned beer, but it looks like they've changed their position.

Secondly, I'd like to indicate to the member — and he may not be aware of it — that the liquor consumption tax was imposed by the NDP government when they were in power.

And thirdly, we are not looking at changing that tax at this time.

Increased in Tuition Fees at the University of Saskatchewan

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, and it deals with this government's chronic underfunding of education, particularly the universities.

Mr. Premier, as a consequence of the persistent underfunding of education in this province, the University of Saskatchewan has been forced to depend

more and more on tuition fee increases placed on the backs of the students. You will know, sir, that the university has now been forced to resort to a tuition fee increase of 8 per cent for this coming year and a further increase of an additional 5 per cent for the following year. And that will only mean, sir, a heavier burden placed on the students.

Now in Wednesday's by-election, sir, the students of Saskatchewan and the educators overwhelmingly rejected your cut-backs to education. So will you reconsider, will you reconsider your budget cut-backs so that the U. of S. students will not have to bear the brunt of your misplaced priorities?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we know in both by-elections that approximately 40 per cent of the people didn't vote at all, and I understand in Eastview that most of the students didn't vote, and a very low turn-out with respect to young people, so you couldn't say that at all with respect to the

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, order I think when the Premier rises to respond, he should be given some opportunity to do so.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I just responded to his observation with respect to students voting in Eastview or in Elphinstone. I just reiterated the point that there was a very low turn-out, and the probability of a lot of students voting was just simply not there.

Secondly, the student union, I'm sure he knows, at the university thought that the tuition increase was reasonable. In fact they said they expected a much higher increase.

Third, I would say to the hon. member that the increased funding for universities, and the increased funding generally with respect to education, has certainly had Saskatchewan ranking with other western Canadian universities any place that you'd want to find across western Canada.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, it's alibi after alibi, but you've really now got two messages. The first message was the faculty and administrative dispute which was caused by your underfunding. And now the second one was the student and the faculty and the people of Saskatoon Eastview voting against you in this by-election.

The facts are plain and clear to see. Ten per cent student fee increase in the last two years; 8 per cent for the coming year; 5 per cent for the year after. Your underfunding is hurting the universities and it's hurting the students. In this by-election they tried to send you that message once again, Mr. Minister. Have you heard it? Will you now stop your cut-backs to education which are hurting the students of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the average student

pays about 15 per cent of the education cost, and the government pays about 84 or 85 per cent of that cost. and when you say that it's cut, you obviously are not aware of the fact that we have increased the expenditures dramatically. The only way that you can find any reduction is on a per-student basis, because the number of students has increased dramatically. But the expenditure are up and we're covering about 85 per cent of the expenditure for a university student. They cover about 15 per cent.

I'd also say, Mr. Chairman, the public probably does not know that the average full professor would run 62 to \$65,000 a year in salary. And I know that about 50 per cent of the professors on campus are full professors. And being a tenured faculty member there, I can attest to the fact that a young faculty member coming in would receive something in the neighbourhood of 30 to \$34,000.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to the rejuvenation of the University of Saskatchewan with the funds that we're providing and additional funds, a new agriculture facility, and a new administration building, the new geological sciences building, additions to hospitals and health care. All of those things will make a difference in the long run, as well as the increases we've provided for students now so we can cover up to 85 per cent of the costs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Transportation of RTM Houses to Northern Saskatchewan

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I direct my question to the minister responsible for Sask Housing. Mr. Minister, I understand that the government has approved a plan by the federal government CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) to move as many as 30 houses from Calgary to northern communities, including Ile-a-la-Crosse, a distance of approximately 600 miles.

By way of information, Mr. Minister, these are RTM (ready to move) houses completely built and ready to move. You will know, Mr. Minister, that there is a housing shortage in the North. Far more serious however is the shortage of jobs. In Beauval I am told that the houses will cost \$75,000. We have contractors up North who are capable of constructing these houses and need the jobs.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: how can you justify such an expensive plan? Would you and your federal government and CMHC agree to build the same number of houses in northern communities using local materials, local contractors, and creating local jobs? would you consider that, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I suppose in response to the member, I can tell him that the unemployment figures were released today and we find Saskatchewan second in the country again. So I would suspect that

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — I would suspect that our government is doing a reasonably good job in job creation, Mr. Speaker. Not only that, for northern jobs our uranium mines are open and they have a lot of jobs up there that are, in fact, keeping the people of the North occupied.

As far as it relates to the question of the Olympic trailers, that is a federal program, Mr. Speaker. Our government has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Thompson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister talks about the figures that come out today, but I'll tell you he's not including the region of northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, your political speeches and . . . supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Your speeches about the past don't address the problem. The issue is northern housing today and northern jobs today. The issue, Mr. Minister, is the future.

Will you agree that it would make far more sense both socially and economically for northern housing to be built in the North by northern residents instead of buying them in Calgary and moving them hundreds of miles up to northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — By way of information, Mr. Minister, the winners will be ATCO corporation and the movers, and the losers are going to be northern Saskatchewan residents.

Mr. Minister, your plan makes no sense. Will you reconsider that plan now?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I explained to the member that the movement of those trailers going in there, or the accommodation, is a federal policy. And it's a federal area and they're doing it. We as provincial government have nothing to do with it.

So in response to his second concern about employment in the North, you bet we're concerned about employment in the North.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Would you please allow the member to continue. Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems that, you know the few questions that I receive in this Assembly, I have a lot of noise coming from the opposition ranks all the time, and I don't know why. I appreciate you bringing them to order.

But in event, we are concerned with employment in the North. And if you would pay some attention, and your seat mate beside you knows that, we have more exploration going on in mining in the North right now than has ever occurred in this province. Gold mines are opening — all kinds of mining activity and exploration

going on up there that in fact the member and the member beside you employment for their people in the North.

Of course we're concerned. We always will be. And we do something about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The question I asked the minister was on housing. He is turning to exploration. And just to respond to that, you're spending one-tenth of the money that we spent on exploration when we were in government. I tell you that, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, today in Saskatchewan the unemployment rate is already far too high, and in northern Saskatchewan it is triple to what it is in the South. And in the North, as you know, there is a job crisis. I realize that your government policy is open for big business, but in case, wouldn't it be better to be open for Saskatchewan people?

Mr. Minister, northern people need housing and they need jobs. You have a responsibility to address those needs. Will you use your . . . My question is to you: will you use your good office to reverse the CMHC plan and have Saskatchewan Housing Build the 30 houses along with Saskatchewan Housing in northern Saskatchewan? I ask you again: and will you use your good offices and make sure that northern contractors and northern residents have an opportunity to build those homes?

Some Hon. Members:— Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, we have a federal-provincial housing agreement, and in that agreement the federal government has agreed to supply the housing in the North, which they are doing, and this is part of their program.

Getting back to what the member said — and we're speaking now about mining — he indicated that their prior administration, the NDP government, spent 10 times as much as this government on exploration and job creation in the north. And yet, that's the difference between them and us, Mr. Speaker. We have \$50 million, \$50 million of private sector money going into the North on exploration, creating the jobs; we don't have to do it at government expense. And that's the difference between them and us.

Computer Card System for Paying Prescription Drug Bills

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. The minister will know that he and this government have repeatedly put themselves into trouble with ad hoc changes to our health care system, one prime example, of course, being the changes with respect to the prescription drug plan.

During the recent by-elections, and in the last panic

moments of those by-elections, the minister announced a credit card system for paying prescription drug bills. Mr. Minister, to demonstrate that this idea has been given some thought and is not just a by-election quick-fix or gimmick, will you today give us a clear and specific description of how this scheme is actually going to work?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — A couple of things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, when I announced, I believe it was a week ago now, the work that's going on inside the department and outside the department in terms of negotiations with supplier companies who deal in computer-readable cards in various other sectors, and how that might be applied to the health care sector and the administration side of the health care sector, the reason I announced it then was because we were at the stage of going out to these supplier, companies, and because last week during that very week I had been speaking to the pharmacist's association about some of the potentials it might hold as it relates to the administration of the drug plan.

If the hon. member makes a suggestion it had something to do with the by-election, I would just say this much to him: he's been around politics for quite some time, I've been around for quite some time, and if I was to do that as it related to the by-election, Mr. Speaker, I assure you and all of those members, I would have done it well before two or three days ahead of the by-election, you can rest assured of that.

Mr. Speaker, what we're doing on this thing and these folks in opposition — and I guess it's the nature of opposition to be obsessed with a by-election here and there. And that's fair ball and do that. We must be in charge of and responsible for the administration of government over a longer period of time, and what I had announced to the public of Saskatchewan is what I will reiterate again today, is that ... just that, that we are looking at this. We believe we can have a system, a computer-readable card that will be applied to the administration of health care programs. It has many applications potentially.

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to know from the minister when all of this elaborate consultative work began? I'd like to know the details of how long the government has been working on this grand ideal? and if it has been working on this grand idea for such a long, long time, why is the government not in a position to provide greater detail at this point in time? And does the minister have any intention of referring this idea to the government's task force on health care, which was announced seven weeks ago and has yet to get off the ground.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, we've been working on this for over a year — the idea, the concept — for over a year. We will continue to, and when we have the technology in place ... and when the technology is in place, Mr. Speaker, we will come forward with the card and with the various applications that it is able to do for the administration of health care programs and for the people of Saskatchewan to make it much easier for them.

As it relates to the task force, the task force will be looking

at the wider application of health programs and the way in which they serve people. Some of this kind of technology or other applications of this technology may be something that they can look at.

But all I will say, Mr. Speaker, is we believe — and the people who have been consultants to the government, people in the department — believe that this new technology can be a leading edge and will be excellent programs for administration of health care in this province and indeed will be a leader for across this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hospital Care in la Ronge

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of health. My question relates to the hospital in La Ronge.

Many presentations have been made to you, Mr. Minister. The doctor recently, in *The Northerner*, stated that:

The children, the new-born babies have to share the facilities with the chronically ill, with people with infectious diseases.

We want to know from you, Mr. Minister, what are you going to do about the hospital? When are you going to start having compassion for people in northern Saskatchewan? When are you going to start working with the health question in northern Saskatchewan, and work with the community people from that area, and start moving on it immediately?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, an interesting question from that member, Mr. Speaker, representing the NDP benches, when you think of this hospital in La Ronge.

The people at the la Ronge hospital board, whom I have met with, know that the hospital in La Ronge will be built, and they know that the hospital in La Ronge will be built by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, think about La Ronge for a moment. When that administration was in power, that member from Cumberland House, that the members of the northern part would know that — what did they build in La Ronge?

Everyone in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, should have the opportunity — and I'm just very sorry that they don't — every person in Saskatchewan should have the opportunity to see the large government administration palace, Taj Mahal, that they built in La Ronge when requests were coming forward for a hospital, while they were making la Ronge the capital of the North, and all of that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, they did not build it. Mr. Speaker, I have said to the people in La Ronge, this administration will be building their hospital, and they are on the list to be built. Mr. Speaker, there will be a hospital in La Ronge based on

the needs and based on the increasing activity, which we've heard some more about here today, and based on the increasing population in that area.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Minister, the people in northern Saskatchewan recognize that the hospital . . . the planning budget was there when the NDP was there, 1982.

The people — this is a new question, Mr. Speaker — the people want some action in northern Saskatchewan in relation — we have heard six years of your excuses, your plastic promises and excuses. We want to know . . . we want to see real action in northern Saskatchewan, that people are demanding real action. When are you going to start meeting with them right there in northern Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the former government even had their members, even had their candidates and members believing there was . . . planning had taken place for the La Ronge hospital.

Mr. Speaker, there was no planning that had taken place for La Ronge Hospital, none. so it's absolutely a falsehood that he said; there was no planning for La Ronge hospital. Any planning that has been done for the La Ronge hospital has been done under this new administration. This administration did the planning and is involved in the planning for the La Ronge hospital. Those folks have never been

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I'll give the minister a few moments to wrap up, and I think this would be a fitting end to question period today.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Let me wrap up by way of a comparison for those people who live in southern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They say that the La Ronge Hospital was to be built by them. I say that they built a Taj Mahal in a government administration building.

The said that they were concerned about rehabilitative services in Saskatchewan. They built the T.C. Douglas Building in Regina; we're building the Wascana Hospital in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Public Service Commission Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 33

Mr. Chairman: — I'd ask the minister to please introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the officials from the Public Service Commission her this morning: at my right is John McPhail who is the chairman; behind Mr. McPhail is Mr. Jim Graham, acting executive director, employment services; and directly behind me is Jane Eibner, director, administration information services. For the members of the House, minister responsible for Public Service Commission is Mr. Hepworth. He is . . . sorry, the Minister of Education. He is, unfortunately, not present today and so I will undertake to do his estimates for him.

Item 1

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'd like to make a few opening remarks, and there's some standard questions I'll get into, but I guess if there's any one thing that concerns me about the Public Service Commission and public servant, civil servant, in the province of Saskatchewan, it's the question of morale. Morale has been low for a number of years. It has been since 1982 for a number of reasons, and we need not go into all the details, but it's a serious problem in so far as low morale begins to affect performance, begins to affect the ability of civil servants to provide the kinds o services that Saskatchewan people need and demand.

I think that it's fair to say, and even the minister of the Public Service Commission agreed last year, that morale had reached rock-bottom — rock-bottom because of the radical changes that you've made to the employment complement within the public service as a result of your government's decisions.

I would say at this time that there has been no improvement from the situation of last year. The morale problem that festered for a number of years, and as I've said, reached rock-bottom last year has simply not improved. I have a very strong sense from the civil servants that I've talked to that they are united, united in their hatred and dislike of your government, united in their hatred and dislike of the things that you've done to them.

I would like to ask you: what measures have been undertaken in the last year to improve the question of morale, and can you tell us why these measures have failed, and why there has been no substantial improvement?

I recognize, and I think it's generally recognized, even on your side of the house, that morale would have been low last year because of the many drastic and radical changes that you made. One would also expect there to have been some improvement in that morale, yet there's no one on this side of the House that senses any improvement in that morale.

I'm wondering what it is that you might have tried to improve the morale of public servants, and why it has failed, and also if you can tell us: what kinds of things do you have in your budget that suggest an improvement in the coming year? I wait for your response on that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, with regard to that

question, let me make a couple of observations. The government, and like any government, obviously values its employees and continues to provide a wide variety of learning and staff development opportunities for its employees.

We have offered triple the number of learning opportunities compared to the previous government. In 1987-88, 5,600 employees participated in 310 events involved in learning opportunities. In 1981-82 that was 1,700 employees in 108 events.

We have created a unit on organizational change in our staff development division to provide consulting service to departments on team building, reorganization, leadership services, and other topics of assistance and interest to employees. We continue to offer programs such as job rotation, career leaves, secondment, interchange Canada programs, educational leave, variable work hours, and related programs to provide flexibility, interest and new experience for our employees.

The commission has filed with the federal government a proposed deferred salary leave program which would be applicable to all employees and provide them with an opportunity to set a certain percentage of their wages aside over a five-year period so the employee can broaden their personal interests through education, travel, business interests while on authorized leave. Those are some of the types of programs relating to morale.

Now I know the hon. member was a former member of the public service, or worked for the public service of Saskatchewan. He became rather high profiled, involved in the time when he was bringing actions to court that he is familiar with. I think the hon. member, when he talks about morale, I would pose a question as well to him, that sometimes he plays rather fast and loose with that word as well.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I'm not sure what your question is, Mr. Minister, but you've listed a number of things that you say that you're doing to improve in the public service. For example, you say that you've tripled learning opportunities.

What I asked you is: how come none of these things seem to have worked? Why is it that your budget for these kinds of things — employee relations, staff development — in fact, staff development budget is less this year than it is last year. One would have thought, given the very low morale in the public service — and that's not something that I'm making up, that's not something I'm playing fast and loose with, Mr. Minister.

Your colleague, the Minister of Education, stood in this place last year during these estimates and conceded that there was a significant problem — that there was one. I'm asking you: why is it that the things that you say that you're doing haven't worked? Why have you reduced the budget for that? Why haven't you increased the budget for that? What new ideas do you have to improve on the terrible morale that we see in the public service today?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — A couple of observations to the question. Number one is, some of the departments, a growing number of departments, are in fact doing the work on staff development as opposed to it simply being done through and only through the Public Service Commission. A number of departments — I can speak of my own in fact in justice or in trade and development.

I think when you refer to the hon. member from Weyburn, clearly, last year was a difficult time for government. clearly, it was a difficult time where we had to contain the growth of expenditures, and nobody denies that.

We believe that the corner has been turned on that, and for the hon. member to suggest somehow that everybody in the government is unhappy, there's obviously 5,600 of those people who are participating in those staff development programs. I would suggest to the hon. member that all 56 of those people . . . 5,600 of those people are not unhappy with some of the new programs being offered to them.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think that you have a problem. I think, even more importantly, the people of Saskatchewan have a problem. If we have a Public Service Commission, we have public servants, civil servants, who are there to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people to deliver services and programs. And if those people delivering those services and programs are unhappy, have low morale, feel inhibited in doing their jobs, and otherwise are simply not able to respond to the challenges that are before them given the very serious situations that they're in, you haven't cut many programs, but you've cut staff in those programs.

You haven't been honest enough to simply say, we can't afford to deliver this service or program, so therefore we're going to cut it. No, you've cut out a number of civil servants, making it almost impossible to deliver those things. this is a problem not just for you but for all of the people of Saskatchewan. And I'm asking you: what extraordinary measures have you put into place to ensure that the morale will be improved in the coming year?

You talk about staff development and that some of this work is being done now in other departments. that was the same case last year, but the budget on that item has gone down. If there was a shift of some of that expenditure to a different department, that would have been shown in the blue book; it's not shown in the blue book.

So when you say some of it's being done within departments, that may well be the case; but that was also the case last year, yet you've cut the budget for this at a time that you should be increasing the budget for this to help improve the morale of civil servants in this province. Again I ask you: what are you planning to do?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I think I indicated to the hon. member that the new programs that are being pursued — in 1987-88, 52 per cent of those participating in seminars were in-scope employees. We have introduced a supervisory development program this year for in-scope employees, and that is as set out in the book by the Public Service Commission, *Staff Development Needs Analysis 1988-1989*. Perhaps the hon. member has seen this;

perhaps he has not seen this. It's perhaps worthy of him to look at it. And that's the type of programs that I can indicate to the hon. member that is being pursued by the Public Service Commission in this area.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, I just want to go back to your '86-87 annual report for the Public Service Commission. It says:

The main challenge for the Commission will be to assist departments to maintain high employee morale and productivity throughout the organization during a period of economic restraint.

Now you tell me, Mr. Minister, how cutting the budget for that helps to accomplish that?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicated to the hon. member, the *Staff Development Needs Analysis 1988-1989* is something that we are doing. I think that the hon. member, when he somehow suggests that there are not people working both in scope and out of scope in government that are not encouraged by their opportunities, I would suggest the hon. member is wrong.

Now I can speak for the two departments that I am responsible for, one being in the area of Trade and Investment. Small department, I grant you, but clearly the people there are very excited and interested in the new mandate and the new programs that they're looking at, and there's some good people working there.

In the area of Justice you have a couple of different things: you have a large department in the government where obviously some are somewhat satisfied with their lot and some are not. I suspect that maybe some of them that are not tend to be more involved in the labour negotiations presently going on between the Public Service Commission and the various unions, and perhaps at this point in time that can lead to some lack of morale perhaps more than anything else.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, you so typify this government. You so typify this government. This government is noted for saying one thing and doing another and always playing to a double standard. You say we're doing all these wonderful things, but the reality is that you have a significant problem. It's conceded in your annual reports. It's conceded by your colleague, the minister, yet the budget for that is cut, it's slashed, and you're spending less money in addressing the problem. Yet you say we're doing all these wonderful things.

And again, I think that's just so typical of your government that you've got this double standard about the wonderful things we're going to do, a double standard of: here's what the budget deficit's going to be, but in reality it's something entirely different — out by 200 per cent. That's your government, Mr. Minister.

Let me deal with one specific aspect of employee morale, and that is the question . . . that is the matter of public servants, civil servants, having the right in a democratic society to express their opinions — to express their opinions on political matters outside of the work place —

outside of the work place.

If there is any hallmark of this government — any hallmark of this government — it is the absolute climate of fear that you've instilled in civil servants in this province who, until 1982, believed that they had the right, the same as all Canadian citizens, to be able to express their political beliefs — to express those political beliefs the same as all Canadian citizens in a democratic society. The fear that is there is just simply horrendous.

One might have thought that that might have abated, but in knocking on doors and saying "Saskatoon Eastview" and running into civil servants, the question just keeps coming up time and time again from people who are employed by the public service of this province who are just absolutely afraid to venture any opinion. They make that very clear, that I am afraid to venture an opinion on anything political for fear of the consequences that it might have for me in the job place; and I recognize that I'm outside the job and I should have that right but I tell you, I am afraid.

(1045)

Mr. Minister, I think that that particular question, that particular matter, the question of democratic right, the government. And in that sense you're no different than Joe Stalin's communist Russia, no different at all — no different.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, in light of that problem — and for once be honest and recognize that it is a problem — in light of that problem I want to ask you: what specific steps and measures are you undertaking to tell civil servants and to make it clear to them that they have democratic rights and responsibilities the same as any other citizen in this province and in this country? What specific steps are you taking to address that problem?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member from Regina Victoria speaks in terms of Joseph Stalin. I think that I will leave that. I don't even think he believes that, Mr. Chairman, and we will leave that at that.

With regard to The Public Service Act, as the hon. member knows, that Act has not been changed in this province for some 40 years. Every employee of the government takes an oath of office.

If the hon. member is talking about political activity within the civil service, I think that if he wants to be fair, if he wants to talk about history, then I think he will acknowledge that there has been intense politics in the Saskatchewan bureaucracy for a long period of time.

I would suggest to the hon. member quite frankly and quite openly that he came to this province from Manitoba, a political activist. He became involved in the public service. I'm sure that he participated in politics both while his party was in office and when a new party was in office, or a new administration was in office. that's a reality.

And so I say only to the hon. member, the Act clearly states that the civil servant has clearly the right to participate in the political process. The only condition put on it is that he should not do that, or she should not do that during the time of work. And I think that's a valid rule.

That rule has been in place for some period of time. My suspicion is that rule will stay in place for some period of time. I don't think it's inconsistent with the rules that are used in other jurisdictions, and that process has gone on for some time.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Just a brief question. Can you perhaps elaborate for me how my coming from Manitoba has anything to do with this, how this is germane to the issue at hand here?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well the hon. member was . . . I only indicated to the hon. member that if you're going to stand there and be somewhat critical of political activity in the civil service, I ask you to look at yourself first. And can you honestly say that during your tenure in the public service of Saskatchewan you were devoid of politics during all the time that you were working in the public service? I simply pose that question to you to address in an honest way.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well that's not the question. I think those rights were there. People no longer feel they have those rights.

But again I want to ask you: how does my coming from Manitoba have anything to do with the issue at hand here?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I simply laid that out. I suppose it's got no difference. If you came from podunk Saskatchewan it would be the same rule.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I'm glad we've established that, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, you don't believe that Saskatchewan, at least when it comes to democratic rights, is anything like Joe Stalin's communist Russia; I don't believe that it's anything like Joe Stalin's communist Russia. but I tell you, when you knock on the doors in the cities and you run across civil servants, that comment is offered.

And I would commend to you some time knocking on doors to find out what it is that people are saying about your government so that you get a true appreciation of what your government is doing. You might not have lost two by-elections if you had been more in touch with people.

Mr. Minister, the Act has not changed, but I tell you that the perception of what rights I have has certainly changed — and that there's a great deal of fear out there about what rights I really have — that there's a great deal of fear out there.

And I'm wondering what it is that you're doing to ensure that public servants, civil servants know exactly what their rights are, where those rights begin an end, and to let them know that their government stands behind them

in exercising those rights regardless of what political persuasion they may happen to believe in.

What are you doing to address the problem? The Act hasn't changed, but I tell you the perception has changed very greatly. And I'm asking you: what are you doing to address that problem?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I can simply say that the rights are set out in The Public Service Act. As the hon. member know, rights come from the law. The law clearly state that employees can participate in politics to the same extent of any other residents of the same extent of any other residents of the province provided that the political activity do not take place during work hours and do not impair an employee's usefulness on the job.

That right is there; that right has been there for 40 years. And what people do outside the work place is up to them. When they are at the work place through, we, and any other government across this country, expect their political activities to be curtailed because their job is to work for the public and carry on accordingly.

I mean, if you want to get into the argument of and the question of the politicization, if you like, of the civil service. And I think every jurisdiction is different. I think if you looked at Great Britain as an example, the public service there would tend to be more of a long-standing type civil service and move from one administration to another administration much easier than perhaps we see in Canada.

And I think then, within Canada, perhaps you see a difference in the civil service, perhaps in the larger jurisdictions, let's say compared to the smaller jurisdictions. and I think that's a reality. I think we both know that quite well. I think that you are likely to see some movement in — Manitoba is a good example, where there's going to be some changes there. I don't think anybody would deny that many of the senior people in Manitoba, whether one would say had political connections, certainly they had philosophical connections with the direction of government. Another government comes in and perhaps has a different philosophical approach, a different political approach to things, and you're going to see changes in that. I mean, that's a reality. And I suppose governments will continue to struggle with it, the balance between a purely professional civil service and some that are politically active.

You have many in the civil service that really do not take a political position one way or the other. There are what we would call the purists within the civil service. And I suspect if you talk to them they . . . many of them would express the view that while the right is there, you can have it in two ways. There's two counter-forces if you like. One being the fact that those that become very politically active and very strident politically reactive have an effect upon the larger body of public servants that wish not to take a political view, one side or the other. so I think that the hon. member would acknowledge that various civil servants take a different approach to that particular question.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think you're being far too modest when you talk about make some changes in Saskatchewan. I don't think that there's any government anywhere that could take a back seat to the kind of drastic changes and the kind of misery that you wrought on people in this province, all in the name of politics, Mr. Minister. I would say that your government should not take a back seat to any government anywhere when it comes to that.

You're the ones that have totally politicized this public service. You're the ones that made massive, just massive, changes following 1982, and I don't think there's anyone that's going to take a back seat to what you've done, Mr. Minister.

But I deduce from comments today that you simply have no interest in highlighting the question of just what the rights of civil servants might be, all civil servants, to participate in political activity to express their democratic beliefs and to act in a democratic manner that's consistent with the legislation that's in place and consistent with traditions in this country. I deduce from your remarks that you're simply not going to do anything. You're simply going to be content to stand in your place and say, well the Act is there and people can do what they can do.

But I tell you, Mr. Minister, when you go to the doorsteps and you talk to people and they say, you know there is this person that I know that I work with in the civil service, they took a sign from one of the parties, and the next thing we know, they're being transferred. And when you keep hearing that kind of story over and over again, I say that the reality is something different than what you're saying here today.

But I'm going to leave that, Mr. Minister, because I don't expect to just get any answers from you. I don't expect to get any truthfulness from you on that particular question. And let's leave it at the fact that when it comes to politicizing the civil service and scaring the rest of them, and creating a climate of fear, that there is no government in this country that can take a back seat . . . or that you don't have to take a back seat to any other government when it comes to doing that.

You know what I think? That in Manitoba, in Manitoba in the '70s, before Sterling Lyon got elected, there was a group called the Great-West Life insurance company, right across the street from the Manitoba legislature — right across the street from the Manitoba legislature — that undertook to prepare a number of position papers for the conservative opposition at that time, the government in waiting if you like.

And one of those papers prepared by the Great-West Life insurance company was on how you really grab effective control of the civil service, and their premise was that basically all civil servants are progressive people, and if you're a Conservative government you can't afford to have that. And what you really need to do is to weed out, everywhere that you can, anyone and everyone who you might think has some progressive thought and replace them with your own people.

Now that particular document got a lot of publicity and,

as a consequence, Sterling Lyon, when he got elected, was simply reluctant to act on it for fear of being caught out on following the lead of the Great-West insurance company.

But you know what I think: I think that document found its way into the Executive Council here in Saskatchewan, and I think you people have been quietly implementing that. You've done everything that you could to get rid of any civil servant that you thought that might have some progressive thought, might have any kind of political thought outside of the work place that didn't match with yours, and you've done everything that you could to get rid of those people and replace them with your own hacks and flacks and doughnut-hole punchers. That's what I think, Mr. Minister.

Do you deny that document from Great-West Life is on its way into the Executive Council in this province?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I say to the hon. member the following: is during the . . . he talked about the rights. During the last election, 1986, the Public Service Commission had and received 10 inquiries with regards to what employees could or could not do during the election. And they, quite frankly, they indicated that the rules as they saw it were reasonably fair.

Now to the hon. member who suggests somehow that the NDP has in no way politicized the public service, I mean, that is just absolutely not true, and you can read histories of Saskatchewan if you like; I can refer you to many of those historical analyses of Saskatchewan.

(1100)

Previous leaders of your party, previous premiers have indicated, NDP premiers, that we believe in recruiting and hiring people that are in tune with the views of our government, and you're not going to deny that.

I can, if you like, get into resolutions passed in your conventions of your party, saying that you wish to politicize the various levels of the government. So that's the reality. if you want sit here and argue that the only government to ever exist in this province that is politicized or is involved in politics in the civil service is this one, I don't think that you are being very fair to the history, and I think you fully believe that.

With regards to . . . Let me tell you a story. When we first came into government in 1982 — and this was told to me by various senior people, civil servants that were very professional — that they were strong-armed by several deputy ministers for contributions to the NDP, and that was not an uncommon thing to happen. And that had a significant influence on the way the Public Service Commission, or the public service, would see itself.

So for the hon. member to stand up somehow and suggest that when they were in government politics did not have any play with regard to who was hired in various levels of government, I think that he is, quite frankly, not being very truthful with regard to that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — We'll let the people of

Saskatchewan decide that one. I think they made some decision on that few days ago in Saskatoon Eastview and Saskatoon Elphinstone. They made some decision on that, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — But we'll let the people of Saskatchewan decide on that particular question. They can decide who undertook the largest massive firings in Saskatchewan history to get rid of civil servants in this province so you could replace them with people of your own stripe; they can decide who's been the real masters of intimidation in the history of this province.

Mr. Minister, I want to turn to another question here, and it deals with some statistics in the last couple of annual reports. And those statistics indicate that as of March 31, 1986 you had 12,940 employees, and as of March 31, 1987 you had 11,957 employees. are those figures correct? Can you just confirm those?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Those figures are correct, I'm advised.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, can you then also confirm that in breaking down those figures, that on March 31, 1986 you had 2,594 out-of-scope employees and you had 10,346 in-scope employees?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That's correct.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Do you also agree then, sir, that in looking at the total, that the out-of-scope employees is 20 per cent of the total, and the in-scope employees is 80 per cent of the total?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that is approximately correct.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well let's turn to March of '87. You agreed that the total number of employees is 11,957. Would you also agreed that 2,592 were out of scope and 9,365 were in scope?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Correct.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — The minister says that's correct. Would you also agree, Mr. Minister, that the number of out-of-scope employees, relative to the total staff complement, rose from 20 per cent in 1986 to 22 per cent in 1987, and that the number of in-scope employees was reduced from 80 per cent of the total to 78 per cent of the total?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That's approximately true.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well, Mr. Minister, can you please explain this anomaly; can you please explain that? You're the people that stood here last year and said, well we have to down-size government; we really need to get rid of a lot of those highly paced people to provide opportunities for younger civil servants, and so on.

Can you please explain that, given the fact that many of the

out of scope are the senior people, how it is that the out of scope went from 2,594 to 2,592, a loss of two, but your in-scope employees dropped by a thousand?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I'm advised that the main reason for that is things like SPMC, the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, of 1,300 employees were moved out of those numbers and therefore that explains the reduction down. Same of the assessment organization, the same thing happened there, and therefore those numbers go down accordingly.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Could you advise me when the move was made on the PMC (property management corporation)?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — March 1, 1987.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I have some further questions that I want to

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Order, please. Why is that member on his feet?

Mr. Gerich: — To introduce some guests, Mr. Chairman.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Gerich: — On behalf of the Premier of the province, I would like to introduce some guests that are touring from the Midale School grade four class. There are 16 students. Their teacher, Anne Field, is with them, and chaperones, Mrs. Bunse and Mr. Prawdzik.

I hope that they find their morning here, or short stay, informative and educational. I will be meeting with them after in the rotunda for pictures, and later on for drinks in the members' lounge. Please make welcome our guests. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund budgetary Expenditure Public Service Commission Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 33

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you're choosing to tell me that somehow, because of the creation of these new corporations out there, these new entities, that somehow we lost all these in-scope people, but we've retained all these out-of-scope people. I don't for a minute believe you. I don't believe you at all.

You know what I think is happening here, Mr. Minister? That you're choosing to fire and to get rid of the ordinary workers that work for the Public Service Commission, but that you're choosing to keep all the big shots that you can. That's what I believe. isn't that the truth, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that when you talk

about the down-sizing and when you talk about the actual people who left the public service, whose jobs were abolished, it breaks down in the following way: those in scope, 327, out of scope, 87 — that actually left government, did not find alternative employment within government — for a total of 414. Now if you have an 80-20 ratio that you're talking about, I think that's probably better than being consistent with the 80-20 ratio.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well no matter how you choose to explain it, Mr. Minister, on March 31, '86, 20 per cent of your staff complement was out of scope and one year later 22 per cent of your staff complement is out of scope.

You know what I think is happening here, Mr. Minister? I think that at a time that you're letting go of the ordinary people, the average citizens that work for the Public Service Commission, that you're replacing vacant position, some of those positions, with out-of-scope people, and in particular you're replacing them with your former colleagues, such as Louis Domotor, who's a former PC MLA.

Up until October '86, this fiscal year, when we had the increase in the out-of-scope employees, you appointed people like Louis Domotor. You appointed people like Keith Parker, the former PC MLA for Moose Jaw North, and you appointed him to the Liquor Board. And you appoint people like Ralph Katzman, a former PC MLA, and you put him in the Highways department. And you take all your former PC MLAs and you give them jobs: Jack Sandberg at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and Gordon Dirks, you give him a study to do.

I think that you people are just filling up wherever you can with political hacks, flacks and doughnut-hole punchers, to borrow a phrase from someone on the West Coast. That's what I think that you're doing.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — You know I looked through an annual report, I look at your annual report

An Hon. Member: — What about Metro? Did he get something?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — The member says Metro. No, I'm not aware of Metro Rybchuk getting any favours from this government, and the people in Regina Victoria are asking why.

But you look at your annual report, and you look at your approved mission statement and the goals that you set out, and one of the goals that you have is to ensure that appointment is based on merit.

Now I want to point out some examples of meritorious appointments by your government. One is George Hill, past president of the PC Party of Saskatchewan, now president of the Saskatchewan Power corporation — a meritorious appointment. Rene Archambault, brother-in-law to the Premier, a \$50,000-plus job with the Department of Education — another one of your meritorious appointments. Gordon Dirks, one-time and one-term PC MLA and cabinet minister, a \$30,000 contract, untendered. Merv Nidesh, chief of staff for the

Minister of Finance, now in a senior position in the Department of Public Participation. And the list goes on. I mentioned Domotor and I mentioned Sandberg, and I forgot what's his name, the member that was here earlier that sat behind the rail — Paul Schoenhals, a former one-time and one-term PC MLA and cabinet minister, appointed to be the president or the chairman of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

(1115)

You know, I think that there's just a remarkable inconsistency between what you say your goals are, to ensure that appointment is based on merit, and what it is that you actually do. And what you actually do is appoint anyone, anyone that you can with any kind of connection with the Tory party, you appoint them to positions that seem to come available. you say that you've got to down-size government, but when it comes to appointments for your hacks and flacks, it's up-sizing all the way, Mr. Minister.

I just want to ask you in that vein too, if you can tell me, Mr. Minister, the names — and you can provide this information in writing later — but the names and salaries of each ministerial assistant to the minister as of December 31, 1987. and can you also provide me with the names and salaries for each one of those ministerial assistants as of March 31, 1988? Can you undertake to provide us with that information, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Relating to the second question first, I would indicate to the member I can provide him with regards to that, as it relates to — Public Service Commission. We've been through perhaps half the estimates now, and each minister has undertaken or has given to the members opposite their various staff, what they were paid, etc.

Now I've heard the hon. member (a) to begin with, saying that this is the first time ever somebody that has a political connection has been hired in the Government of Saskatchewan. Now he went through a list of people. I can go through a list; I have it here in this book and I can read it to you. And I'll perhaps start right now and read through it and then I guess we can sit and debate who hired the most if you like. So I'll just take a minute to do that.

First of all we have a Chris Banman, former NDP candidate for Rosthern, 1978; Saskatoon Nutana, April, 1982; appointed to the board, or commission, by NDP government; in 1981 automatically terminated - B16.

We got John Burton. We got John Burton, former NDP MP, appointed executive director of transportation, \$5,000 a month; appointed associate deputy minister of Tourism; appointed administrative analysis, Department of Finance. he was terminated.

We had Don Cody. He was an NDP MLA in Watrous, defeated in 1975. He was employed in a senior position with SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) after the election defeat of 1975. He then, of course, ran again in 1978.

We have Marjorie Cooper, one-time CCF MLA Regina. I'll just keep going through these.

Linda Dufour, executive director of the NDP, moved as Assistant Chief Electoral Officer.

An Hon. Member: — Take it as read.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Take it as read, he says. I'm not done yet, Murray.

Then you have Don Faris, who was a former NDP provincial cabinet minister. He was appointed director of communications and education, department of co-ops. He was getting \$3,500 back in 1981.

Then you have Margaret Fern, appointed intergovernmental affairs officer III, September 1981; sought the NDP nomination prior to '81; defeated in Regina South; received \$9,700 honorarium for special services.

And you have Julius Friesen. He was a federal NDP candidate, Saskatoon Humboldt. he, as well, received employment.

You had Ted Glover, appointed special assistant. He was a federal NDP candidate.

You had Terry Hanson, former NDP MLA, elected 1971, Qu'Appelle-Wolseley; defeated 1975, Indian Head-Wolseley. He was given an honorarium and a job in the Department of Agriculture.

You had Frank Hart who sought the nomination for the NDP in Swift Current in 1978. He was appointed to the department of tourism and renewable resources.

You have Dave Hanley who was a NDP candidate in the federal election of Moose Jaw 1980. He was given a job with Saskoil after the 1980 election. he had also held various positions and was receiving well over \$3,000 a month for that.

Then you had Don Keith appointed general manager of Saskatchewan Development Fund. he was a defeated NDP candidate.

You had Bill Knight, former NDP MP. He was appointed principal secretary to the premier, salary of almost \$5,000 a month.

Holly Ann Knott, who is solicitor for the potash corporation, is an EA (executive assistant) to your present leader, sought the NDP nomination in Saskatoon Nutana.

You had Ted Koskie appointed executive assistant to the minister of consumer affairs. He had connections within the NDP Party, and I'll leave that at that.

Barbara Marie Kramer, appointed executive assistance to hon. Norm Vickar, minister of industry and commerce, daughter of Eiling Kramer.

Alex Kuziak, former NDP cabinet minister, board and commission.

Jim Liggett, defeated NDP candidate Bengough-Milestone. He was given a position at transportation agency.

Howard Lucas, defeated NDP candidate 1978 provincial election, Rosthern, appointed senior industrial relations officer.

Gordon McNeil, former NDP MLA from 1975 in Meadow Lake; defeated candidate in 1978, SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), northern liaison officer — \$34,000 a year he received.

Allan Oliver, former NDP MLA, elected '71, Shaunavon, defeated, '75; appointed to Highway Traffic Board. Hayden Owens. Louis Roy, was defeated NDP candidate, P.A.-Duck Lake, and given a job with DNS (department of northern Saskatchewan), tourism industry, at \$4,000 a year. Martin Semchuk.

Alex Taylor, who I'm familiar with. Alex Taylor was a former member from the constituency I now represent. He was defeated in 1975. He was employed at \$48,000 a year with the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation.

And then I will avoid getting into names of people that are now serving in the House. If you would wish — I don't think that will serve any further purpose. What this simply shows is that while you might say that we have hired some people that are politically in tune with us, I'm not denying that. And I would hope that when you were government, you would not deny that you hired people that were politically in tune with you and active politically with you.

I can go through a whole lot more, but I will leave it at that for now.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — By the sounds of it, you've read the complete list, Mr. Minister. You've read the complete list. The question I have: why did you and your government choose to increase the opportunities for political appointments threefold? Why did you choose to do that?

An Hon. Member: — How's that again, Harry?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Why did you choose to increase the opportunities to make political appointments; why did you choose to increase those opportunities threefold, over and above what it has been? Why did you choose to do that?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I don't accept that. The names that you referred to, people like George Hill, they do not come under the Public Service Commission, or Paul Schoenhals or Jack Sandberg. So I, nor the officials, comprehend your question.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — A lot of those names that you read out earlier had nothing to do with the Public Service Commission either. I'm just simply asking . . . You say that the NDP hired people that had a political connection, and I don't think there's anyone who would deny that. I don't think there's anyone deny . . . I don't think that anyone denies that you appoint people with political

backgrounds to be executive assistants or, as they're now called, ministerial assistants. I don't think anyone denies that, and I don't think that anyone sees anything particularly wrong with that particular thing either.

The question I have is: why did you feel it was necessary to increase the opportunities for that kind of hiring three-fold?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicate to the hon. member that, while we might have taken lessons from the previous government, we certainly did not increase that three-fold. It would probably . . . If it was three-fold, it would be a decrease three-fold.

Now you people were masters at hiring your own, I can assure you of that, and we have taken some lessons from you.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, that's your rhetoric, but the reality is something else because you can go through the government telephone directory, the government telephone directory, and you can look at 1981-82 and, whereas the minister might have had one executive assistant or ministerial assistant, now they've got three or four ministerial assistants. And tell you that the reality is something different than what you say, you know.

Mr. Minister, I'm going to leave this . . . Again, it seems like a fruitless exercise to get any concession from you that the out-of-scope employees, that the number of out-of-scope employees are something that you want to protect, recognizing that many out-of-scope employees are political.

And I think that it's just disgusting that you would go out of your way to fire and to lay off and to transfer hundreds, a thousand . . . at least in basing it on the two annual reports that I have, to do that to ordinary, average men and women who work for the civil service on the front line and provide services, to get rid of them, but to make sure that you hang on to all those out-of-scope employees — that's where all the political appointments are made.

I don't see you making any cuts in that; I haven't seen any cuts in your government in terms of ministerial assistants. I think it's just disgraceful.

I want to leave the chair at this point, Mr. Speaker, and turn over to my colleague for Regina Lakeview.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Let me just read to the hon. member. In the year 1987-88, the number of OC (order in council) appointments was 43 in number. Now if you want to compare that to the last time the NDP were in government, that number was 250. So we hired 43 OC appointments prior to last election; in one year you hired 250. The number of OC positions in government today are 415. When you were in government, 627. Now that's a decrease of 34 per cent.

Now the hon. member knows that many of the OC appointments are in the area of Finance, in the area of Justice where you hire lawyers. And I think the hon. member would not do justice to his critic position to

somehow suggestion that every one of those is a political appointment. So clearly there are fewer OCs today than when you were in government — fewer.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, I'm not denying that for a second. I'm just simply saying that there are sure a lot more people in scope as well. You're the ones that have chosen to cut drastically when it comes to in-scope employees, but you seem to be less than drastic when it comes to out-of-scope employees. Let's just make that clear.

You have no regard for the average men and women that work in the public service of this province, but when it comes to the big shots that are hired on the out-of-scope process, you know — yes, you've got a reduction of two in the year, but you lay off and get rid of 1,000 others. That's the point that I'm making, and I think it is simply indefensible.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I indicated to the hon. member, the figures show that the number of people that lost their job in scope was 327, out of scope was 87. The hon. member was the one that was saying it's an 80-20 split between in scope and out of scope. And what that means is that there was a proportionately higher, if you're at 80-20, that came from the out-of-scope position than come from the in-scope position.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in view of the fact that so many single mothers and working women are living under poverty, and in view of the fact — are living in poverty or under the poverty line — in view of the fact that what appears to be happening in Saskatchewan and across Canada is that we have a growing number of people living under the poverty line, and by far the vast majority of these people are women. In view of those facts, Mr. Minister, what is your government's policy with respect to implementing a pay equity program in Saskatchewan?

(1130)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Two observations. First of all, with all classification systems within the public service are gendered neutral and do not discriminate on the basis of sex, one.

And number two, as it relates to the vast majority of people working for government — the 80 per cent that are in scope, that is, as you are aware, part of the negotiations with regard to the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union), and the bargaining there sets the rate of pay to be paid for any classification of employee. That negotiation is always gender neutral. So with regards to the program within the Public Service Commission as it relates to hiring people and their level of pay within the government, it is gender neutral.

If you are asking the question further about people working in other areas than in government, that question is more appropriately addressed to the minister responsible for that which would be the Department of Human Resources, not the Public Service Commission.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, your comments indicate a

total lack of understanding of why we need pay equity in the public service in Saskatchewan. The fact of the matter is that the jobs that are ordinarily filled by women are low-paying jobs in the public service, and right across society in general they tend to be low-paying jobs.

Without a pay equity program — and it's been demonstrated in many, many other jurisdictions, Mr. Minister. If you were familiar with the problem, you would know that it's been demonstrated that a government has to take control of that situation and take a serious look at whether or not jobs are being paid equal for work of equal value because that's really what we're talking about. It means a commitment on your part, Mr. Minister, to look at the pay schedules, and determine the relative value of work being performed, and pay equally for work of equal value.

It's not good enough just to provide us with an argument that the . . . we don't look at a person's sex when we're hiring. That's not the issue; that's an affirmative action question. The issue is: what are you going to do about jobs that primarily women fill in the public service that are low paying because jobs that women fill tend to be low paying even though they may be of a value equivalent to others.

It's not good enough to say that you simply bargain with the union on that. The union, as I understand, would like to look at pay equity being implemented in the province of Saskatchewan. And I want to know if you've sat down and talked to them about a pay equity program, and what you will be doing to ensure that there's equality in wages between men and women in this province?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Am I to interpret that what the hon. member is saying is that the pay equity issue is on the bargaining table right now between PSC (Public Service Commission) and the Public Service Commission . . . or Public Service Commission and SGEU? You're suggesting that that is on the bargaining table?

Ms. Simard: — I don't know what's on the bargaining table, but I have spoken to people in SGEU who indicate that they are prepared to look at — employees in the union — at a pay equity system. That is my understanding. I don't know what's on the bargaining table.

But this has been . . . We had a discussion in the legislature last year on this issue, and the minister said he was going to look into it, and as far as I'm aware, there has been nothing done by this government.

Then the government has to show leadership on this, Mr. Minister. The government has to show leadership on this pay equity question in the public service and right across Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, with regard to the public service, if you have somebody . . . if you have a classification and there is several people that fall within that classification, some are women, some are men, then they're paid exactly the same.

With regards to negotiating the classifications and the pay

for those classifications, clearly the union bargains that process for pay. Now are you saying that there are not enough women in higher jobs within government as opposed to only the lower jobs?

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I'm saying that you have to make a commitment to pay equity, and then you have to take a look at all your classifications and evaluate them with respect to implementing pay equity in the public service in the province of Saskatchewan. That's what has to be done.

It's a cop-out, it's a complete cop-out to say that, well we bargain with the union every year. That's a cop-out, Mr. Minister. It shows no leadership and it shows no commitment and it shows an anti-woman and an anti-family attitude, because many women are heading single parent families. Most of single parent families are headed by women.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — With regards to the number of women in management, in March 31, 1981 — that's when your party was in office — 7.7 per cent of the management group of government were women — 7.7.

In March of 1988 that has increased to 23 per cent. Now that's maybe not right to 50 per cent, but I think even you would acknowledge that's a significant increase.

Between 1981 and 1988 the number of women in management positions of the public service has increased by some 187 per cent. And notwithstanding even last year where there were significant restraints within hirings within government in management positions, the number of women in those management positions increased from 17 to 23 per cent, which was a 32 per cent increase last year.

So all I'm saying is that there is some progress being made there. I think the hon. member would have to acknowledge that.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, that is not . . . it totally begs the question and it totally misses the point that I'm attempting to make. And I regret to say that it illustrates a total lack of understanding of what pay equity is about when you respond with that answer. You are talking affirmative action. Affirmative action is one thing; pay equity is another thing. Pay equity is being paid equally for work of equal value. And your response just indicates a total lack of understanding for the problem that women are being faced.

We're not talking about women in management now. We're talking about women on the lower range of the pay scale, and the fact that many of these low-paying jobs are pink collar ghettos. That's where we put women. And they continue to be paid less because their work is undervalued. And that's what happens in society — society tends to undervalue the work that women do and pay less. And the government has to take a look at the Public Service Commission and your own positions in government to make sure that that's not happening. It's not good enough . . . you don't do that just when you bargain with a union. You establish a pay equity program that looks at that.

Let me just give you an inkling of some of the problems that women are facing, Mr. Minister. Something like 53 per cent of women working for pay earned less than \$10,000 in 1985 — 53 per cent of them earned less than \$10,000. Something like 60.2 per cent of single mothers with dependants lived below the poverty line, Mr. Minister. Something like 9.4 per cent of male-headed households as opposed to 42 per cent of female-headed households lived in poverty, Mr. Minister.

Those are the problems we're talking about. And if you want to correct those problems, it has to start right here with the government. The government has to set an example with a pay equity program which will have spin-offs in society as a whole.

Now I don't want the rhetoric about women in management. That's a different issue. Those aren't the women we're talking about; we're talking about women on the lower scale. I don't want to hear that rhetoric. I want to know what you're going to do to set an example in this province with respect to paying women properly for their work and what you're going to do about implementing a pay equity system in the Government of Saskatchewan.

(1145)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I can advise the hon. member, when she talks about . . . She doesn't want to talk about women in management, but she was the one that raised that question. In the question specifically put to me, is there . . . there are fewer and fewer women that are working in the management level of government; they all have the low paying jobs. That's exactly what you said.

Number two, what you're now trying to lead to the public is that there are many women working for the government making less than \$10,000. That's not true either. As I understand, the clerk 1, or some of the lowest positions on the contract now, are about \$10 an hour — that's around \$10 an hour for the lowest paid employee of government. Clearly those are not all women.

But even at \$10 an hour, for an average year of 2,000 hours is \$20,000 salary, which really becomes the minimum salary within government. And so I think the hon. member, leaving the impression . . . if she wishes to leave the impression that that's not true outside of government, I'm not here to argue about that because, as I indicated earlier, that's not the function of the Public Service Commission.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I didn't talk about women in management, and I'm confident that *Hansard* will bear that out. That was your red herring, Mr. Minister.

With respect to the \$10,000, I was quoting statistics generally, not specifically saying it was the public service. So once again you are attempting to put words in my mouth.

The fact of the matter is, the point I was making, and I'll make it once again, is that we have to implement a pay equity system. We start by implementing it in the government and looking . . . It's not good enough to say,

well she's getting 11,000 or 12,000 so that's good enough, if the job isn't being paid what it's valued at or what it's worth comparable to other traditionally held male jobs.

That's not good enough, Mr. Minister, and the women of this province won't accept that. Well we're paying her more than . . . she's getting \$10 an hour; that's good enough if she's working for less than jobs of equal value that are traditionally held by male persons.

I wish to also point out with respect to my comments, that a pay equity system isn't geared only to women, Mr. Minister, it's also geared to all people in lower paying jobs. Whether the job is held by men or women, it would be pay equity for men and women. The reason I used women as an example is because women primarily hold the lower paying jobs; but if men happen to be holding them, they would benefit from a pay equity program as well.

Mr. Minister, then if you wish now to talk about affirmative action, I will give you an opportunity. With respect to the affirmative action program that the government sought approval for from the Human Rights Commission, I want to bring to your attention: When you quote figures of 23 per cent of women in management, I say good; we want to see more women in management. But what about the women in the lower echelons of the public service? What about those women, Mr. Minister?

Let's look at the facts with respect to those women, as I have them, as of November 1987. The budget cuts — as a result of your budget cuts, Mr. Minister, your government's cuts, something like the number of women in non-traditional, non-management positions dropped to 7.3 per cent from 16.2 per cent and the Human Rights Commission called your record affirmative action in reverse. Now would you please tell me, Mr. Minister, what you've done to rectify that situation since November 1987?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I can only go back . . . Perhaps you could refer me to the Human Rights Commission statement. I have a difficult time commenting on that if I haven't seen it.

Let me simply say this: as I said before, there are 23 per cent of women now in management in the Government of Saskatchewan where that was 7.7 per cent before. There's no numbers for women in non-traditional jobs from 1981 — there's no statistics from that. But I can say from March '87 to March '88, that has increased from 13.2 to 15.8. And total women in government now is about 48.6 per cent.

So if you could refer me to the Human Rights Commission statement, I would then refer to it.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, when you were seeking approval for the affirmative action plan in the government, and I'm looking now at a November 12, 1987 Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* article, and I'll just quote from it for your information:

The plan is supposed to cover government hiring

in the temporary, part-time entry level and non-union positions within the Public Service, a group that covers 34 per cent of all civil servants. Within that group the number of women in non-traditional, non-management positions dropped to 7.3 per cent from 16.2 per cent in a 17-month period ending on August 31, 1987.

It goes on to talk about natives and other natives and other . . . I can send you a copy of this, Mr. Minister, if you like. But the crucial point that I was referring to, or one of the points, is that the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights told the commissioners the government's record shows it wasn't ready to implement an affirmative action plan when it sought approval.

At calling the government's record affirmative action in reverse, the association's written brief to the commission set six conditions it said the province should be forced to meet before the approval is given.

My next question to you, Mr. Minister, is: what conditions were attached to your approval for the Public Service Commission and what is the status of the fulfilment of these conditions at this time?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, I wonder perhaps if Your initial statement was that the Human Rights Commission had said this. And I take it, from reading what you say there, it's not the Human Rights Commission at all but the association, or Saskatchewan Association for Human Rights.

An Hon. Member: — It's the association.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — It's the association. Some of the people from the Public Service Commission advise that they were in fact at that meeting and this is a statement made by he association, which as you know is an advocate group. No comment was in fact made by the Human Rights Commission at all with regards to that. So I think that we should make that clear so that it's not being seen as the Human Rights Commission saying that, or necessarily even accepting the numbers as presented by the association.

Ms. Simard: — What are the numbers, then, with respect to those groups? If you don't accept the numbers — and this article isn't clear as to who put the numbers out, whose numbers those were — but if you're not accepting their numbers, what are they, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The difficulty of trying to respond to that question, as I indicated to you, that we have and maintain statistical information as to the hirings and the number of women in various levels, and it's difficult for us to know what the association of human rights were referring to there so that we can in fact compare apples to apples.

I can say that statistic on the appointment of women, in 1987-88, 52 per cent of all permanent positions were women. That is, 523 of the 1,006 new permanent positions appointed last year were in fact women.

So I mean, what we can sit and argue about is various

interpretations or statements on statistical information. Until we are able to analyse what the association of human rights were saying, not the Human Rights Commission, then it's difficult for us to respond to those statistical comparisons.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I will send you a copy of this article. Will you undertake to look at the article and provide us with your interpretation of the figures or what the figures should be from your point of view. Would you give us that information please?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I will undertake to do that. With the caveat, as you know, that if the statistics are maintained in the department in one way, it might take some time to interpret them in a different way. So I'll undertake to get that information — the Public Service Commission will get that information to you — but I can't guarantee that it'll be there tomorrow for you.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, there were conditions attached to the approval of the affirmative action program with the government. What were those conditions and what are we doing about it or what are you doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I wonder if that question might be more appropriately addressed to the Minister of Human Resources because it falls under that department.

Ms. Simard: — Is it not the Public Service Commission that went for the approval, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No, that was presented by the Department of Human Resources, not by the Public Service Commission.

Ms. Simard: — Well I would still like the information right away, Mr. Minister, but I can understand your problem.

Another point that I wish to make is the fact that 75.2 per cent of the public service positions cut by your Saskatchewan had been filled by women, Mr. Minister. I only have to think, for example, with respect to the dental therapists — over 400 dental workers, most of whom were women, by far the vast majority were women — totally fired and eliminated from their jobs by your government.

Your budget cuts, Mr. Minister, have hurt women in this province very, very much. But it's not only hurt women, Mr. Minister, it's hurt heir families because many of these women were supplementing incomes in their families, or were heading families themselves and supporting the family as a single mother.

(1200)

Mr. Minister, there's no question that the public service cuts have attacked women in very large majority — 75.2 per cent of the positions cut were formerly held by women, Mr. Minister. Now I would like to know what your government is going to do to correct that situation, and what you're going to do for these women in order to ensure that they're re-employed in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, I make two observations. What I'm saying is you asked what are we doing — 52 per cent of all new permanent employments were women. Now, that is increasing the number of women in the public service. If there's 52 per cent of them are women, 48 per cent of them are men. So that is an increase.

Now if there is a given group where a decision was taken and they lost their job, clearly that's true. I don't know or cannot confirm your figures, but they're probably close to true, because the large number of people that ultimately lost the job were the dental therapists and they are predominantly women.

Now the cuts should not be made according to whether they are men or women. Most governments are going to determine whether or not they make a cut and they make a decision to either move down here or move down here. If you're going to eliminate a program now, obviously that will have a bearing, but there's many other things that go into it. And so I don't disagree with your figures necessarily. I indicate that permanent hirings are — 4 per cent more are women than are men, a total of 52 per cent, so you have to constantly move.

Ms. Simard: — I just wish to make the observation, Mr. Minister, that with respect to the dental therapists the advice that I have received is that out of those dental therapists there's only been 50 that have found employment, and out of those 50 only 30 of them, or less, have found permanent full-time employment, Mr. Minister.

So your programs and your goodwill, if there is any, Mr. Minister — and I'm not sure that there is — is not working for those dental therapists. And many of those women who have lost their jobs as a result of your budget cut-backs, and their families, are suffering, and your anti-family government policies have hurt them severely, Mr. Minister. And I want an undertaking from the Public Service Commission and from you government that you will not be engaging on budget cuts that are direct attacks on the women and their families in this province.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I responded to that question last time. The budget cuts are obviously going to be based on whether government decides that a program is going to continue or not continue, and that's not based upon who fills the job as much as whether or not it's this department or that department that's going to be changed.

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, your government has constantly said . . . whenever we've raised a concern with you in a general way, whether it's people on social assistance or people who have been hurting from the drug plan or people who've been with hospital waiting lists, you've said, give us the names and we'll do something about it.

Now I'm standing here to ask you about a constituent of mine who is currently sitting in front of the office of the Premier on 22nd Street in Saskatoon, concerned about the fact that he was dismissed from a probation job that he has as a fire-fighter. He alleges it's because he was a diabetic, and he has in writing, and he's shown it to me,

the statement that it was a concern because of his diabetes. He's very concerned about the affirmative action program which he understand is still under the Public Service Commission.

Now he's been in front of the office of the Premier for the last week and he is trying to get an inquiry in front of Hepworth . . . or the minister in charge of the Public Service Commission — sorry to mention people's names. he's wanted this inquiry and he's been asking for it, His name is Earle Mireau; it's a public name. There's been a description of his concerns in the *Star-Phoenix*, and he's been on television in Saskatoon, and many people are aware of his protest.

There's a very particular individual person trying to get attention from your government. And as far as I know, no one has even come out to say to him that the affirmative action program is no longer under the Public Service Commission — it's under the Human Resources, Labour, Employment and everything else over the department. Now I want to know what your government is proposing to do about the case of Earle Mireau in Saskatoon.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I . . . the officials do not have all the details. If the hon. member would give me, as well, where he worked and when he was terminated, as you say, we can investigate it. I assume that h has grievance rights. Has he used those grievance rights? ha he taken the opportunity to do that? I don't know.

What I can undertake to do to you, if you . . . You've given the name; if you can say where he worked and when he worked, I will undertake to have the Public Service Commission investigate.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Minister, I'm sure that your government has a file on Earle Mireau that's about this thick, because he sent the papers down to the government, he sent them to the minister in charge of the Public Service Commission, and he has sent them to the minister responsible for the Human Rights Commission, and he has been asking and asking for a public inquiry.

Now if your officials know nothing about this, this is really shocking, because this case has been quite public and he's been very persistent — extremely persistent. You better ask your officials again if they don't have any information on Earle Mireau — M-i-r-e-a-u.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can only indicate to you that I have the name; I will do an investigation and find out.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Minister, I'm sorry that I was talking to a colleague and didn't hear your response.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I said I had the name and I would have the Public Service Commission investigate it, bring that back to me, and I will personally send a letter to you explaining the position as we see it.

Ms. Smart: — Well I thank you for that, and I'm sure that Earle Mireau will be pleased to hear that he will get some attention, and it will be much appreciated.

Before I sit down, I would like to just make a couple of comments about the pay-equity program that we've been talking about, because it's been obvious to me in your responses that you're not at all clear on what a pay-equity program is. And I would just like to take this opportunity to explain to you, from my own personal profession, just what that's meant in terms of librarianship.

Librarianship is a profession where 85 per cent of the people employed are women, and 94 per cent of the administrators in the library profession are men. And in the federal government there was also a classification called archivists. Those are the people who do the historical work in the archives of Canada.

And at the federal level the librarians launched a grievance to the Human Rights Commission and they were found to be classified at a lower level . . . Mr. Chairman, the minister is not listening to my explanation.

Mr. Minister, this is just one more example of why women are so frustrated with this government, that even when we're trying to speak to you, you won't have the courtesy to listen.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — That is shameful.

The government has an opportunity to show real leadership in making conditions better for women. In the federal government there's a classification called archivists and a classification called librarians. They do exactly the same kind of work. The archivists were mostly men; the librarians were mostly women. The archivists were getting a lot more money than the librarians. There was an investigation on the pay equity scheme of making those jobs equal pay for work of equal value, and the librarians got an increase in pay because it was judged that they were doing the same work.

That's what we're talking about when we're talking about a pay equity scheme. We're talking about looking at the job classifications and seeing if the jobs are done the same.

Now again the minister is not taking the courtesy to listen to me, and I'm trying to explain a serious program for women. And I'm giving you an example from the federal government which you could look at, and I'm sure you could understand it because it's fairly clear.

When you look at the work done by librarians and the work done by archivists, the work is very similar. The pay at the federal government level was very different, and they won an increase in pay.

In the provincial government in your various departments you've got people doing the same kinds of work, classified differently. By and large, women are classified lower. Even though they have the same education, the same skills, the same amount of training, etc., they don't get the same pay.

So I want to hear from you what your commitment is going to be to a pay equity program in the Public Service

Commission for the government of Saskatchewan, based on my explanation of what it is that pay equity is.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — To the specific question of the hon. member, the people from the commission will investigate. There is no classification of an archivist in the public service of Saskatchewan. They're classified as a clerk. We will undertake to get the pay levels of the people that work in the archives and the librarians, and make that comparison for you.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I want to continue in the affirmative action area and deal with two areas actually — the first in that of physical abilities — and wish to make a point that to move towards having employers recognizing abilities rather than seeing somebody in a wheelchair and saying, oh, they can't do a job, they're obviously physically disabled. To move towards recognizing potential abilities, we have to address the issue of accessibility.

There are regulations in place, but I point out to you that my understanding is that the number of renovations and the amount of wheelchair lifts that have been purchased in this past year is roughly one-half of what it was in 1982. Clearly that's not a move in the proper direction. We should be enforcing the regulations that are in place.

(1215)

I think it's no surprise that we see this newspaper report showing the physically disabled employed in the government down 11 per cent last year over the year before. And it's also no surprise that we see natives — 12 per cent fewer natives employed by you than were employed simply one year earlier.

That's shocking, Minister, to see those statistics, that proof, and the proof is really in the pudding, just where your government stands in regards to helping people that have been put down, helping people that have no end of road-blocks put up to their employment.

I urge you to get on with the accessibility standards, following through with those installation of wheelchair lifts, that type of thing. And also at the same time, I want you to take a good look at your affirmative action program. The two areas that I'm dealing with in tandem, I am simply because of the time running out and I want to turn this back to my colleague.

But when are you going to get on with enforcing the building regulations and when are you going to get on with enforcing affirmative action program for people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well let me first get into the question of access. That falls under SPMC as you are fully aware of, and so I don't . . . Your statistics that you use, I can speak only for Department of Justice. When the Justice estimates were in, the question related to the court-houses, for example, and the member from Regina Centre in fact gave a bouquet to us, Department of Justice, for what we had in fact done in that particular field for access by handicapped people, wheelchair people, to get into various public buildings.

So I think that the hon. member to say that there is nothing being done relative to when you were in government, I don't believe that's true, but we'll leave that for the estimates on the property management corporation because they're the ones that co-ordinate that.

I can say that the Public Service Commission is in the process right now of a study through all departments to see where those levels are, in fact, and have progressed to, to determine how the employees are faring within the provincial government.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, I just want to ask you when you stopped using English as the only language in the Public Service Commission?

An Hon. Member: — Say that again, Harry. I didn't hear.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I asked you when you stopped using English as the only language within the Public Service Commission itself.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I don't know what the basis of your question is. If your base of your question is, is there services provided for the public service to be able to learn another language than English, that has been going on for some time, and I would hope that you were not against that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — No, what I'm talking about, Mr. Minister, is something called the non-permanent resourcing unit. Can you tell me what language that is and what it means?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — It is the unit that hires part-time and temporary employees.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well, Mr. Minister, you have a couple or three university degrees, and you had to consult with your officials to give me an answer on that, and I'm assuming that this is in the English language. Can you tell us when you might get a grip on the bureaucracy and start using the English language again. I mean, if this is an office to hire temporary help, why don't you call it that?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I suppose we could all cite chapter and verse of the jargon of the public service. I mean, this is not the first time that has existed. They use the great buzz-words. I've often believed that very often the public service use those buzz-words to, in fact, confuse people, and not only just the public but also the politicians.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well you're right, Mr. Minister. It's time to stop confusing the public. If you, with two or three university degrees, have to consult with your officials to explain to this House and the people of Saskatchewan what a non-permanent resourcing unit is, and that it's in fact a temporary employment office, then pray tell what the average person out there is going to think about this.

My colleague says it's kind of a non-permanent resource on the other side, and I'd have to agree with him after the by-election results.

Mr. Minister, just on student summer employment

program, I not your budget is the same as last year. Can you tell me, the students that are being hired to process the fuel tax rebates, are they being paid from that particular vote in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised they are.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — What you're saying then is that even through you're not hiring any extra people necessarily to process those fuel tax rebates, the budget's the same and there are no additional jobs for students in this province to process those fuel tax rebates.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I guess they're doing that rather than some other job.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well that's obvious, and you should pass that message along to your colleagues who somehow tried to leave the impression that additional jobs have been created in Saskatchewan to process those rebates, and as if it's some great thing for students out there that additional jobs are being created.

I just want to ask you: last year I received a letter from someone called Guy Chartier, head of the non-permanent resourcing unit, saying: the following students have been hired under the student summer employment program who happen to reside in your constituency.

Can I just ask: were those letters sent out to all MLAs with respect to all the summer students that were hired under this program to advise them that this was taking place?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — If you could send me a copy of the letter, I will take it back through and chase that letter down and respond to that question.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — You know, I don't have his letter with me any more, but I got a letter from a Guy Chartier, saying, the following students have been hired on the student summer employment program, and they reside in your constituency. You may wish to send them a letter of congratulation.

I'm just simply asking: was that a practice to advise all members of the Assembly that this was in fact happening, giving them the names of all those who have been hired from their constituency under the auspices of this program?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised by the chairman that it is not his intention to do that, and he does not agree with that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Was there a slip-up there somewhere? How do you explain then that I received this letter and others didn't receive this letter?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I asked the hon. member to please send me the letter and I will check it out. He asked the second question: is it the intention to send letters out? The chairman indicated that it was not his intention to do that. So please send me the letter and I will check it out.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, I have here a list

provided by your colleague, the minister responsible for the Public Service Commission. This was sent last year, and the list indicates the number of students hired, by constituency, under the summer student employment program.

I want to ask for your explanation as to why, in the city of Regina, Regina Elphinstone, 10 were hired; Regina Lakeview, 44; Regina North, 15; Regina Centre, 24; Regina North West, 19; Regina Rosemont, 19; Regina Victoria, 14 — although only two names were sent to me — as contrasted to Regina South, 91 students; and Regina Wascana, 75 students. How do you explain that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I guess . . . To the hon. member, I don't know the breakdown like that. If he could, again, send a copy of that over to us, perhaps I can have the commission investigate that and respond to him.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well I think the most appropriate comment on this one came from your seat mate, the Deputy Premier, who said it has to do with the MLA.

Do you know what I think is happening here, Mr. Minister? That you've set up a cute little arrangement with the Public Service Commission to assure that students who come from the constituencies of Tory MLAs get the jobs, and that those students who come from the constituencies represented by New Democrats or the Liberal are simply not provided the same opportunity to get those jobs; that you're playing politics with the students of this province.

First you cut back on the amount of money to hire students and to give help to those kids that are returning to university. And the next thing you do is you play politics with that. I want you to deny that, Mr. Minister. I want you to say that that isn't true. Do it.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that the system of hiring students in the summer has not terribly changed in the last 25 years.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I think with all due respect, Mr. Minister, when you look at that list, I think that it's terribly changed over the last number of years. I think it's terribly changed. And I would submit to you that your government is just playing politics with the students of this province. You've got no heart.

First you cut back on the opportunities, and the next thing you do is you play politics with those kids. That's what you're doing. I think it's disgraceful, and the people of Saskatchewan will pass judgement on you for that.

I want to just turn to employee relations for a few minutes, Mr. Minister, and I want to ask you: what kind of mandate does the PSC have to negotiate with the public sector unions, given the fact that the government is dictating a policy of zero and zero wage increases for the next two years?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Two observations. The list that the hon. member sent over to me shows that from the constituency of Kindersley there's nine people were

hired; from the constituency of Regina Victoria there's 14 people hired. I'm not sure what the

And number two, as the member obviously knows, that negotiations are ongoing between the Public Service Commission and the SGEU and other unions. I don't think the hon. member would expect me to make any statements with regards to that negotiation. I have no intention of doing that. And that would not be a proper function for this Assembly to in fact negotiate or give signals with regard to negotiations. And I do not intend to do that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, doesn't it make a mockery of good faith bargaining when you say there's going to be zero and zero, and yet you should go negotiate. Doesn't that make a mockery of the negotiating process?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I know. But you said that a year ago with regards to the teachers or whatever. Negotiations are ongoing — negotiations are ongoing.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well just about that, there's also been a cut in the industrial relations area of the PSC, and as a result the PSC has been hard pressed to get people to bargaining sessions. And I would point out that bargainings have been delayed, and we're informed that nothing has been happening since January or February. How do you explain that, and does that exemplify bargaining in good faith when you're so understaffed that you can't get people to the bargaining table?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I will read this to you. Since August of 1986, 24 meetings have been held. The parties last met January '88 when the Public Service Commission presented SGEU with the proposed package that includes revised economic positions. A further date was set for February 1988. The SGEU cancelled those dates and subsequently informed the Public Service Commission that they did not wish to meet until April 25, 1988. Bargaining dates have recently been set for May 16, 17, 26 and 27, so your information is wrong.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Minister, isn't it true that as a further consequence of the cuts that you've made in the industrial relations area, and the number of new people and people coming and going, that the processing of grievances have become very slow; that there are great delays; that there's a huge pile of unprocessed grievances; that there's dissatisfaction as a result of that; that there's unhappiness; that there's anger, and that there's no serious attempt that has been made to make the grievance procedure work?

(1230)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Processed 135 this year. The number of grievances outstanding has not changed dramatically from last year.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Item 7

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Just on item 7, with respect to payments to the property management corporation, can the minister explain for this House how it is that the payments to the property management corporation has increased?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We are advised by SPMC that the last year when it was first introduced was an estimate — that the actual came out to this amount. This is the figure that has been given to us by SPMC and we pay it accordingly. You should address that question in SPMC estimates.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Here we go on the old merry-go-round again. Mr. Minister, I wonder if you can provide us with an itemized list of facilities, offices, compounds, parking lots provided to your department by the property management corporation.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — You indicated now what you wanted — the list of properties that Public Service Commission uses?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — That's correct, Mr. Minister. If you could send that list over later, if I could have your undertaking on that, that would be satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We'll provide that list to you.

Item 7 agreed to.

Vote 33 agreed to.

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

Mr. Van Mulligen: — If I just might thank the minister and thank the officials for attending today. I think the presence of the officials is probably far more important today, given the minister is in an acting capacity, and their presence has been very helpful to these proceedings, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the officials. Again, it's unfortunate that the minister was not here, but times took him out of the city today, and so I think the officials should be commended for carrying these estimates through.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:36 p.m.