

## EVENING SITTING

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

General Revenue Fund  
Public Service Commission  
Vote 33

## Item 2

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I told you this afternoon that I would get those Taylor names for you, which I have them for the record now. In fact I have several names that I picked up a couple more through the evening that had the same type of firings.

And it was Katherine Taylor. She worked for Sask Housing, and she was a daughter of Graham Taylor. She was fired at Christmas time on '91, and she had such a crude firing that at the Christmas party they didn't even give her a Christmas present. I mean it was just an unreal firing and I'd like you to just check into that, Mr. Minister. This is not the people . . . the people that I deal with here, it's not their type of doing . . . way of doing things.

And the daughter-in-law's name was Carla. When she was hired by government at the Liquor Board, it was Carla Lozinski, and she was hired at the Liquor Board and she was fired about the same time, a day or two into the new year. And at the time she was fired she would be Carla Taylor. She was hired, Mr. Minister, in government and then she couldn't help it, she was . . . fall in love with a Taylor and then this government come along and then whoof, they're gone. So it was pretty . . . pretty serious stuff for these young people.

And then the other one is just a young man. It was Tim Chatterson, and he worked for Property Management, and he was just up and gone. And the other one was quite a sad one, a nephew by marriage to Mr. Taylor, and his name is Willard Thomson. And he was fired. He was just a janitor at the museum. And he was a native boy. And too close related to Mr. Taylor and gone.

I'd like you to look into this kind of stuff, Mr. Minister, because it's just come to my attention the last . . . didn't have a chance to ask before and it wasn't the kind of things to ask in question period. And I know that you will look into these things, and also of that Kevin Williams I gave you this afternoon.

One must question, Mr. Minister . . . Somebody's kind of snickering about no Christmas presents over there. I don't know who it is, Mr. Chairman, but it's not very becoming of anyone when we're talking about young people being fired. And I think that it can be corrected because these things are not right. But it's not right for a member to laugh about it.

I question, Mr. Minister, yourself when you always said there'd be no political patronage and this government will stand on that and there hasn't been.

This is your quote from some time ago, maybe a year ago now. But I want to question you on Zach Douglas who was hired in the Economic Development department and climbed in a very short time to become the vice-president of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). Would he be involved with the PSC (Public Service Commission)?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Douglas in none of his jobs has passed through the Public Service Commission process. They've been Crown corporation or jobs at which the corporation is not . . . or the commission has not been involved.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have another one and I don't know where he came from, so that's why I'll have to ask the question. You'll have to inform me whether he came from a Crown or department. Mr. Ian Laidlaw — I hope I'm pronouncing that right — was let go from a government department. Do you know if that was a department or a Crown?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — I think this is the Mr. Laidlaw that has been raised during question period once or twice. Again, this individual has never passed through the Public Service Commission process. I believe that he was employed, if I remember the line of questioning, with SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) and was . . . That's a Crown corporation, as you know. And wherever it is that he's working now, it is not part of the public service proper, so that he's never passed through the Public Service Commission process.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, that's fine. My information was just the department, and I didn't know whether it was a Crown corporation. I have several like that, and I'll just leave those to the appropriate ministers in their Crowns. That's all the questioning I had left, Mr. Minister.

Item 2 agreed to.

Items 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 33 agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members of the Assembly I'd like to thank my officials for coming this afternoon and again this evening to assist the committee in its work.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I also would like to thank the officials, and we've had an hour and a half roughly, Mr. Minister, where we've got along very well. And we hope that all the questions that I've asked that you'll be supplying. I'm quite sure we'll get them in due course. And we just hope that you and I can get along as good this next hour or two on the next . . . on SPMC. I'm not quite, sometimes quite as good a humour in the evening but we'll see what we can do. And I again want to thank your officials and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**General Revenue Fund  
Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation  
Vote 53**

**The Chair:** — I would ask the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation to introduce the officials who have joined us here tonight.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce, to my left, Brian Woodcock, the president of the corporation, and to his left, Al Moffat. Al Moffat is the vice-president of commercial services. Immediately behind me is Rob Isbister, the director of financial planning and reporting, and to his left is John Law, senior vice-president of finance and accommodation.

**Item 1**

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister. I too would like to welcome your staff here this evening and we'll move on with some questioning.

Mr. Minister, I would like to start out . . . Firstly, when I finished off with the last minister on PSC, I was thinking that he was the minister coming on. I knew better, but I sent him off with too nice a departing. I'll have to be a little different with you now that he's got away. But I'll be very kind. I'll be as kind as I can, Mr. Minister, as long as you answer the questions.

I'd like to start out by asking a few questions about your ministerial staff — provide the names, job descriptions, qualifications, and salaries of your staff.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I think to expedite the process here I would just maybe send over a list of my ministerial staff. On it is their position, their salaries, and what their duties are with respect to the operation of my office.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know. Were you not asked to provide this ahead of time like different . . . like the other departments, information like this? Were you not asked for information prior?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, I was advised by my officials that we were asked for a list of information. That was not among the list of things, but I do have that list of the questions that were asked of us beforehand, and I can send that across to the member.

**The Chair:** — Order, order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — I had completed my answer, Mr. Chairman. I just would want to indicate to the member if he'd like I can pass across a copy of the list of the answers to the questions that were provided to us beforehand, if he would like.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, I'd appreciate that and seeing that

this wasn't asked, it should have been for the job descriptions and qualification, salaries of your staff. Maybe you could read that into the record, seeing that wasn't asked for so we will know what the salaries are and the names of your staff. Would you please read that page into the record.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, I can, Mr. Chairman. The chief of staff is Andrew Thomson at a salary of \$50,652. His duties are management and policy, House business, cabinet, caucus, and constituency liaison. The second ministerial assistant is Sean Caragata at a salary of \$41,448. His responsibilities are the Liquor Board, the Liquor Licensing Commission, and Gaming. The third ministerial assistant is Tricia Harding at a salary of \$34,716. Her responsibilities are directly with SPMC, Saskatchewan Forest Products. My secretarial staff is Sandra McLean at \$38,556. And do you want the job description on her as well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . She is secretary, cabinet and caucus documents, her areas of responsibility. Cindy Wolk at \$33,420; she is the first assistant secretary. She deals with department referrals, incoming correspondence. And the last secretarial staff is Michelle Kobayashi at 25,692. She is the second assistant secretary. She deals with outgoing correspondence, files, and supplies.

(1915)

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Did you inherit any staff from the previous minister when you became minister in this last year?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Not ministerial staff. The ministerial staff in my office was all new when I was sworn into cabinet.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — So when you became minister, this group of six was all new employees to your office. Did any of them transfer from another minister's office or were they all brand-new moving in?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — I can say that Mr. Thomson was originally, I think upon his employment with the Government of Saskatchewan, working for the government caucus. He was for a period of time working in Executive Council. He was then hired in the former minister of Finance's office and from the former minister of Finance's office he moved to my office as the second ministerial assistant and was later promoted to chief of staff.

Sean Caragata was hired from a position with a law firm in Ontario; Tricia Harding came from the University of Saskatchewan, I'm not sure what her previous employment was. I can't recall right now but we can find that for you. Sandra McLean worked in the civil service, I believe with the Fire Commission. Cindy Wolk, I'm just . . . It slips my mind where Ms. Wolk came from but I can find that for you. It was within the civil service, as was Michelle Kobayashi.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — That's fine, you don't have to give me that other name. It's not important . . . or the other, where she came from.

Mr. Minister, are all your staff working in Regina?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Do you have any other political staff located in Saskatoon or elsewhere in the province, political staff?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — No.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, we know that all the members of your staff are being paid from SPMC. I understand that, that's what you said tonight. Even though they have nothing to do with SPMC, they're paid from there. How are they all . . . How is your staff . . . what staff would look after SPMC duties or whatever? Like, they wouldn't all be working for SPMC. Would you break that down for me, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well first of all let me say to the member that they are . . . as the lead agency in my portfolio, Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation is responsible for the ministerial budget, for my office budget.

Within the framework of that budget, these employees are hired. They deal with budgetary issues, as you will know, having formerly been in cabinet; they deal with policy issues; and they deal with liaison with people throughout the province in terms of concerns that they have with government direction, government policy; and they feed that input to my office and through my office to the government department.

I would want to say that I am very pleased with the kind of attention that my staff deliver to the people of Saskatchewan. I think that they have been . . . for a group of young people, have done an exemplary job and I'm very proud of the work that they do.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, what other staff members do you have doing other duties? Like, you have other duties of government. Which ones does other duties and which ones are directly, nothing else but SPMC? That's what I more or less want.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well as I've indicated and read into the record, Mr. Minister, Mr. Caragata deals with the Liquor Board and Liquor Licensing Commission, Gaming; Tricia Harding has dealt with Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and Sask Forest Products which are other parts of my portfolio; my chief of staff, Andrew Thomson, deals with management and policy, House business, cabinet, caucus, and constituency liaison.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Well, Mr. Minister, you're saying they're all involved with SPMC, but still the paper you sent over to me here and what you read into the record, I only see one name, and that's Tricia Harding is SPMC. They all seem to have other duties. So looks to me like you've got at least five of your staff are paid by SPMC, but they don't work for SPMC. It just doesn't come clear with what you're saying, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well I think perhaps what I should do is clarify for the member from Arm River

because I'm not sure if he's familiar with the report of the Provincial Auditor. It may be that he hasn't read the appropriate parts as it deals with the hiring of ministerial assistants and how they are paid.

So let me just quote from chapter 6.

Appropriate departments, agencies, and Crown corporations which are legally permitted and which appear before the Committee of Finance should provide all furnitures, support services, ministerial assistants and any other goods or services required for the operation of Ministers' offices.

As a former member of the Executive Council and one who was involved in the structuring of the Property Management Corporation, I'm sure you're well aware that the Property Management Corporation reports to the Committee of Finance, and it appears before the Committee of Finance and as such is an appropriate vehicle to hire and to fund the ministerial office. And that's what it does.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, now this seems to be just a Property Management office as far as I can see, an SPMC office completely. Where does your salary come from then? Do they pay it too? Where's your salary come from?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well as you will know, my salary as an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) is paid in the same fashion that yours is, through the Legislative Assembly Office.

And my ministerial salary is paid by the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. That's where the ministerial budget is as you will, I would have assumed, have been aware how these things function. The ministerial assistants are all part and parcel of my budget and as such are funded from Property Management Corporation which, as I indicated, is an appropriate vehicle as the auditor has indicated in the auditor's report.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I understand the way it should be because I was in Executive Council and of course I understand the way it was run when we were there, but with you people you never know. It didn't have to be run that way. And I'm not saying that with you, Mr. Minister, because I don't know yet until we do a little more line of questioning here.

Mr. Minister, I got a commitment from the minister this afternoon that when we're talking about PSC that there was none of the ministers' offices were being paid in this manner, that they were all being paid by OCs (order in council) in Executive Council. So is your staff an OC being paid by Management Corporation or what are they? I mean, are they seconded or are they hired by OC and paid by Executive Council?

**The Chair:** — Order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, in answer to

the member's question, they are all under individual contracts to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, that puts us in some situation here because I got the wrong information from the Minister of Justice and the minister responsible for the Public Service Commission this afternoon, because he said absolutely that there wasn't one minister's office, that all the staff was hired by order in council and paid by the Executive Council.

Now we move into your department and it's the first department that I've had a chance to question since he left, and I need him back here . . . get him straightened out . . . or straighten out this situation. How come that we'd have the Minister of Justice, the high profile cabinet minister and I questioned him and questioned him on this, because we already knew from articles in papers that your staff was paid by SPMC. And now you say that they're on contract from SPMC. Now let's get this real, real straight.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the member's question, I guess I can . . . I wasn't here, I'm sorry, for the Public Service Commission estimates, and I guess we can review in *Hansard* what may have happened this afternoon.

I can only say that my former portfolios, my ministerial staff were paid in . . . before the reorganization of the departments, the ministerial staff were paid by the line departments that I was responsible for. There were some that were designated to Rural Development and some were designated to Natural Resources and that is how I understand the funding share works with respect to those. I can only say to you that the individual contracts that my staff have with the Property Management Corporation are appropriate. They correspond to the concerns of the Provincial Auditor, and I would want to say that we have been very careful in terms of making public the salaries of ministerial staff because we think the people of the province have a right to know.

We have not attempted, as the former administration did, to hide ministerial staff in Crown corporations, and I can suggest to you that the staff that I have hired are all . . . It's all been publicly documented. Their salaries are publicly documented. We have put them before the people because that's the type of government that we want to run. And I want to say as well that in compliance with the concerns of the auditor, we have done just that.

I would like to say as well, the cost of my staff is considerably down from what members of the former government were paying their staff, number one; and number two, that the numbers are down. I have six staff in my office. Under the former administration, I understand that there were eight ministerial assistants paid for through either the line departments or the agencies that these ministers represented.

We have as well standardized the wage scales for

these ministerial assistants. We have three levels depending on their role and depending on the job that they're asked to perform. My chief of staff, as I've indicated to you, is clearly paid more than the second in command who is paid more than the third in command. We have set up these rate structures because we feel that this is the fairest way, and we wanted to have uniform salaries across this portion of government. And we have attempted to do that, and I think we've achieved what we set out to accomplish.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not caring whether you have your staff paid out of whatever department. This doesn't make any difference. It's all . . . it's all funding. But what bothers me — and I know that this is the fact here, but I took the minister's word this afternoon and we can't go back into his estimates — but I took his word and I just took it for granted that this here article in the paper, that this staff is all . . . your staff is all paid under SPMC because he clearly said there wasn't any. So I took him at his word.

(1930)

So anyway he must have made a mistake and . . . but I don't understand why when you have your staff paid out of SPMC that your government is suing a Judy Bellay, an innocent woman because she was paid from a Crown corporation. What difference did it make? You're being paid from a Crown corporation, your staff, and you think it's all right. And is it . . . did it make a difference whether somebody didn't put it in the paper that Judy was being paid from a Crown corporation? Can you explain that, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well, in answer to the member's question, let me say this: that the staff who were paid as ministerial assistants to work in the minister's office actually work in the minister's office and perform duties out of the minister's office, for the minister and for the people of Saskatchewan.

I would say that that was not necessarily the finding of the Provincial Auditor when he sent down the special auditor's report. And I think the member's well aware of that. But I don't want to get into politics here. What I want to do is be open and explain, very concisely, how my staff are paid, the amounts that they are paid, and I don't want to rehash the 1980s and what happened in the . . . in the former administration. Although we can do that if you want; if you want to get into that we can certainly reminisce a little bit. And that's fair and fine.

What we want to do here today is to be open and up front with respect to how the Property Management Corporation runs, now in the 1990s . . . post the election of 1991. And I want to say with respect to that, that this corporation has a mandate to serve government departments and Crowns, and we intend to do that.

And we intend to do that in fair and an open way, and as cost effectively as we can possibly . . . we can possibly manage. And I want to say that we have, as a matter of fact, made some changes in Property

Management Corporation that are going to substantially save money for the people of this province.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Well then if you done so many things — I had some more questions to ask you, but maybe we'll just stop right there. If you've done so many things in Property Management to save the taxpayers some money, then tell us. Put it on the record; tell us exactly what you're doing and be factual.

I mean it's easier for you ministers to stand over there, holier-than-thou and say that, we do this and we do that; we do it better than you. And it's easier for you to say, Mr. Minister, that, oh I've got less staff than the minister before me or the minister when we were in power. That's like comparing apples and oranges, Mr. Minister. We don't know how many other departments he had. I understand you've just got SPMC and Liquor Board. Is that correct? Well then, the other minister maybe had a lot more. In fact, I know he did. So you can't compare apples and oranges, whether a minister had eight in his staff or six, or whatever.

But let's just go ahead and talk about that for a little while. You said you've done such wonderful things, and maybe you're right — and I hope you're right, for the sake of the taxpayer of Saskatchewan. I hope you've made some moves in SPMC to save the taxpayer money. Now just tell us and put it on the record and be exact.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — If you're that curious, I say to the member from Arm River, I'm going to give you one example of how we saved the province of Saskatchewan some money. We closed down the premier's office in Prince Albert, and in the premier's office in Prince Albert worked one Gordon Dobrowolsky — and I'm sure you're well aware of him. Well since we closed down the premier's office in Prince Albert, we were able to save some money, not only on future rent and office furniture and utilities, but we were able to save the cost of the salary of Gordon Dobrowolsky, and we've done that. And that's part of a payment of \$629,922 that the Property Management Corporation was paying for employees who didn't work at Property Management Corporation or work in the minister's office as part of the minister's budget, through that. So we saved the people of this province a few dollars on Mr. Dobrowolsky's salary. We, I think, did a fairly good job.

I understand there was two staff working in the Future Corporation that were billed to SPMC. Well they're no longer paid by SPMC so we've saved the people of Saskatchewan some money on that.

We've, I think, done a number of things in terms of positions. We've embarked on some early retirements and we've managed to reduce, in '93-94, 20 positions through attrition. And I think those are all important things.

And the downsizing of this government is important in terms of getting control of our debt, getting control of the provincial debt, and the amount that we're spending on interest every year. And I think all of these things that we've done in the Crown corporations and in the line departments, and what we've done in terms of consolidating line departments — and as an example, we're consolidating the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Liquor Board with the Gaming Commission; we expect to save more money there.

I want to say to the member from Arm River, we're not done because we think we have a lot of trimming to do in government yet. And I want to say that as we do this trimming and as we downsize government and as we save real costs to the people of Saskatchewan, this year I am understanding that our costs of operating this government are down some 3 per cent, and I think that's a very good start. I think there's a lot more we can do, but we're going to continue in that way.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, that all sounds good if it was all factual. Now you're probably cutting down a little bit in, like you say, in SPMC. You make it sound good for the listeners out there tonight but you're neglecting to say that we still have to have . . . the Premier's got to be elected again.

And so what do you do? You save a few dollars in SPMC. You just said that you saved this and you saved that and you closed the Prince Albert office and you got rid of some staff up there, but you didn't talk about the \$800,000 that's gone to the Deputy Premier to be the political boy out there, and who he hires.

And you can talk all you want about it. It sounds good to the people out there in Saskatchewan but you don't fool the people that know and you're not fooled yourself. Because you can do all the downsizing in government you want. It costs . . . We used to have 23 ministers one time and everybody complained so much, went back down to 16. And it was very little money saved because you had to hire more staff. The 16 ministers were so busy they had to have some legislative secretaries.

And you people have got extra money. You hire . . . you find out that the ministerial staff, the Executive Council, why you're not having your people paid out of Executive Council is because the Executive Council figure will be too high. We'll get on that with the Premier when we get there, why he's trying to keep his Executive Council price tag down so they pay your department out of SPMC.

So don't think that you're fooling people out there saying, oh we're cutting down the size of government, cutting down here. That only puts a drop in the bucket of the \$15 billion that you people left for us to take over in 1982.

You sound so . . . and your people know that I'm right on it because I'm going to have this sent over to you. I'm going to send it to every minister that I talk to until this House closes. And it shows you right there that where this here deficit that we're trying to save, and

the smoke and mirrors that you're going through . . . and you've seen that before. Your own Deputy Premier that sits right in front of you there, he says that we know it's \$5 billion, but it's . . . actually he admits there was a \$3.5 billion debt that we took over in 1982 and he admits it, from the total from the departments, the Crowns, and it's admitted and it's a fact. If you take \$3.5 billion in 1982 and put it to 1993 figures, you got 14-some-billion dollars debt. And if you don't understand it, I'll explain it to you, if you don't understand it. Because everything you say, every minister that I've heard talking on estimates is always going back that we have to have our cut-backs, we've got to do this because of the Tory deficit that was left by you, this legacy we took over from us.

Well I'll tell you, for us to take over that 3.5 billion — we think it's 4.8, but it's admitted by 3.5 — admitted by when he was the minister of Finance and that was under Appropriation Bill in June 1992, and now that's a fact. So you tried to make people think that this is all . . . You've misled the people in Saskatchewan. You said that we left — and I'm not saying you particular, because you weren't a cabinet minister at that time and you weren't out, maybe as some people in the front row, saying to people that we have absolutely left them a balanced budget and we're going to get these figures out to Saskatchewan. It's getting out there fast because people are very, very surprised.

And the reason why I bring it up even in your estimates, I was going to bring it up on the other minister and I neglected to. Every minister that we have estimates left, I'm going to tell him to read this and read it carefully and quit telling the people of Saskatchewan that you left us absolutely a zero deficit because you didn't. It's just exactly like if I, Mr. Minister, if I buy a farm or a business for \$100,000 and I pay for it and think it's all right, then fine, there's another 100,000 tag goes along with it. And that's exactly what you people left us.

So every time we ask you a question why you cut back, why you fired people, why . . . Every time you speak, every time even the ministers speak in question period or whatever, we have to get this little lesson because we're doing it because you people done it to us. Well it's not true. You misled all of Saskatchewan.

So don't stand there and tell me that you're doing this . . . holier-than-thou way you're answering here tonight, that oh, we're cutting back on SPMC and you didn't put a figure on it.

So I want a figure in dollars and cents because if you're . . . Like I asked the minister this afternoon if he knew how much money was saved from the 289 cut-backs. Then he didn't know. Well if you don't know what you're saving by getting rid of 289 employees — putting them practically on to welfare, that's where they're going if they can't get another job — and you don't know the figure, what did you do it for?

So tell us exactly what the figures that you're saying . . . because you brought it up, I didn't. What are the dollars and cents saved at SPMC by these here little

cut-backs you're talking about?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd be more than willing to do that. We've reduced SPMC's budget by 24 per cent to \$133.2 million, \$5.9 million or 4.2 per cent in '93-94 alone. And I want to just, if I can, just talk for a few minutes about how we did that.

In '92-93, SPMC had 70 occupied positions and 107 vacant positions eliminated and that saved the corporation in the neighbourhood of \$3 million. We implemented new cleaning standards and eliminated private cleaning contracts and that resulted in a saving of 1.3 million. We introduced an energy management program that saved the corporation in the neighbourhood of \$200,000 a year.

Now \$200,000 is maybe not an awful lot of money in the bigger scheme of things. But when you add the 200,000's and you started adding them together and you come up with a nice little tidy sum. And that's how we've been able to cut back on government expenditures, just a few of those things.

We downsized in the '92-93 budget and we abolished the 177 positions and that required 70 lay-offs of staff in May 5 of '92. We took a look at the space of Property Management Corporation's head office and we moved from 2045 Broad Street which was leased space, to 1940 Lorne Street which is government owned space. And our calculations are that we saved in the neighbourhood of \$700,000 a year just on that one move alone.

And I say to the member from Arm River, I think there's . . . and you're a businessman, you're a farmer, a businessman as I am, and I think you understand the need of putting the nickels together to make the dollars to make the bank account balance. You've been in this House a lot longer than I have and clearly a much more experienced member, but I know that you understand that concept and I believe that's the way you run your business as I attempt to run mine.

And I don't think there's any secret to government. I don't think there's any secret to knowing how much your revenues and trying to do a reasonable forecast as to how much your revenues are and having a close look at your expenditures on an annual basis to see where you can trim those little frills.

And I don't want to refer to the 70 positions that we eliminated as being frivolous because they're not. They're a very serious impact and those are very tough decisions that government has made in terms of getting the cost of government in hand. So I just say that we've got more examples of things that we have done to cut the cost of operating this corporation and I'm more than willing to share them with you.

But I guess I will just finish my answer by saying that we've reduced by 24 per cent the cost of operating this corporation. We brought it down some 24 per cent, to around \$133 million. I think that's a real good accomplishment.

And I want to say, as a matter of fact I had a meeting with the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation management team just this week, and it was one of the things that was brought to my attention. We talked about the possibility of increasing the savings to the government by the delivery of services the Property Management Corporation does. And Mr. Law brought to my attention — and that's why I know these figures — the fact that the Property Management Corporation has in fact done a fairly reasonable job in terms of doing its share in working to get the provincial deficit under control.

(1945)

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, yes, I thank you for that information. And if it turns out to be that way and you're saving that kind of dollars and cents, then I appreciate your remarks, and I'll congratulate you for it, because that's what we want you to do, is the saving of money for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Because we all know in this last few years we're going into a serious economic . . . we're in it, very serious economic conditions. And if you can do that . . . but I just hope it doesn't turn out that you just put figures together. And I'm not going to doubt your word. I don't know you very well, but the minister of PSC this afternoon, he maybe just made a mistake, but did give me wrong information. I hope your information is right for the sake of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

So I'm going to . . . I've just got one more question on your staff and then I'm going to move to a different kind of questions entirely. I believe that an Andrew Thomson — he's the highest paid of your staff — is doing constituency work while being paid out of SPMC. How do you explain that, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I should correct the member in terms of Mr. Thomson's role. He attends the constituency work with me when I return on constituency business. We have in my riding — no different than many other ridings — people who are concerned and who are interested in the functioning and the way the corporations under my purview, under my portfolio operate, and he attends to meetings with me in my constituency. His home town is Prince Albert, so I'm assuming he gets home on weekends; I don't check with him that closely, in terms of when he goes home. But I can say this to you: Mr. Thomson is not paid to do political work in my home community and when he's on government time, he does government business. That's what he's paid to do, and that's what I expect from all of my staff.

To suggest that these people are never back in my riding would be inaccurate because that's not true. We have, as all MLAs do, I have a joint constituency office with two other MLAs from the area; that's where a lot of local concerns are raised. But a lot of times there becomes a question by one of my constituents, and on occasion by one of your constituents, to which Mr. Thomson will attend. And that's his function,

that's what he gets paid for and that's what he does.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I thank you for that. We've asked many ministers those kind of questions, and I've been here, like you know, quite a few years — I was four years in opposition before and now I'm back in opposition — and not too many ministers will answer as straightforward as you did there, and I thank you for it. You've admitted that he does constituency work and there's nothing wrong with that. So if he's not doing it on government time, that's . . . I like to give credit when credit is due, so if you're saying that and I believe you, and I call that an honest answer.

So, Mr. Minister, we're going to ask you some other questions here. Do any of your assistants travel in conducting their work? Like . . . (inaudible) . . . please provide me with the total your department has spent on ministerial assistant travel expenses. Do you have answers you can give me to that?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, as the member will know, I haven't been in this portfolio that long, and so the travel costs that would have been charged to the Property Management Corporation are not that large. I can pass across my costs, my travel costs, as well. All I have is for the month of March, which is a partial figure. I haven't got April or May's with us. We can attempt to get that for you.

So there are two flights that I have taken at \$125 each; there's one for \$105, and I don't know . . . No, there's one from the former minister, \$105 to attend meetings with a CVA (central vehicle agency) car. Sean Caragata, parking costs \$3, parking costs \$3. And I believe this would have been by the former minister's assistant, meetings in Saskatoon and North Battleford for 84.95 for a total of \$449.30. So if you'd like, I can pass that across, or if you want to take it from *Hansard*, whatever.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, just for the sake of time here, I'm going to just include my request at once, and you can just take it out of *Hansard* tomorrow and just give it to us later on. This is what I want.

I would like full details . . . what I'm asking . . . the time period that I want this for is not while you've been minister, for the office because there is going to be a minister before you, so naturally I want it for the year that we're talking in question here, the year of the budget year. I would like full details of this travel including the assistants' name, total cost per trip, the purpose of the travel, mode of travel, who they accompanied, the minister or departmental officials, and destination.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly didn't attempt to mislead the member. The figures that I read into the record were for the whole fiscal year, and I was not aware. We thought that they were for the month of March. But I'm led to believe that these are for the whole year, but we can certainly pass that information that you've requested

on to you.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I've already asked you the question. You gave it the report about your own ministerial travel in which you haven't been a minister that long, so that's fine. But your departmental staff now — that's in the department now — what is the total number employed at SPMC?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, to answer the member's question, the exact number as of March 31, 1993, is 1,045 employees and that's down from March 31, 1992, from 1,142 employees. So it's roughly a decrease of 100 employees.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. What is the total salary paid to these people? And if you've got several officials there, so maybe I can ask several questions at once here to speed things up. What is the total salary paid to these people? What was the total employed last year . . . but you already gave me that information. What was the total salary last year? Have you got that straight, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, maybe just to speed this up, this is all part of the parcel that I just sent over. But I'll certainly read it into the record. The salary for '93 was \$34,080,513; for the previous year, for '92, the figure was \$41,708,854, roughly a decrease of \$7 million.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Yes, when I ask a question that's in this material you gave me, you just have to remind me because I have no way could I get through it to see what's there. And I think you understand that.

I'm just going to ask a question about the Echo Valley Conference Centre. What is the status of Echo Valley Conference Centre?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, just to give a brief update with respect to the Echo Valley Conference Centre, we are still in the process of negotiations. We are really quite encouraged by the comments from the officials in the federal department of defence. We are certainly hopeful that the federal government will follow through with the proposal as we have put forth to them. We think, as many people do, that it's a very good proposal. It's good for Saskatchewan and it's good for the people who would use the conference centre. So we were, as I said, very encouraged by the remarks and statements made by the federal department of defence and we're certainly hopeful that we'll be in a position to make a public announcement soon.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, was there a federal . . . was the federal government involved in that negotiations or contract?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well as the member may be aware, there was a statement made by federal officials some weeks ago who had indicated that they felt the process of negotiations was very fruitful and that we

were going to be very shortly in a position to sign a contract.

What we were looking for when we looked at the Echo Valley Centre was a low-cost conference centre so that we could entice people, different groups who come into the province. And it certainly seemed to us that the Department of National Defence was just a real legitimate candidate with respect to the cadets and the types of facilities that they look for.

And this is why we entered into negotiations with the federal government. And quite clearly there have been negotiations and we're certainly hopeful that we can make an announcement in the near future.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, thank you. Now I understand in July of 1992 the government announced that they were negotiating the sale of Echo Valley Conference Centre but that it was being held up by the Star Blanket Indian Band who made a claim to the property as part of a land entitlement. What is happening with this?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, the caveat by the Star Blanket Band is still in place and will remain in place while we're in the process of negotiations with the federal government, the discussions with the local communities, and with the Indian bands as well. So we are, as I've indicated, hopeful that we can find a speedy resolve to this issue.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, okay, that's okay for that. But I have a couple of questions here on some SPMC legal battles that you're involved in. Rod Hiltz, 17 years of experience at SPMC, was fired when the NDP (New Democratic Party) took office in 1991. Where is this court case at?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — As the member will know, this issue is before the court so there is limited information that I can share other than what is public knowledge, frankly.

And I'm told that there was an examination for discovery on May 19 in 1992. There was a pre-trial conference held on November 13 of '92 without settlement. And I understand that the matter will now proceed to the courts. And there's — as I understand it — a date set for early June in Prince Albert.

(2000)

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. The other one was Ray — and I don't know if I'm pronouncing it right or not — Ray Fiaber, F-i-a-b-e-r, was also fired and also took your government to court. Where's this case at or is it in the same position?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — I'm told that the examination for discovery was originally scheduled to start on January 26, 1993. But to date, no examination for discovery has been held. And I'm led to believe that negotiations are still ongoing.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Just a



question. I'm pretty near through asking questions, and the member for Morse is going to ask some of you. My last question I'm going to ask you, Mr. Minister, is on executive air. Mr. Minister, please provide total monies spent on executive air flight within the province for the past year.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact numbers here, but we can get those to you. What I do have here are the approved amounts for executive air for 1992-93: 1.326 million. And for the '93-94 year, in the budget there is approved \$1.117 million. But I'll get the exact figure in terms of how much the actual costs of running executive air were in the last year.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, Mr. Minister, I would appreciate it you could get that. And as well, I'll give you what I want. I don't think you'll have this either. Please provide totals for each minister as well. You should be able to put a breakdown on that. Maybe you have that now; I don't know. You could get us that information if you haven't got it now.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll pass across a list with a breakdown of the amount that the individual ministers have charged to executive air . . . or have had charged by executive air, as well as the amount that were spent on charters. But I can tell you that the total aggregate is \$200,696 for all of the travel.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'd like to have a breakdown please, if you would, if you could give me a breakdown on the out-of-province flights over the last year per minister. Will you be able to provide that also?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, we have the amounts billed. We don't have them with us here, but for the out-of-province travel done by executive air, we have those figures available and we can supply those to you.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Another question: do any of the ministers use other companies for flights?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, and to the member from Arm River, that's included in the amount that you have there on charters. That's the total aggregate amount that is spent on executive air and on charters as well.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. How much staff is employed at exec air? What is the amount budgeted for salaries out there?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — We're just looking those figures up. If you want to ask another question and then we can get that answer to you as soon as we find them.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, yes, I just have one last question while they're looking that up. It's kind of a ticklish question; I hate to even ask it but I have to. We understand that

Transport Canada is currently investigating executive air. Is it true that the pilot and engineer are under investigation for fraud and that they have been suspended with pay until the investigation is over? If this is true, how much of the taxpayers' money is going toward each of these individual salaries? In addition, how much money are they accused of stealing?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, I have the answers here with respect to the salaries and benefits. The aggregate amount is \$513,200, and the number of employees are 11. And I'll get an answer to you with respect to your last question.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, did I hear accurately that your salary is being paid by SPMC, the amount of money that is coming for your ministerial salary?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to . . . in answer to the member from Arm River's question with respect to executive aircraft. There is an investigation ongoing by the Department of Transport, and pending the results of that investigation, two employees have been suspended with pay. We are awaiting the Department of Transport to come in with the results of their investigation, and as I've indicated there are two employees that are suspended with pay until the results of that comes in.

With respect to the ministerial salary, I may have been in error to the member from Morse. I'm told by my officials that ministerial salaries come from Executive Council or from the Legislative Assembly. The MLA salary for sure comes from the Legislative Assembly Office, but the ministerial salary, I guess, if all ministerial salaries come from Executive Council, then this would be no different. But I can double check that just to be sure.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well there is, Mr. Minister, a significant difference in my view from where it would be coming. That's why I was interested in your answer that you gave earlier. Your car, is that . . . your CVA vehicle, is that supplied by SPMC?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, it is, Mr. Member.

**Mr. Martens:** — Would you provide back to me the answer for the question I raised about the ministerial salary at some point in time so that we can know who's paying that?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, we will. We'll get back to you with that answer.

**Mr. Martens:** — I listened with some interest regarding the information you provided about how you rationalized your staffing and the payments through SPMC. How do you rationalize and justify the work of your staff that work for . . . responsibilities as you suggested about constituency work being paid for by SPMC? And how do you rationalize those that work in doing responsibility as it relates to the Liquor

Board and then being paid for by SPMC?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, the member from Morse, I don't want him to misinterpret what I referred to as constituency work. I guess what I'm saying is that from time to time I will deal with, as a minister, issues that arise in my constituency, as well as yours and the member from Arm River.

It is not, as you will know, having been a member of Executive Council, an uncommon occurrence for ministerial assistants to travel with the ministers as part of their duties. And my ministerial staff acts in certainly no different fashion. In terms of constituency work, that's what I refer to.

On government time my ministerial assistants are expected to do . . . perform their duties, as I have outlined to the member from Arm River. They are designated and I have no reason to believe that they perform in any other fashion. If you have any evidence or any indication that members of my staff have been acting inappropriately, I will deal with that in the appropriate fashion.

**Mr. Martens:** — I'm not concerned about it. I know how that works and I understand the value they are as you go about your business and realizing that you have to have some connection with your office regardless of where you are, and it's important that you have a person that realizes on that responsibility. I have no problem with that.

I just wanted to know how you rationalize the SPMC paying for that, and what's your rationale for doing that? And also, how do you rationalize the SPMC paying for the Liquor Board work that you do and the Gaming Commission that you do? That's the question I had.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well I guess in order to justify this, I should perhaps maybe do a little history. As you will know, the Property Management Corporation began in 1986. Prior to that, it operated as a line department for a number of different reasons. And I still to this day don't understand why the need to design and to put in place a Crown corporation.

But I do know that the costs to turn it back to a line department, I'm told, would be in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million dollars, which I would see to be, at this point in our province's history, a waste of money because it performs the same function as a Crown corporation as it would if it were a line department.

And I take you back to the history of the corporation as it related to its life as a line department. It was called Supply and Services, Public Works, Government Services, but whatever name it was under, it still basically performed the same function.

Now Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation isn't a line department; it's a Crown corporation. But whether it's Crown or whether it's a line department, the appropriateness of a line

department paying for ministerial staff, I think really is no different than the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation paying the salaries of ministerial staff.

Now you may disagree with that, but I think if you look at the history of this Crown corporation, and if you look at the legal aspects as to whether it's legal, you may argue that the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation shouldn't be a Crown corporation, that it should in fact be turned back to a line department. And I guess other than the cost effectiveness and the costs of doing that, I would at this point tend not to agree. But whether it's a line department, whether it's a Crown corporation, the function is the same.

(2015)

And the ministerial staff are paid by the Crown corporation as they would be if Saskatchewan Property Management Corp was a line department. So really the only difference from prior to 1986 may be the number of ministerial staff, and we can debate that too, but I think what is important is the history of this Crown, what its function is, and whether or not it's appropriate to pay ministerial staff from this Crown corporation. You will say to me that you believe it's not. Well I take you through the history, and I say in terms of the legality of it, there's certainly no problem.

In terms of the appropriateness of ministerial staff being paid by a Crown or a line department, historically that's the way it's been done. So I would say other than whether we want to debate whether or not we turn it back to a line department, I guess just cost is probably where I might disagree.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I never inferred or implied that it should go back to a line department or wherever, and the history. I just know that sitting in Crown Corporations Committee, every time there was a minister who had ministerial staff paid for by a Crown corporation, the ridicule and derision that came from members of that Crown Corporations Committee who were on your side of the government was interesting. And the reason that it's interesting today, Mr. Minister, is that you are taking individuals from a Crown corporation and having them sit in your office, and that is what I find really interesting.

As a matter of fact, if you rationalize yourself into that kind of a position because it used to be a line department, let me just read into the record or give the public an overview of Sask Water Corporation. Sask Water Corporation was a part of Department of Environment, was a part of the Department of Agriculture, was a part of Urban Affairs, and I even forget the other department that it was a part of. And that, Mr. Minister, is a fact.

Now if you want to use the rationalization in determining that because at one time it was Revenue and Financial Services, that's the reason and the rationale for doing it, I never ever said it was wrong. It was you and your party that said it was the wrong

thing to do. And now you're turning around and you're making that point to us and saying, well because it was this and this and that, that rationalizes the decision you made to have your ministerial staff paid for by a Crown corporation.

You said you would never do it. I didn't say you shouldn't, but you said you wouldn't do it. And I say if your salary comes from Executive Council, then in the rationalization and the determination of Executive Council doing the job and doing the job right, you should take that into consideration and have that ministerial staff paid for by Executive Council because that's what you decided you wanted to have done. And you said you would never, ever pay ministerial staff out of a Crown corporation.

Now that's the part that is really interesting coming from this side of the House. And the media reported it also as being a very interesting observation. You probably could rationalize every one of the Crown corporations into that very same instance. You could probably do it with SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance).

I'll just raise two more for you, sir. Crop Insurance Corporation today is a Crown corporation. Crop Insurance is now a part of the Department of Agriculture. So the Minister of Agriculture, in the same arguments you just used, could say, well I need somebody in the Crop Insurance Corporation to give me assistance in the Crown corporation, because he may need some expertise that is exactly as it relates to the Crown corporation called Sask Crop Insurance. You could rationalize the same thing with Ag Credit Corporation. Exactly the same arguments.

And yet you turn it around and say that one time it was bad, it was the wrong thing to do, and now you turn around and say, well because I do it, it's right. And that, Mr. Minister, is what I want the public to know is that you are doing contrary to what you said you were going to do.

And that's why I wanted to have the rationalization and how you justified the option that you made available to yourself and to the other members of Executive Council. And your rationalization, I have no problem with it. In fact, that's how every one of us rationalized that decision in times gone by. However, you said you'd never do it, and that's the difference.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be argumentative. As the member knows, we've spent long hours in this legislature, you and I, and rarely we get into much of an encounter, but on this one I think we have to disagree.

I think the issue, I say to the member from Morse, is accountability. And I remember well the debate in Crown Corporations and in Crown corporation estimates. And the debate at that time was not in so much as who paid the ministerial assistants, but whether or not there was accountability for the ones that were paid, and whether the general public were aware of who worked in these Crowns and how much

they were paid.

Well clearly today we've opened up the salaries of ministerial assistants, not only Property Management Corporation, but Agriculture and Health and all of them. We publish on a regular basis any promotions that ministerial assistants receive, and I think that's a very positive step. With respect to accountability, as you will know, the Property Management Corporation reports to the Committee of Finance; that's what we're doing here. There's a open forum where you can ask questions. You can ask about the ministerial staff, what their role is, how much they're paid, and I think that's good, and that's the way it should be.

This corporation also reports to Crown Corporations, so in some ways we're even more accountable, I guess, than what a line department would be, say, as an example, the Department of Agriculture which only reports to the Committee of Finance. Property Management Corporation, I repeat, reports not only here but to Crown Corporations.

With respect to your question on ministerial payment, it does and is a line item. It's under vote 10, Executive Council. And I believe it's on page 51. And my ministerial salary would be included in that.

**Mr. Martens:** — I haven't got my book. On page 51, is that the vote that deals with the Crown corporation SPMC or is that a separate item that deals specifically as an Executive Council payment to the minister's office?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — To the member, it's on page 51 under Executive Council, vote 10, item 6, titled "Members of the Executive Council (Authorized by Law) (Subvote EX06)."

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I want to ask a few questions about CVA vehicles. How many have you purchased this year, and did you take a volume that had asked for bids on these cars or vehicles that you purchased? I'd like to know how many you purchased and for what price and whether it was tendered and when it was done.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, the answer to the member's question is that we purchased 292 vehicles for a total amount of 4.5 million, and it was tendered.

**Mr. Martens:** — How many suppliers did the 292 vehicles come from?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — We can get back with that information. I don't have that here, but we can get that to you.

**Mr. Martens:** — Would you be able to provide me the volume of dollars for each of the bids that were received for each of the vehicle dealerships that received the bid?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, we'd be happy to

supply that.

**Mr. Martens:** — In that information I'll find out how many were purchased in Prince Albert too, I guess. And that's only good business, Mr. Minister. The office space in the province . . . Well first of all I'll go back to these vehicles. Can you give me a description of what kinds of vehicles they were, the types of vehicles, whether they were trucks for Parks or cars or just exactly the details of each of that 292 volume?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1993 vehicles ordered were three compact sedans, 26 . . . no, three sub-compacts, 26 compacts, 34 mid-size sedans, 41 mid-sized wagons and mini vans, 2 full-size sedans, 2 full-size wagons, 26 compact pickups, 48 cargo vans, 13 personnel carriers, 10 four-by-four pickups, 44 two-wheel drive pickups, 41 one-ton trucks, and 2 one-ton trucks, I assume that would be . . . 2 two-ton trucks.

**Mr. Martens:** — Were these purchases made on behalf of all of government, the line departments and Crown corporations, or just line departments and SPMC?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — The list is too long, in terms of the ones that we supply. We don't have that now. But we can get that to you, in terms of who we've supplied vehicles to.

**Mr. Martens:** — Okay. You are referring to individuals who you supply the cars to, and within the framework of the line departments, that's the response that you gave me? I'm not sure just what it was that you suggested.

What I wanted to have was the volumes of cars that are purchased not only by SPMC, but is there a group of vehicles that you would buy for SaskPower Corporation or SaskTel or any of those Crown corporations? And that's what I wanted the information on. And the details of that I'd like to have provided.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do supply to SaskTel. We don't supply to SaskPower. So it's not all of the Crown corporations that Property Management Corporation supplies, but we do supply all of the line departments and some of the Crowns. And the aggregate amount of vehicles that we've purchased on behalf of those who have used Property Management Corporation is 292.

**Mr. Martens:** — I'd like a list of all those Crown corporations and the vehicles also that you supply to them and then have on hand. That would be information that would be of value to us too, so that if you supply them for SaskTel, you should have a certain volume of vehicles that you have available. And I'd like you to provide that for us, if you don't mind.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — That's no problem.

**Mr. Martens:** — Can you provide for us the aggregate

volume of office space that you have in the province of Saskatchewan along with the amounts that there would be in certain locations? Can you provide that if it's, let's say, in Regina that you have X amount of space in Regina, and then have occupied and unoccupied; in North Battleford, occupied and unoccupied; and going throughout the province? Can you do that for us?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, we can supply that for you.

**Mr. Martens:** — Would you also provide to me or for us a list of the furniture that you supplied to the various agencies in the province of Saskatchewan. I'd like to have that list, too, if you could.

(2030)

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — In response to the member from Morse's question, we're purchasing \$50,000. As I understand it, that's the figure.

**Mr. Martens:** — I didn't quite hear you. You purchased 50,000 or . . .

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — In '93-94 we'll be purchasing \$50,000 worth of furniture.

**Mr. Martens:** — Fifty thousand dollars worth of furniture in '93. What's the inventory that is on hand in the province on furniture? Do you have any inventory volume or do you do an inventory volume at the conclusion of every year for . . . an inventory for SPMC on office furniture and including chairs, tables, desks, computers, and all of those kinds of things?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — To the member from Morse, what I can give you is the depreciated value in 1992 was 5.039 million. When inventory was transferred to the corporation in 1986-87 when the corporation was established, there was no inventory taken of the furniture that was moved in, so we have no way to base any kind of an inventory base. So all we can do is account for what we purchase on an annual basis and we depreciate that in the appropriate way.

**Mr. Martens:** — You mean to tell me that you don't have an inventory supply list of the \$5 million worth of assets that you have on hand, that you know that you've got 6,000 typewriters and 3,000 computers and all of that sort of thing — you mean you don't have that list available so that you know what kind of an inventory base you've got?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well as I've explained to the member, in 1986-87 when the former administration put this corporation into place, there was no inventory taken of what came from the line departments. And subsequent to that, there isn't a piece-by-piece inventory in terms of 16 desks, 17 desks. It's an aggregate figure and it's depreciated by the age of . . . I would understand by the age of the equipment that is purchased. But as it is, there's no itemized inventory list. It's an aggregate figure that was handled in the same fashion as the former

administration handled it.

**Mr. Martens:** — Okay, I don't have a problem with that. What I wanted to tell you, though, is that I just received information saying that all of the MLAs' equipment and office supplies and all of that is going to be identified now. And everybody who is sitting in this Assembly is going to have to identify every piece of furniture that he bought from supplies made available to a member. And we're going to identify every one and you're going to keep an inventory list of that and you're not even going to keep an inventory list of what you've been doing for the last 10 years or eight years.

And so on the one hand you're asking us to supply you a list of goods and services purchased with the allowances paid for by members or to members in lieu of providing a service to constituencies. And on the other hand you don't provide . . . take that same dynamic and make it available and require that office supplies in offices around the province and that they don't have an inventory list. You tell me which business runs that way.

You got \$5 million worth of assets. You don't know whether you got \$3 million worth of assets in overhead projectors and movie screens or slide screens and slide projectors and all of those kinds of things. You don't have any idea what you've got. And I would say that maybe it's time you did an inventory list in order to establish what you have there. Making the MLAs accountable is a reasoned approach and I have no problem with that. However, the reason I ask, you're going to have MLAs be required to do that and you're not going to have government employees required to do that and I think you need to have both of that happen.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, to answer the member's question, the Property Management Corporation has looked at this. The cost as they estimate it would be in the neighbourhood of a half a million dollars to do an inventory and then to maintain from that would be, I would assume, another cost. But let me say with respect to inventorying MLAs' office furniture, I think that it's a positive thing that the Board of Internal Economy has done.

I think the members of the legislature have shown some leadership, and I would want to say as well to the member opposite that two members of his caucus sit on that board and supported the inventorying. So I'm really pleased to see that they will support the new direction of this government with accountability and doing the right accounting procedures.

I want to say that I am sure the Property Management Corporation would have undertaken an inventory had the budget pressures not been as extreme as they are. Hopefully in 1994 we can find within the budget of the Property Management Corporation half a million dollars to do the inventory and an analysis of the inventory that may satisfy your desire for an accountable government which I can say to you that all members of this side share. Hopefully when we

alleviate some of the budget pressures that this government is operating under, we can accomplish an inventory list for the furniture that Property Management Corporation manages.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I think that you are neglecting your responsibility as a minister in not having provided to the . . . and have your staff receive and require from offices all the way across this province the amount of equipment, the services provided in each of those locations, because you don't know how many overhead projectors you've got. And you don't know how many you need. Somebody just told you you have to order three new ones.

So I say to you it's going to be money saved by understanding, first of all, your inventory list, your inventory supply, and then making these supplies available to other agencies when they're required, and then they won't have to buy them. So if you've got two in one office and none in the other, you can move one over.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that it's time to consider that as an option because I believe that it's an important part of maintaining supply and an inventory. Just the same way as you know just about every vehicle that you have on hand, it is significant also to know how many computers you have on hand and how many you don't need and how many you should get rid of, in each one of those areas. And I think you need to have that inventory and an inventory control of that, equally as well with your staff as you do with everyone else in the province, and I think it's absolutely necessary.

I even believe that you could save money and you could rationalize the decision to have that inventory control dealt with. You could save money doing it and save the province money in capital expenditures in relation to those items in that inventory.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well I guess maybe I should clarify because I think we're lumping a lot of different items here together. And I want to say that each department keeps a list of computers, typewriters, all of the electronic equipment of that nature. And what I was referring here to was just office furniture, desks, maybe room dividers, tables, those kinds of things.

But I want to say that I commend the member for his suggestion because I think it's a good suggestion and I think it makes sense. And a former minister's Property Management Corporation had thought . . . had you been, when the former administration was in power, perhaps the minister of Property Management Corporation, you could have had this done. But I want to say that it's operated since 1986 without that inventory.

I think it makes some good sense and I'm going to ask the officials to have a very close look at the costing and what it might cost to do an inventory on this office furniture as we do keep an inventory with computers and typewriters. And I think it's a good idea and I'm

taking your suggestion under advisement.

**Mr. Martens:** — Another question I want to ask you. When arrangements were made prior to moving the assets and the liabilities of health facilities out of Property Management Corporation into the Consolidated Fund and the debt was moved there, municipalities throughout the province cost-shared the construction of acute care side of each one of those facilities in an integrated facility. And the municipalities paid 50 per cent of the assets of the Cabri Prairie Health Care Centre on the acute care side; they paid 15 per cent on the long-term care side.

Do you have any record of those facilities in the province of Saskatchewan today where the municipalities have assets in those health care facilities? And would you be able to provide us a cost — no, a value — that was provided in money that was given to the people of Saskatchewan by RMs (rural municipality), by towns, and the volume of dollars that was contributed in each of those cases? Would you be able to provide that to us?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Chairman, and to the member from Morse, we have a breakdown of the debt load on each of those facilities, but Property Management Corporation doesn't keep record of the items that you asked. That would be a responsibility of the Department of Health and I'm advised by my officials it would be more appropriately asked under Health estimates.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I need to be absolutely sure that I'm hearing this right. Each one of those . . . like I'll use for example one that wasn't finished. Coronach, for example, wasn't finished and is now being completed and yet the acute care side of it, 50 per cent was funded by the RMs and the towns in those local communities.

Was the debt transferred to SPMC? Or from SPMC was it transferred to the Consolidated Fund and to the debt of the province? And did at any time those assets go back to the Consolidated Fund in a debt and equity? Or did only the debt go over? And who owns 50 per cent of those acute care facilities, and the 52 that are integrated facilities, who owns that today? That's the question I need to have some answers on. And I want to ask you because SPMC provided the financing and I need to know the answer to that question.

(2045)

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Member, I guess you would want to look at Property Management Corporation as being the lending institution. In terms of arrangements between the Department of Health and a health care facility or a local facility, that isn't under the purview of the Property Management Corporation. That has nothing to do with the role that the corporation has ever played, so clearly the corporation wouldn't have that information available to it. We can tell you how much the debts were owing against it and what has been written off through the Consolidated Fund, but those are the only figures that

we would have. We would have no knowledge of other arrangements that were made in communities such as Coronach.

**Mr. Martens:** — Okay, then what I would like to have you provide if you can, the volume of dollars that the debt was transferred in each of those individual health care facilities. Now an integrated facility, for example, like Coronach which is an integrated facility, 85 per cent was financed through CMHC (Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation) or related; 50 per cent was financed . . . in the acute care side, 50 per cent was financed by SPMC and sometimes Health, and 50 per cent was financed by the local community. In the level 4 care portion of that facility, 15 per cent was financed by that community.

Would you be able to provide for me, in the province of Saskatchewan, those communities that have that kind of a relationship, the amount of money that you transferred to the Consolidated Fund as a debt to the province of Saskatchewan. And would you be able to do that for me?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, thank you very much. And to the member from Morse, I'm told he already has this information that was provided to him in Crown corporation estimates. We only have one copy with us tonight, assuming that you would have had your copy with you. But since you haven't brought it, if it's all right with you we can undertake to have a page make some copies, and she can take them across to you. This is the only copy we have, otherwise I would certainly give it to you.

**Mr. Martens:** — Does that include the debt of the Sask Housing in relation to those facilities and CMHC, or does that only include the debt that SPMC had in relation to each one of those facilities? What I guess I would also need to have from you if you could — and you probably do have it some place — is the volume of dollars CMHC has, Sask Housing has, and Property Management Corporation, and what the . . . We can find out what the communities contributed from the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Well to the hon. member, we are trying to be as helpful as we can, but I guess we can only present you with and pass on to you what SPMC was involved in. With respect to the other agencies, the appropriate place to ask those questions would be under Health estimates. We deal with SPMC business and we'll certainly provide all that we can and I see the page just brought it in now, so . . . and that's the only information that we have because those are the only areas of involvement that we had.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. These are advances that were made by SPMC to March 31 of 1992. Were there any made in 1993 at all?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — That was the end, there were no more after that.

**Mr. Martens:** — So from that time on it was paid through the

Consolidated Fund through the department?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — That's what I understand.

**Mr. Martens:** — I want to ask the same kind of a question as it relates to the University of Saskatchewan. Do you have those same kinds of contributions made by SPMC in relation to the volume of dollars that you contribute and had lent the money to the agency to supply the facilities in the Ag Building and also I think maybe there was a geology building too, but I'd like to have those numbers.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — To the hon. member, those are on page 5 and 6 of the sheets that I sent to you and that's up until the end of the fiscal year. Those are the only involvement in the projects.

**Mr. Martens:** — I'm not sure that I recall whether you said you would undertake to provide the space for me for the different centres. Can you do that for the different centres in the province, occupied and unoccupied?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, we'd be more than pleased to give you a breakdown of the amount of occupied space, the amount of unoccupied space. And there is some very interesting numbers in there. And I hope when we pass them across that you have a very close look at them because we're really having a serious problem dealing with that particular issue.

**Mr. Martens:** — On the inventory of vehicles that you've got in the province, do you ever have an assessment done of how many times those vehicles are used in relation to whether they are worth keeping or not.

Do they supply a service to the province? Do you have a way of measuring that when a car isn't being used — even though it may have only 100,000 kilometres — is it of service to the province of Saskatchewan to keep a vehicle like that? Do you do an inventory of those kinds of assessments in your deliberations on a day-to-day basis?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — We get an annual report on each vehicle on a monthly basis, and by that we can determine if there's adequate usage of the vehicle. That way we know sort of where we are with respect to the sort of a time X, and when the life span of that car has ended. And so it's really quite important for that number of vehicles that we do have a monthly report.

**Mr. Martens:** — I noticed, Mr. Minister, just recently that there was an ad in the paper for some vehicles, and they were I think '88s and '89s. And I wondered if that was the reason why some of them were being sold or put up for tender bids. And if that's the case, then I'm comfortable with that. But I'd like to know that.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Most of the vehicles that you see advertised, irrespective of what year the vehicle, they've got 160,000 kilometres and over. And I guess, weighing the repair costs and the maintenance against replacing the vehicle, the

corporation generally looks at getting rid of them at about 160,000 kilometres.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister. Just a couple more questions, then we're through. Just looking over some of my questions and thought of a few more.

Now your government's had massive lay-offs. What property that is not occupied — that you no longer needed — how much property throughout Saskatchewan that you do not need and it's not occupied, and what are you doing with it and how much have you . . .

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — To the member from Arm River, there's in the neighbourhood of 20,460 square metres that's available for relocation that we're looking for other clients and other tenants within government to take over at this point.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, is this property that SPMC owns or leases? Owns or leases?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Yes, it's a mixture of each. There's some leased, some is owned. As the member may know, we're involved in a number of properties that have long-term leases. Some of them, we feel, inappropriate with respect to the amount that the market will bear, and some of that is in our inventory. It's space that we would rather not have, but because of decisions to purchase for whatever particular reasons, prior to us assuming government, we have that space. And it's a concern of ours and we are going to be dealing with that issue.

To answer specifically your question, it's a mixture of leased and a mixture of owned space. And we work on a daily basis to try and utilize as efficiently as we can our space inventory, and that process, as you will know, is sort of ongoing.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, when I was questioning you some time ago, I mentioned two legal cases. And I'm not sure whether I asked you if SPMC had any more legal cases that are ongoing or settled. Anyway, the question is, is there any more than those two, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — To the member from Arm River, there are two other cases that are before the courts.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Could you give us those names? Other names were made public; might as well make those public.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — We have one conflict with a Laurence Berry, and another problem with a lady by the name of Dianne Hoes, H-o-e-s.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. My last question is the paper you sent over with the total minister's executive and charter air travel. Just so I understand this clearly, you've got executive and charter. There's executive and charter in the lists here.

And I just want to be very clear. Does that include all air travel, like out of province, world travel, everything is on here or is that just executive air and the charter within the province?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — No, to the member from Arm River. It includes executive air and both in province and out that is done by exec air and charters which I am assuming are for the most part provincial, but I can find out specifically what those charter breakdowns are, if you would like.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Minister, what you're saying, that includes any world travel . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, then that leads to another question then. Would you be able to supply us then . . . I thought that's what this would be, but I thought you were answering differently, but I looked this paper over and I thought it was executive and charter. Now could you give us a breakdown on all travel for all ministers for any airline throughout Canada or the world. Can we have a list of that?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — We don't book that. In terms of ministerial travel by an international or a national airline, that's done by the individual departments. As an example, I've passed my travel across as it relates to my agency of record, the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. Other ministers will have their line department or their Crown corporation where that will be billed to, and they will have that information. We don't have it available for you.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — All right, that's fine. That explains it because it just didn't look like it could be enough dollars and cents to fly around the world, and fly Air Canada. But anyway, that's the last question I have to ask, and I'd just like to, when I'm on my feet, thank the ministers and thank you, Mr. Minister, for being very straightforward tonight. I think some of the ministers in the front row should take a lesson from you because I think you . . . I'd like to congratulate you on answering your questions as straightforward as you did. Thank you, Mr. Minister, and thank you, officials, and Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — I would like to thank the members of the opposition for their questions. I hope I've been an assistance in terms of them performing their duties. We certainly attempt to be as open as we can. I'd like to as well thank my officials for the work not only that they've done this evening, but the work that they've put into the preparation for these estimates on an ongoing basis.

(2100)

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 53 agreed to.

**General Revenue Fund  
Women's Secretariat  
Vote 41**

**The Chair:** — I will ask the Minister of Health to introduce her officials to the committee.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Chair, I would like to introduce Marianne Weston, the executive coordinator for the Women's Secretariat. And immediately behind me, Joan Pederson, the assistant executive coordinator of the Women's Secretariat.

**Item 1**

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I wonder if you would mind outlining to me just briefly what you feel the role of the Women's Secretariat is and the job they're doing.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well the Women's Secretariat works in partnership with all provincial departments in the community in order to achieve the goal of equality for Saskatchewan women. They work to integrate women's concerns into the mainstream of all government planning and policy making. Government programs and services are available to Saskatchewan people through line departments such Education, Health, and Social Services.

The Women's Secretariat activities then within government ensure that women's particular needs and perspectives are considered in the development and delivery of these services.

For example, the Women's Secretariat will consult with women's groups and organizations throughout the province, as well as with individual women, to ensure that the different needs are being considered. They also provide public information and education to raise awareness and understanding of issues that affect women. They work towards encouraging self-sufficiency for Saskatchewan women, and they will coordinate and implement and develop programs and activities of the government relating to the status of women. They provide a policy development and research support to other government departments, and they also engage in research to analyse and predict trends with respect to issues that impinge on women, and to predict the need with respect to future programing, for example.

So they do sort of a role of coordination and integration, policy development and research, and they meet extensively with groups and organizations within and out of government.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Has the agency produced any material or conducted any studies in the past year? And if so, would you please provide us with copies of all study and material produced by the agency?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Yes, I will undertake to provide that to you. There are two important pieces of paper, the papers that have been done. That's on employment equity and then another one again on labour standards discussions. So there has been ongoing work in that area, and I understand there has



been some research and some discussion papers put forward on it. I'll undertake to get you that and anything else that has been done by the secretariat.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Madam Minister, in your own mind, would it be more appropriate to spend \$1 million on policy coordination like you're doing in this department or to spend \$1 million on keeping a hospital or a school open or reducing the deficit?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well if you're saying that the Women's Secretariat is not important and isn't necessary, I say you're dead wrong. There are issues that pertain to women that need the attention of government. And in Saskatchewan we are doing this through a Women's Secretariat, and we are doing it by coordinating policy throughout government and making sure that government departments consider issues that impact on women.

So the answer to your question is, it's absolutely essential that we have an agency of government that will make as its primary concern issues that impact women and their families and that will act as a watchdog on behalf of women and that will move society to a goal of equality for women. So the answer to your question is, an agency of this nature is essential.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Well, Madam Minister, do you think the women of the province would agree with your statement in that respect? Or do you think the women of the province would prefer to see the million dollars for policy coordination spent in another way rather than on a Women's Secretariat?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — The women's organizations throughout the province, that speak for women generally, believe that the government should be spending more on performing a role of moving society towards more equality for women. So I think the answer to your question would be that the spokespeople for the women of this province, through women's organizations, are urging us to provide a body of this nature and would like to see actually more government money being spent on issues of that nature.

**Mr. Boyd:** — When you say the women's groups of this province, I wonder if you could provide me with a list of those women's groups of the province that would support your view?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — We can provide you with a list of women's groups. I can also tell you this, that many women's groups were asking us to actually have a department that pertained to women, and the government, of course, with respect to a matter of restraint has chosen not to do that. We feel we can provide the service that they are asking very effectively through a women's agency of this nature.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Madam Minister, I wonder if you could provide me with a list of direct services that the agency provides to women of this province, just a list of the actual things that they can come in to the Women's

Secretariat and receive?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I will get the department to put together a list, but essentially . . . or the secretariat. Essentially what the secretariat does with respect to direct services is public education and public awareness and they will be involved in workshops, for example, with respect to sexual harassment in the workplace or in other situations.

They also provide an entry for women who are trying to access women's services in government and people will phone the Women's Secretariat, for example, in order to be directed to where they can access this service. Those are the types of direct services that the Women's Secretariat provides. It also provides a very large policy development and research component so it is very much a policy development unit within government as well.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, could you tell us, does the Women's Secretariat fund any third parties or any NGOs (non-governmental organizations)?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — No.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Madam Minister, does the Women's Secretariat have any involvement with the Women's Institute of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — It's my understanding that there is dialogue and consultations that take place between the secretariat and the Women's Institute.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, from what you've described of the Women's Secretariat it would seem to be somewhat of an advocacy group to forward the goals and aspirations of women. The Women's Institute has been in place in this province since 1911 and for some reason, Madam Minister, the Finance minister has decided that this organization should no longer receive any government funding.

And the women in the Women's Institute feel that they are providing a valuable service within their communities, that the support they provide is needed and very worthwhile and yet the Minister of Finance, Madam Minister, has decided that that objective is not worthy of support within the government. Madam Minister, what was your response or did you even know that the Minister of Finance was cutting funding to this organization?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — The Women's Secretariat in government is not simply an advocacy group. It is a policy and development agency. It is also an agency that provides some direct services such as workshops, public awareness education, and acting as an entry for women's services. So it does more than simply advocate within government. It is largely a policy development body within government that focuses on how programs impact on women and how they can be improved with respect to women. So discontinuance of the grant to the Women's Institute is not an reflection on how the government views the

contributions that have been made by the Women's Institute. It has provided very fine community work throughout the years.

The discontinuance of the grant relates directly to the government's financial situation and is as a result of the deficit and the attempt by government to get a handle on the deficit. That means that we can no longer continue to fund all of the things that have been funded in the past, and this is one area that the Minister of Finance felt would not receive a grant any longer, but it has nothing to do with the type of work that has been done by the Women's Institute.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, my colleague was talking of a million dollars for the secretariat, just for the policy development area. What kind of policy development are you talking about? What kind of development are you talking about that you're spending this money on, Madam Minister, if you feel that the Women's Institute is not an organization worthy to continue to receive government funding?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well first of all there's a lot of policy that is developed by government as we move through programs and services in government; there's a lot. If you look at health and how health impacts on women, look at education and how that impacts on women, these are the kinds of things that the Women's Secretariat does.

And I'm surprised that you're not aware of that because your government, as you know, had a Women's Secretariat for years, the whole time that you were in office, and presumably provided much of the same functions. This isn't something new. So the Women's Secretariat was there before we took office. You had a Women's Secretariat that did policy development.

(2115)

What sort of policy development does the Women's Secretariat do? Well some of the very extensive research issues that have been undertaken this year are things such as the whole issue of pay equity. We have two human rights cases right now that have been launched with respect to that issue and the business community is asking us to look at it, and the Women's Secretariat is looking at that issue. Workers with family responsibilities is another policy area that needs clarification. Women and labour standards legislation is another area that needs research. Employment equity, career development, women in non-traditional occupations — these are some of the areas that the Women's Secretariat are taking a look at, researching, and providing government with recommendations.

The violence against women and the need to try and get a handle on that issue is another very extensive area that the Women's Secretariat is involved in and has developed numerous workshops on sexual harassment, for example, and they're working on the partnerships committee on family violence. There's

very extensive work of that nature being done on an ongoing basis by the Women's Secretariat.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, some of those goals are very laudable, but it seems that some other goals that women may have do not seem worthy of your consideration or the consideration of your government.

Education is one of those things that the Women's Institute was involved in, and health was one of those things which you said is part of the policy development area of the Women's Secretariat, yet you felt that the Women's Institute was not worthy of funding. Perhaps, Madam Minister, it's simply a situation of politics.

Your party has a political vein which it wishes to head in and which was not the direction the Women's Institute was going in. They were not advocating pay equity, which is one of the items you suggested you're doing research in.

Madam Minister, which areas of policy have seen a growth in funding and which areas have seen a cut in funding?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — First of all, I had told the member opposite already — but I know that it is their bent on the other side of the House to make allegations that are clearly not accurate and to continue to say it over and over again in the hope that someone will believe what they say — I indicated to you that the reason the funding had been cut off for the Women's Institute had to do with the fact we have a \$15 billion debt and an ongoing deficit in this province and we can't continue to fund everything we would like to or that we funded before, and had nothing to do with the worthiness of the Women's Institute. And I'm saying it again, for the third time, I believe, this evening.

You may think it has to do with their worthiness; I'm saying it does not have to do with their worthiness. It is a deficit situation that is considered here. So I want to correct that statement once again.

There are many women's organizations throughout the province that do work on these issues, and the Women's Secretariat provides sort of a central resource. There's a library, for example, that can be accessed by some of the other organizations that choose to do research — and there's lots of them in the province, of women who are interested. They may represent one aspect like the pay equity aspect or the violence aspect for example. And I pointed out to you as well in my comments earlier with respect to pay equity that there were two complaints at the Human Rights Commission about pay inequity. So I think it's important that as a government we examine that issue.

Now you can smirk at that. I'm sure you don't believe in pay equity or that women should be earning wages of equal value for work of equal value. I'm sure that's your position because I know that's the Tory position. That women should be paid less than men to do the same work, I know that's the Tory position, and that's

why he's smirking.

I think it's important that we take a look at this issue to determine what the extent of the wage gap is in the province. And although we cannot afford to implement a full-fledged pay equity program, there may be things we can do to lessen the impact, that don't cost substantial amounts of money. And I think we have an obligation as a government to look into those things, and that's one of the areas that the Women's Secretariat is taking a look at and will continue to take a look at.

And of course, there's some urgency on our part to look at it because the business community is saying there are these complaints before the Human Rights Commission, and you should determine how you're going to deal with this particular issue. So we are taking a look at it from both points of view in that regard.

But you know, to suggest that because there are other bodies in society that do research in a particular area or have interests in a particular area, that governments should not have its policy developmental branch, it doesn't work that way. There are all sorts of bodies outside of government that have special interests that do their research and then present them to government. That doesn't mean that government abdicates its responsibility to develop policy in those areas.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, you did a very good job of avoiding the question, and that was how many . . . which policy areas received increases in funding and which policy areas did receive cut-backs?

Madam Minister, you don't know what my position is on pay equity, and I'll tell you what it is. It's equal work for equal pay which is exactly the opposite to what you said it was. So, Madam Minister, you don't know what you're talking about on that particular issue.

You said that there was two pay equity complaints before the Human Rights Commission. Madam Minister, that's two out of how many complaints before the Human Rights Commission. Now will you answer the question of which policy areas received increases and which ones received decreases in funding?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — You will have to clarify that question. I don't know what you mean. Which policies received more monies? What do you mean? What . . . like, can you be more specific because I'm not sure what you mean by that question.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, you said you have policies that you develop within the Women's Secretariat. So you must have a list of what areas of policy you're investigating or which you're studying. So what are those areas that received increases in fundings and which areas received decreases?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well first of all, I did give you a list of things that were being reviewed. We don't fund; we don't fund these various areas. Now I can say this, that with respect to family violence there was some increased funding in last year's budget in the Health department, and there may have been in some other areas. But the Women's Secretariat doesn't fund programs. It develops policy, and other government departments will then fund the programs if they decide to proceed with them.

And in many cases it doesn't even mean an increase in funding; it means a change in direction. So it doesn't necessarily amount to funding for a particular thing. But I can get you information . . . if what the member wants is some information on additional funding for women's services within government, I can get a list of that put together, if indeed we have it. We may even have it here now.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, there's a million dollars or so for policy development. What do you do with that money? Do you simply give it to the Women's Secretariat and say, here's a million dollars; spend it some place? Or do they provide you a list of things that that money will be spent on? If they provide you a list of things that the money will be spent on, which of those items have gone up and which have gone down?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Okay, the budget is 768,000, if this is your question. You're asking, how is the 768,000 . . . It's not a million, it's three-quarters of a million, a little bit more. Five hundred and seven thousand is spent on personal services; that's researchers and people who work within the Women's Secretariat. The other expenses are 166,000 and there is 95,000, I believe, to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. This totals 768,000.

So what is not happening is that funding is being taken and applied to a particular project or program, if that's what you're saying. There is a general research analyst component in the Women's Secretariat which was there when you were in government, and the personal services come to 507,000.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, as another correction I was not in government. The research analysts that you have in place there, Madam Minister, what are they researching? Are they researching certain policies, or do you just give them a set . . . a lump of money and they go off and do whatever they want to?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I indicated to you earlier that they are researching policies. I gave you a list of some of the things that were being researched. If you want a more detailed, comprehensive list I can undertake to provide you with that.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, that's what I was asking about four questions ago, was that list and what funding was going up and down for each

one of those areas.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — The member opposite in his very condescending fashion doesn't seem to understand that when you have a department with employees in it, you're not contracting with them on a contractual basis, saying X number of dollars for this. You pay them a salary, and you tell them you want these items taken care of and this research done. They are paid salaries. They are not paid by contract.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Madam Minister, it seems to be very difficult for you to give me those items and those research matters that they're doing. That's what I'm asking for and whether there is more funding being spent in one particular item area, or less money being spent in that particular item area than there was previously done.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I've told you the priorities are family violence, wage gap, workers with family responsibilities, income security with respect to women. Those are the priorities. They will also do other things.

Now as to how much money is spent on that, you don't . . . (inaudible) . . . you pay a salary and you get a job done. You don't say, okay you're only supposed to spend 10,000 of your \$30,000 salary doing this. These people are on salary and they do their work and their research. You don't break it down in terms of how much money is being spent on a particular issue.

Now if you want us to sit there and take every hour down and how much time they spend researching this and counting up all the hours for that place, maybe we could come to a formula that would tell you, they spent X number of hours on this particular area and that's how much money then is allotted to it. It's not the way it's done. They're paid a salary. They're given their duties and responsibilities and they fulfil them.

I don't understand why the member can't understand how that operates. That's how you do a policy and development. You don't break it down into terms of dollars and cents on this issue and dollars and cents on that issue. You hire people. They're on salary and then they do the research.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — So basically, Madam Minister, then you just give them a lump sum of money for a year's salary and say, here's some areas that we'd like you to do some research in and they go out and spend whatever amount of time they feel like spending on those particular areas. Is that what happens?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well what happens is this. The government establishes priorities with respect to policy development. They want to know how a certain issue will impact. The employee then goes out, does the research and provides the government with some recommendations and findings. And this information will be provided to other departments as well so that further policy development and issues, the handling of issues, can take place in an adequate fashion.

(2130)

So what happens is people are paid a salary, they are instructed to do certain kinds of work — and I told you what the priorities were — they go out and they do that work and they provide government with recommendations. From that, government determines whether or not they're going to implement the recommendations or how they're going to implement them and so on. So that's how it works with respect to a policy development unit. You pay a salary. You ask for a job to be done and you move on to the next job.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Okay, Madam Minister, you say you've given me a list of priorities. Will you give me a list of your secretariat's policy priorities, numbering them the most important at one and going on down the list? And what impacts your research has come up with in those areas.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — We can certainly do that for you, give you a list of the work that . . . the ongoing work that is being done by the secretariat and any other information we have with respect to exactly what is being achieved by the Women's Secretariat. We can certainly do that.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Will you place that list in the priority of the government?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well yes, we can do that. We can itemize our priorities.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Madam Minister.

Now I'd like to go to another issue which we discussed last year in the Women's Secretariat and that was the situation of maintenance. What has changed, Madam Minister, if anything in that area, for the women and children of this province?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I'm advised that there has been increased funding in 1993-94 to improve enforcement powers and to enable the program to continue to successfully service Saskatchewan families.

The maintenance enforcement office apparently has received 13,902 cases from 1986 to March 1993 which I think is quite important. As of March 31, 1993, there's been nearly \$50 million processed which I think is also important for the public to know. So there has been some increased funding to improve the enforcement powers in this year's budget and there has been, since 1986 to 1993, nearly \$50 million processed. Now we can still do better and the government will do what it can to improve on that situation, but it definitely is a move in the right direction.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. I know that it's a great problem out there for quite a number of people.

One of the problems that is brought forward to me is the garnishee situation, where a person's wages are garnisheed. They move from that point onwards, but it seems to take quite a while before, in most cases, a woman receives that money. And it seems to be quite a time period in there where it's lost in the shuffle, where the man has had the money garnisheed before the woman gets it. Is your Women's Secretariat looking into that at all, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well they will look into it. If that's a problem, we will check with the Justice department to determine why the delay. So thank you for bringing it to our attention.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — One other issue, Madam Minister, is, and this may not necessarily pertain to the Women's Secretariat — I'm not sure — but it's access to children.

Some parents do not have an easy access to their child, and it seems to be a situation where the one spouse for whatever reason wishes to deny access. And it may be a situation where maintenance has not been paid, and I can understand some of the emotional involvement in that kind of a situation. But in other cases, it's not that that's the problem; it's some other issue. Have you looked at the situation of access to children, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — No. The Women's Secretariat would not have looked at that. That is really an issue for the courts. That if a . . . And there's very little else that can be done about that. Like, I can't see how governments could legislate access to children. Because what has to take place in a situation like that, if a parent is being denied access, they then would have to take an application to court or go to a mediator and have the matter settled in a manner such as that, either through arbitration between their lawyers, through a mediator, or through the courts.

Now I know the hardship that that causes for people, but I don't see any way that government can intervene and start legislating access. This is something that's going to have to be worked out within families and through the legal system and any other services, counselling services that might be available for people.

So the Women's Secretariat, no, would not have a mandate to review that particular issue, but . . . unless the member opposite has some ideas of his own as to what government could do in that regard, I'd be willing to hear them. But my instinctive reaction is that this is something that would have to be settled through the legal process. And I'm not saying that because I'm not aware of the hardship it creates and the turmoil within families when that situation arises, because I understand that problem. But if you have some suggestions, I'd like to hear them.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Yes it is a problem and perhaps one of the things that needs to be put in place is some sort of an intermediary system that parents, either parent could

apply to for some recourse, such as what was suggested in the Environment Committee's report for people who had concerns with the environment. Some sort of an intermediary step before you actually were forced to go into the court and the expenses involved there.

On a situation of maintenance again, Madam Minister, where a person moves out of the province or moves continuously, we talked about this last year. We talked with the Minister of Justice about it. Has anything been done there to try and speed up the tracking systems to follow a person as they move, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — This requires the cooperation of other provinces if we're going to speed up that process. And it's my understanding that there have been ongoing discussions with other provinces about what can be done. But it's also my understanding that there's been no resolution with respect to that problem at this time. So it is something we're aware, something we're working towards, but it's not something we can solve unilaterally. We need the cooperation of other players.

And it does get very difficult when people move because you may catch up to them in one place, and then they're gone to another location and another province. So we are very much aware of that. And if there's something that we can do interprovincially to deal with that, you know, we would like to know. To date, the discussions haven't resolved that problem.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 41 agreed to.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I would like to thank my officials, Marianne Weston and Joan Pederson, for the help that they have given us, Mr. Chair, in these estimates.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, thank you for answering the questions and as well thank you to the officials for coming in this evening.

### General Revenue Fund Health Vote 32

**The Chair:** — I would ask the minister at this time to please introduce the officials who have joined us.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to introduce to my immediate left, Mr. Duane Adams, the deputy minister of Health; and to his left, Kathy Langlois, the executive director, finance and administration; and immediately behind me, Mr. Dan Perrins, the associate deputy minister; and behind me and a little to the left, Ms. Glenda Yeates, the associate deputy minister.

Item 1

**Mr. Britton:** — Madam Minister, I would like to visit with you a little bit tonight on some of the housekeeping questions, firstly, if it's all right with you.

I was looking through the Health estimates on a line-by-line basis and can't help but notice that the increase of funding is in your administration and your human resources and communications branch. Why is it, Madam Minister, that Saskatchewan residents endure cut-back after cut-back and health care professionals and other staff must endure massive lay-offs while your own department flourishes. Could you explain that a little bit to us, please.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Okay, I'm told that communication is not up, that the cost in administration is up as a result of the associate minister's office.

**Mr. Britton:** — Well, Madam Minister, the only branch of the Health department to receive an increase was administration. I don't think that's acceptable, Madam Minister.

I note that the salaries increased substantially. Is this increase due to higher numbers in this area or is it just higher wages paid to the same people, or less?

(2145)

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — There are additional staff members as a result of an Associate Minister of Health. The member opposite knows that we're launched on a major health reform in the province, very massive health reform that's involving a lot of areas. In order to do this, of course, we need people who can get the job done.

Now with respect to salary increases, I want to point out that the deputy minister of Health under the former government made substantially more than the deputy minister of Health under this government, for example.

The increase in administration, as I indicated, is because of additional staff associated with the associate minister's office.

**Mr. Britton:** — Well thank you, Madam Minister. The previous associate minister was probably worth more money.

Madam Minister, how many new people?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I'm told that the net increase is 3.5. There's six people employed in the associate minister's office, but there's been a decrease in administration in the Department of Health itself. So there's a net increase of 3.5. I should also point out that under the former government, as you know, your government as well had an associate minister. We did not have an associate minister in the first several months of government until we were well launched into the health reform.

**Mr. Britton:** — Madam Minister, did we have one in the first few months of our government?

Madam Minister, I notice that the operating expenses increased as well. Could you tell us why the increase, Madam Minister, in the operating expenses?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — The member opposite should know that the increase in operating expenses is largely due to the fact that the plastic health card that was initiated by your government has to be reissued because there's an expiry date. As a result of the policy developed by your government you have a plastic health card with an expiry date. That comes due this fall, in December, and has to be reissued and that's largely the result of the increase.

Now we are not going to reissue the card I'm told by the department. We are going to put out stickers in order to try and keep the cost down, rather than reissuing the card as you had originally anticipated would be done.

**Mr. Britton:** — Well thank you, Madam Minister. I appreciate the thought but I kind of wonder, because the card is plastic — and I think even your side of the House would agree that it was a good idea — but plastic does wear out. And I wonder if you're going to be able to make that work with a sticker. I hope you can because of the cost, but I doubt it. Could you explain . . . you said you had 3.5 people. Does that mean you have a part-time person or how do you split that person up?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Yes, that's a part-time person. And with respect to the plastic card, to reissue them would cost, I'm told, almost three times what it would cost to put a sticker, or to deal with a sticker. And we've tried to go the less expensive route and see . . . I believe it will work, but there may be some problems associated with it. I know what the member's referring to.

**Mr. Britton:** — Well as I said before, Madam Minister, I appreciate what you're doing, and I'm not so sure it'll work because the plastic card that I have usually splits, but fair enough, fair enough.

Madam Minister, could you tell me what the total amount the Department of Health paid in communications. What is your communications budget?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — The total budget is 1.982 million, which is down from 2.056 million from last year. And this is for everything including nonpromotional printing and duplicating.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Am I correct in assuming that the total you provided as the communication budget includes all advertising cost? And if it's yes, would you provide the total amount on health and reform, wellness communications?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Yes I understand it is . . . yes, that is all inclusive and we don't have figures for this year

because we haven't spent the money this year, but last year there was \$291,953 spent in developing information for the health community about the wellness approach and health system reform. So the 1.982 million is all inclusive.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, I appreciate that. I'm curious about another thing. It's something I saw on the Saskatoon Health Board's recent news release and it's regarding the lay-offs in the city hospitals. In that release I noted that they have both a communications coordinator and a communications officer. Now how many other communication professionals are employed with the Saskatoon Health Board? Could you tell us how many? Could you tell us what they are paid? And is it necessary, Madam Minister, to have two communication people for one board? And the other thing, while you're there, could you tell us, are these people paid strictly from the Health Board, or are they hospital employees?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — The member opposite should know that with respect to the amalgamation of hospitals in Saskatoon that all of the employees of the former boards are now employees of the Saskatoon Health Board, and we don't have the salary range of all these employees. We don't know what every employee makes on the Saskatoon Health Board.

In the past, every hospital had its own communication department. Now what has happened under one board . . . that this has all been amalgamated under one board, and we don't know how many employees they used to have as opposed to how many employees they have now. I don't have that information or the details of that information.

But in the past, it was three separate communication departments. Now it would be one communications department, and all of these people would be employees of the Saskatoon Health Board.

I was just handed something here from the Department of Health with respect to the Saskatoon Health Board that seems to indicate that they have only two employees with respect to communications, but I'm not sure that that is the final answer. I would want to check that; I would want to double-check. But this chart, this organizational chart seems to indicate that. But I would want to double-check it with them.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. We may have to come back to this a little later. I was just trying to clean up some more or less housekeeping kind of questions with you. But I would like to find out a little more about that later.

Madam Minister, could you tell us then who was on the Saskatoon Health Board payroll? Please provide us the names of those individuals and include the positions they fill. And would you please inform the Assembly if these positions are full time or part time. Are they voluntary or paid positions? If they are paid, please detail the total cost of the positions, including salaries and expenses. I'm trying to lump these

questions, Madam Minister, in the essence of time.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — A point of clarification. Are you asking about the board members or are you asking about the staff? Because if you're asking about the staff, we're talking thousands of employees. You're asking about the board members? Okay, I'll get you that information.

Okay the names of the members are Cliff Wright and he's a very well-known person to all of you; Darlene Bessey, who was an executive director of the YWCA of Saskatoon since May 1989; Susan Wagner, who is a nurse and associate professor with the University of Saskatchewan's College of Nursing; Mr. Brian Rourke, who is a lawyer; Mr. Brian Morgan who is the director of personnel services with the City of Saskatoon, and Ms. Dorothy Fortier who is the vice-president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association.

I have their resumes here, their biographies which I'll send over to you and we've already provided you with information about the per diems that these people receive and the money that is paid to them. That information was provided a couple of weeks ago but we can get it together again for you if you want us to.

**Mr. Britton:** — Well thank you, Madam Minister . . .

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — If there's some comments you want to make, I was just going to report progress. If the member from Wilkie wants to make some comments, he can do so.

**Mr. Britton:** — I guess we can revisit this at the next session.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:01 p.m.