

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

April 25, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTIONS OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce through you, and to you, to this Assembly, a group of 14 bantam hockey players from the town of Hudson Bay. They're called the Hudson Bay Hunters. They're in town playing in a tournament at the Downtowners Optimist Centennial Cup tournament. They're accompanied by their manager, Bill Adams, by a coach, Blaine Hitchcock, and by an assistant coach, who many of us probably know well, who plays for the Saskatoon Blades, Trent Yawney.

Trent, we feel, is going to go very high in the next draft choice this year, coming up in June. I understand that you won your game this morning. I wish the team good luck in the tournament. I wish you a safe journey home. I'll be meeting with you for drinks and pictures later, and I ask all the Assembly to join with me in welcoming this group of Hudson Bay hockey players to the city of Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Separate School Teachers' Strike in Moose Jaw

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. And my question again, Madam Minister, deals with the Moose Jaw separate school dispute which is in its fourth week. And I'd like to ask the minister to provide to the Assembly, to the concerned students and the parents of Moose Jaw, with a complete progress report on her handling of the dispute to date.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, since yesterday — and the member from Quill Lake had a progress report up until yesterday — there were meetings that took place yesterday afternoon, and as late as 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Plus, as I understand it, the board had a meeting in Moose Jaw of all board members last night.

Today they are back meeting with the department, with the teachers' group and the school board, and that's where it is till now.

Mr. Koskie: — I'd like to ask the minister whether she or her officials have, in fact, put forward any specific options or recommendations that the two parties will have an opportunity to look at, subject to her ultimatum that the students, one way or the other, are going to be back by next Monday. Have you put forward any specific options or recommendations for the parties to consider?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did.

Mr. Koskie: — Would the hon. minister outline the options that she put forward? I asked her that yesterday in the House. Outside the House she was apparently able to put forward some options. Would she provide the information to the Assembly, what options you put forward?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, we outlined several options and alternatives to the media, and I would be pleased to outline those same options to the member from Quill Lake today.

Obviously, there are several alternatives. Back-to-work legislation is an alternative. The teachers going back to work on a volunteer basis: that's an alternative. Plus you can couple along with that, perhaps you can look at the issue of conciliation, binding arbitration, or simply a review without conciliation or arbitration. Those are all options and alternatives.

Mr. Koskie: — Further supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister why she does not, in fact, avail herself of the recommendation which has really been submitted to her, first, by the parents, by the school teachers and, to some extent, by the board: that is, that you establish an inquiry or a management study, and the teachers have offered to voluntarily return to the classroom. Why haven't you taken this as the high recommendation, and why haven't you, in fact, pursued this, since the parties have indicated their willingness to accept this?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just indicated that one of the options or alternatives to be looked at was the issue of a review — he titles it an inquiry — whatever. I think we're talking basically about the same thing.

The teachers, in putting forth their proposal, was not in the same vein as the proposal that came forth from the parents. It was a scope that was much broader . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The proposal that the teachers put forth had a much broader scope than the proposal that came forth from the parents' group, and it also came forth at a later date than the proposal that came forth from the parents. And I have not indicated in any way that I rejected the teachers' proposal in total.

So I'm not sure where the member is getting his information from. I did tell him that, yes, I rejected the petition from the parents, that I would not have an inquiry into the operation of the board and the attitudes of the board. I indicated that to him in this House. But there has been no formal rejection, or whatever he wants to title it, to the teachers in terms of their proposal.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Education: would the minister agree that it is preferable to have an inquiry in terms which she may dictate, which is close to what all three parties have agreed to, and a voluntary return to work? Would she not agree that that would be preferable to back-to-work legislation that would have to be imposed upon the parties by this legislature?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Would she also, Mr. Speaker . . . Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you also agree that you have powers under The Education Act to order such an inquiry?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, that is in legislation.

Role of Lane and Whitmore in Sale of Former SGI Head Office

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Insurance. I have a question, Mr. Minister, with respect to the option agreement between SGI and Mark Silver Holding Ltd., dated October 17, 1983, and which you tabled in the House on April 13, '84.

Mr. Minister, on the cover of the option agreement is the name of the Regina law firm, Lane and Whitmore. My question is: what role did the law firm of Lane and Whitmore play in this agreement; specifically, for whom was the law firm acting?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know the answer to that question. However, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I think it only fair that I read to this Assembly a statement that I have prepared relating and referring to old SGI building.

Mr. Speaker: — This is not the time for ministerial statements. That will come later in the day.

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I find it somewhat odd that you would table in the House an agreement on the face of which is a name holding out the Minister of Justice to be associated with it, and not know what role he played.

Let me continue, Mr. Minister, with another question which I'd like you to take notice of, as well. What duties did the law firm provide, and who paid the bills, and how much was the total fee, if indeed they acted for Saskatchewan Government Insurance?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I didn't take notice of that question. In the first question that you asked, you asked me what role they played, and I told you I didn't know. I didn't tell you I would take notice of the question. However, if you want an answer to the question, I'm prepared to take notice on the question.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the document was prepared by the offices of Lane & Whitmore Law Offices, and I know and I'm sure the member opposite will agree that the Attorney General is no longer involved in part of that law office. The firm of Mr. Whitmore prepared the document, obviously. It's on the front cover of it.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, supplementary. Do I have the minister's undertaking that he will inquire into it and report back to the House on the question of whether or not the office of Lane & Whitmore acted for the Government of Saskatchewan, or the Saskatchewan Government Insurance, in this agreement?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Yes, I'll take notice of that question, and I'll inform the House of what role they play.

Mr. Shillington: — Supplementary. And will you also take notice of the further supplementary of what duties, if they did act for the Government of Saskatchewan or SGI, what duties they performed, what fees were paid, and whether or not those fees were paid out of public funds?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Yes.

Economic Policy on Education

Mr. Sveinsson: — I would like to, Mr. Speaker, get back into education for a moment. The minister, since the budget, has adamantly criss-crossed this province and expressed that the budget adequately dealt with the funding for education in Saskatchewan.

I would like to ask the minister: is she still of that opinion that the budget for education in Saskatchewan will adequately deal with the funding requirements of the boards in this province?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am still of that opinion.

Mr. Sveinsson: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. You were satisfied, Mrs. Minister, with the formula that was structured regarding education funding in Regina. Recently that formula has been changed.

In your own words, in the *Leader-Post*, in an article of April 21, you indicated there was a change to the funding formula, and there were extra moneys put into the education budgets in the city of Regina. Are you still happy that the change in the formula has addressed the severe underfunding of the Regina School boards?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I'm going to tell him, Mr. Speaker. The funding formula was not changed. So I suggest . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Perhaps the member would do better in putting a saddle on a dead horse as opposed to doing his research out of the media. The formula was not changed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the member is sincere in his interest in education, he'll listen to the answer.

When the grants went out to the school boards, it was recognized that some boards will have a few problems because of reassessment — not the amount of money that's on the per pupil — but because of reassessments. Regina and Saskatoon were put into that position this year. When they came to us, they laid out their case, and they agreed with me that if there was anything to be done at all it had to be in the terms of fairness and equity with other school boards in the province. They agreed on that. So we listened, as a government, and they proposed some possible solutions.

One of the solutions was to do away with the differential on the computational mill rate. We have now made the computational mill rate for urban and rural the same, because the theory of reassessment was to do the equalization factor so there was no longer a need for the differential in the computational mill rate. That's what was changed, not the formula for the grant foundation.

Mr. Sveinson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister calculated what funding would be required to maintain education at last year's level in the city of Regina without increasing the mill rate in the city of Regina?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, when we do our budgeting we do it on a provincial basis. We take the percentage that is required to maintain a certain level, the same level as last year. Approximately 52 per cent is the government's portion. And we required 5 per cent on the per pupil recognition in order to maintain that level of 1983.

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I think the minister misunderstood my question. My question was: Mrs. Minister, have you calculated, have you calculated how much will be required to maintain the quality of education that Regina residents have come to expect from this government, based on last year's level of education? Have you calculated how much is required to maintain that level of education without increasing the mill rate and passing on the tax burden, rather than passing it on through your government, passing it on through the local school-board to the Regina ratepayers?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Precisely. Mr. Speaker, there is a local school-board duly elected by the citizens of Regina, the public board and the Catholic board, which run their schools and that meet the expectations as laid out by the citizens of that given community.

The government's function is one of, first of all, setting some provincial standards to be met, and ensuring the standards are met, and the funding. Now the local board also has a degree of autonomy, a very large degree, and responsibility in raising some money at the local level to cover some of the additional costs, plus the splitting of the share between government and local.

Mr. Sveinson: — Final supplementary. The Premier criss-crosses the province saying that we are not participating in a recession. The chairmen of the two local school-boards in Regina indicate that there are severe cut-backs that they have to deal with, with respect to education in Regina. Is the minister saying that she's satisfied that the budgetary requirements for the boards in Regina are being satisfied by this provincial government?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say that and he knows it. What I said was I was relatively satisfied with the level of financing, provincially. That's what we are responsible for, and that's what we budget for.

I have also recognized that, given the circumstances of Regina and Saskatoon this year, and reassessment, they would have more difficulty with their finances this year than what they had last year because they were not into reassessment.

I will also refresh the member's memory, if I may, and tell him this is not the first time that a community has gone through reassessment and has had a negative effect on their government grants.

Construction of Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. Last October he and the Minister of Advanced Education announced a new building, the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, to be built at the 1600 block of the Ross Avenue in Regina. What I would like to know from the minister is: can he tell me who, in fact is building the building, who is the construction company, and whether they are building it for themselves to be rented to the government, or whether it will be, in fact, owned by the government?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I could give some of the details. The Roberts Group is the winning proposal when we sent out proposals to build this building for the purposes of the use of Advanced Education and manpower, an extension to the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences. And for any other detail, in terms of who the contractor is and the subcontractor and whatever else that you want to know, I can certainly take notice, Mr. Speaker, and provide the full and detailed information.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, the detail that I wanted was simply whether the ownership of the building, if you could tell me, and I imagine you wouldn't have to take notice of that, who will own the building when it's completed? Will it be the Government of Saskatchewan, operated by your department? Or will H. A. Roberts own the building and lease it to the government?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — H. A. Roberts will own the building, and it's on a lease arrangement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if you could inform the Assembly, Mr. Minister, whether or not the project was tendered, and can you confirm or deny that H.A. Roberts were the low tender? Or is this like the auction sale that we talked about last week where you will refuse that kind of an answer? Mr. Minister, the question is: were they the low tender for this project, or can you give us that information?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — It was a proposal call, Mr. Speaker, which dealt with many factors, and one of them including location, the land that was available, all of those kinds of things. It was a proposal call. H.A. Roberts was awarded the proposal; on the basis of the proposal was awarded the contract.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I know very well they were awarded the project because you mentioned it in your last question. The question to you this time is: were they the low tender? Can you confirm or deny that H.A. Roberts were given this contract and were the low tender? Because I think on a project like this it's very important for the public of the province to know whether or not, in fact, H.A. Roberts were the low tender. I'll ask you again: can you confirm or deny whether or not the successful applicants were the low tender?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is — and I've been through this with the member several times — there is a difference between tender and proposal. In this case there was a call for proposals. The proposals came in. H.A. Roberts had the best proposal, taking into consideration all that needed to be taken in in this case, and H.A. Roberts was awarded the contract on the basis of the best proposal submitted.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, you seem to be able to distinguish very clearly between a tendering process and a proposal. I wonder if you could, for the Assembly, and the public of Saskatchewan, who are not as clear as you are, define the difference between them? Because most of us would believe that when you tender a project, it should be public knowledge. And if the low tender is not accepted, then it's the right of every individual in the province to know why, and to give some detail on why this H.A. Roberts were successful, and why more than the regular amount would have to be paid of taxpayers' money to get the building put up.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I will bring for the member, just so that everything is absolutely clear for the hon. member, for all members opposite, and for everyone else, I will bring the details and the difference between a proposal and a tender. And I will provide that to the hon. member and to the House; I'll take notice.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the minister will know that late last week a part of the building collapsed, the mezzanine portion, where concrete, precast concrete and steel collapsed. Luckily no one was injured. But in light of the fact, have you investigated the cause of it, and are you still as sure as you were when you gave the contract that this is the company best able to build this kind of a building, in the light of the fact that part of it collapsed before the building was even up?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, yes, there was an industrial accident on that site last week. That's true, as the member indicates. And as he also indicates, it is fortunate that no one was injured, and certainly that's the main consideration, and must be.

As far as me, as minister, being assured that the best proposal received the contract, yes, I am assured that that's the best . . . the best proposal was awarded the contract. Certainly, he asked if I am carrying out an investigation. I understand, Mr. Speaker, there is an investigation under way with the architect and the engineers involved, and the contractor and others. As would be the case with any building of this nature where an industrial accident would take place, that is under way. I would certainly be willing to give the hon. member and the House a report once that investigation is completed but, at this time, it is not complete.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Final supplementary to the minister. I'm sure that you're well aware that over the next couple of months 650 students will be attending this institution — 400 on a permanent basis, and 250 part time, and a number of staff.

Mr. Minister, I'm wanting to ask you whether you are making sure and will be doing regular and ongoing checks as the building progresses, now that we know there are some serious faults with the structure, to make sure that once this building is in use that it's not going to fall apart, as buildings throughout the world from time to time have been known to do.

We know where hotels where similar things have happened, with the loss of life. And I'd want to get from you a guarantee that you will watch the construction process to make sure that a similar accident will not happen here in the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, H.A. Roberts group has built many buildings. There's no question about their credibility in terms of their capacity to build buildings and safe buildings and so on. H.A. Roberts has built many building, and I have every confidence that this building will be very safe and so on at the end. As I've indicated, engineers and so on are . . .

The member asked if I will be watching the construction. Mr. Speaker, I, personally, will not be watching the construction. I am a politician; I'm a minister.

The hon. member opposite would suggest that under their system they, as the government,

would build the buildings, and they would have some socialist minister go over and watch the thing and make sure that the thing wasn't going to collapse. I'll tell you that we would have an engineer who was very well qualified to look at it, as it should be regardless of who owns the building, and the building will have to be safe.

As the hon. member would suggest . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Allow the minister to finish his answer.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also made reference to the fact that there will be a good number of extra spaces for training in this particular building when it's completed. And I say that something this government is very proud of, that those extra spaces will be provided by this government, those spaces which were not provided by that former government opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STC's Prince Albert Bus Garage

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Speaker, in response to a question I took notice of on April 17 from the member from Pelly regarding closing of the STC bus garage on May 15, 1984, I would just like to inform all members of the Assembly that no firm date for this adjustment has been decided upon yet, because there is discussion, Mr. Speaker, there is discussion between management and the union and, basically, the bus drivers that when this transfer of operational facility moves to the city of Saskatoon, that the bus drivers will sweep out the buses and fuel those buses. Prince Albert is 80 miles north of the city of Saskatoon. We can expect no reduction in service. There still will be drivers located in Prince Albert, ticket clerks will be there, janitorial services will still be provided. There will be no reduction in service to the people in the area, and there will be no reduction in personnel there. Those two personnel will be transferred to the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. Lusney: — I have a supplementary for the minister responsible for Sask Transportation Company. Mr. Minister, in moving or closing down the garage in P.A. and moving the buses to Saskatoon, this is going to affect definitely, I would imagine, the two mechanics in the garage. Are you saying at this point you have no intentions of moving any of the bus drivers out of Prince Albert to Saskatoon? The buses are still going to remain in Prince Albert?

Hon. Mr. Garner: — That is correct. There will be no bus drivers transferred from Prince Albert to Saskatoon. The two employees that are affected: one is a mechanic 1, that is presently on a long-term disability. The other one has over 35 years of service with STC and could retire with full benefits, if so desired; if not, he could transfer to Saskatoon. No reduction in service whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Sale of Former SGI Head Office

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to clarify statements made by me in this House concerning an alleged offer by Mr. Syd Lovell or his companies . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite will listen very closely . . . By Mr. Syd Lovell or his companies for the purchase of the SGI old head office building or the annex thereto.

I had been assured, Mr. Speaker, by management that they were confident that all the offers and expression of interest had been passed on to them. Now, when I made these statement, I was acting on the assumption, as apparently was the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Regina Centre, that the events detailed in Mr. Lovell's correspondence, copies of which I

understand are also in the hands of members opposite, were entirely accurate in respect of Mr. Lovell's discussions with Mr. Gary Miller and Mr. Lovell's alleged verbal \$750,000 expression of interest.

And during the term . . . or the time the property was on the market, there were several offers and expressions of interest, Mr. Speaker, and I have a list of them. I'm prepared to make it available to the members opposite. However, I have now been advised by my officials of SGI, that they have contacted Mr. Miller, and he emphatically denies ever showing the SGI old head office building, or the annex thereto, to Mr. Lovell, or having any discussions or meetings with, or receiving any offers from Mr. Lovell on the old head office building, or the annex thereto.

My officials at SGI confirm the building, including the annex, was shown to Mr. Lovell and his colleague, Mr. Bulych, and they confirm that the showing was on the morning of Wednesday July 13, 1983, by the then manager of the facilities department . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I would ask the members to listen carefully on this. It's important that you listen because you should know what it's all about.

However, Mr. Speaker, the manager of that department at that time was not Gary Miller, whose employment with SGI had not yet commenced. SGI management has concluded an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the sale of the old SGI head office building, and the subsequent allegations of conflicts of interest levelled by the opposition. The results of management investigations are contained in memos from SGI management members to the president of SGI, and forwarded to me with a covering memorandum, all of which I will now table, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I just say that the two members opposite have systematically and without any hesitation, impugned the reputation of two local businessmen and management of SGI in this Assembly, where these people, Mr. Speaker, are unable to defend themselves. I would challenge both those members to make those statements outside of this Assembly.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, to put it mildly, your explanations are not doing anything but deepening the suspicions of us and of the public of Saskatchewan, with respect to the way this matter was handled.

Mr. Minister (and I direct these words as much to the Minister of Justice), Mr. Minister this case has got to the point where it should have been the RCMP commercial crime division and not management which is investigating this.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to the two ministers opposite, you have an allegation by Mr. Lovell that, I suggest to you, deserves a more thorough investigation than that which would be given by the management. And I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that if this matter would be properly handled, it would be the RCMP commercial fraud division which would be investigating this and not the management.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, what you're doing, you are covering this matter up. You are covering this matter up, and you're not doing yourself any good, you're not doing your government any good. And I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, you come clean. Mr. Minister I suggest you come clean.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege of this House, the hon. member has impugned some criminal conduct, I believe, to members. I think he knows full well the rules. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to investigate the statements made by the hon. member, and the rules of privilege, because the hon. member has gone far beyond the rules of privilege and the bounds of privilege in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I will review the statements by both sides of the House, and bring in a ruling tomorrow.

Question of Privilege

Mr. Shillington: — Before orders of the day, I wish to raise a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker will be aware that I have already advised you of the subject matter of the question of privilege. I say as well, Mr. Speaker, before I launch into my comments, that I have raised this at the first opportunity.

The subject matter of the point of privilege is a letter and a statement of claim which I received late Thursday afternoon. I did not have the opportunity to be in the House yesterday until very late in the day, so I'm raising it at the earliest opportunity.

Before I come to the substance of the case, I want, Mr. Speaker, to outline a number of citations which I think make it clear of what I'm about to tell the House constitutes a prima facie breach of privilege.

First, I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, citation 16, page 11

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus, privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law.

The distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers". They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members: and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity.

I further ask the Chair to make note of citations 85 and 86, and 90, at pages 26 and 27 of *Beauchesne's*. Citation No. 85 reads:

A complaint of a breach of privilege must conclude with a motion providing the House an opportunity to take some action. The action is normally the reference of the matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for examination. It may, however, be a statement of condemnation for a breach of privilege or an order for an individual to appear at the Bar (of the legislature).

86 reads:

The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections has a free hand within its terms of reference to hear witnesses and call for papers. It is customary for the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel to present a brief and to assist the Committee in reaching its conclusions.

No. 90 says:

Privilege grants considerable punitive powers to the House of Commons. The mildest form of punishment is a simple declaration that an act or article is a breach of privilege. When an individual has been present at the Bar it has been customary to deliver this conclusion to the culprit in the presence of the House. On such

occasions, censure of the individual is usually added to the conclusion that privilege has been offended.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that these citations make it very clear that this Assembly has the power to call before it, before the full House or a committee of the House, anyone whom this Assembly wishes to be questioned with respect to a *prima facie* case of a breach of privilege.

A further definition of breach of privilege or contempt, which I believe holds particular significance in this case, I refer the Chair to the 19th edition of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, Chapter 10, page 136, paragraph A, "Contempt in General."

. . . It may be stated . . . that any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as a contempt, even though there is no precedent . . .

Page 150 of Erskine May, under the heading "Attempted Intimidation of Members":

Attempted intimidation of members. — To attempt to influence Members in their conduct by threats is also a breach of privilege. Examples of this kind of misconduct are:

. . . Sending a letter to a Member threatening him with the possibility of a trial at some future time for asking a question in the House.

Further, at page 151 of Erskine May, the following are examples of contempt: threatening to inflict pecuniary loss upon a member on account of his conduct in parliament. There are specific citations with respect to conventional parliamentary practice, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the specific law governing this legislature. I refer the Assembly in particular to The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, section 24, under the heading: Jurisdiction of Assembly. Section 24 of our act states:

The Assembly is a court (and has) all the rights, powers and privileges of a court for the purpose of summarily inquiring into the punishing . . .

Then sub paragraph (b) is particularly relevant:

(Any) obstructing (or) threatening (of) or (any) attempting to force or intimidate (a member) . . .

I'll be referring to (j) in a moment, when I read the statement of claim:

(The) bringing (of) a civil action or prosecution against or the causing or effecting (of) the arrest or imprisonment of a member . . . for or by reason of any matter or thing brought by him by petition, bill, resolution, motion, or otherwise (or) said by him before the Assembly;

Section 24 (2) states:

For the purposes of (the) Act the Assembly (possesses) all (the) powers and jurisdiction(s) (that) may be necessary or expedient for inquiring into, judging and pronouncing upon the commission or doing of any . . . acts, matters of things (referred to in subparagraph (1)) . . .

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that these citation clearly state that any attempt to threaten a

member of this House by reason of his conduct in the House or any attempt to influence the action of a member in this House constitute a prima facie case of a breach of privilege. These are the rules, practices, and citations upon which I state my case.

And I now come, Mr. Speaker, to the substantive point. I have sent, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the letter addressed to me from the firm of Wilson, Drummond, Finlay, and Neufeld, and signed by a member of that firm, Eric J. Neufeld. The relevant parts of the letter are — it's addressed to Shillington Law Office, and I'll table a copy of it in a moment, and addressed to the attention of myself.

We act as solicitors for Mr. Miller and Silver Developments Ltd. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Mr. Lovell and Fossil Fuel Development Ltd. of this date, which basically outlines our clients' position. The action which we have commenced also names yourself as a party defendant claiming damages for the tort of publication of injurious falsehood in which legislative privilege does not appear to be a defence. We are of the view that our clients are entitled to a formal apology from yourself, both in the media and in the legislature and, in addition, to substantial compensation.

And I want you to note the next paragraph:

As indicated to Mr. Lovell, in ordinary circumstances these matters would be set out in correspondence and a reasonable time given to respond. Had this matter been raised publicly but once, my clients may have been content to proceed in such a fashion. However, due to the continuous repetition of remarks suggesting improprieties in their conduct, they have instructed the immediate issue and service of a statement of claim. Again, if satisfactory amendments are not made to our clients within 14 days of this letter, the action will be pursued vigorously.

A clear suggestion that if the matter is not pursued, the action will not be pursued.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I sent you a copy of a statement of claim issued out of the Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan at the judicial centre of Regina, dated the same date, April 19. I'm not going to read the entire statement of claim, but I do think paragraph 11 should be noted in particular. Paragraph 10, I'm sorry. The plaintiffs (and the plaintiffs are Gary Miller and Silver Developments Ltd.); the defendants are Syd Lovell, Fossil Fuel Developments Ltd., and myself.

The plaintiffs state that the defendant, Shillington, falsely, maliciously and with intent to cause the plaintiffs economic loss, did publish the words above complained of, or words to the same effect, in the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan, on or about April 11 or April 13, 1984, and thereby did commit the tort of publication of malicious, injurious falsehood.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that these documents constitute a prima facie breach of privilege on at least two grounds — I will table these two documents now, if I may, the letter and the statement of claim: the letter from Mr. Neufeld on the grounds that it is threatening me as a member of this Assembly for statements made in this Chamber; the statement of claim because it reflects on the performance of my duties as a member of this House in a derogatory way, and because I suggest it is a clear violation of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act of Saskatchewan, section 24 (1) (j).

Let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that this is not an attempt to fight a court case from the Legislative Assembly. I intend to pursue that court action in another form, and pursue it vigorously.

My statement of claim has nothing to do with the pros and cons of that case, but rather with the

import of circumstances surrounding those two documents.

If you find, Mr. Speaker, that I've outlined a prima facie case of breach of privilege or contempt of a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, I intend to propose a motion along the following lines:

That a letter from Eric J. Neufeld to Shillington law office, dated April 19, 1984, and the matter of statement of claim between Gary Miller and Silver Developments Ltd. as plaintiffs, and Syd Lovell, Fossil Fuel Development Ltd., and Ned Shillington as defendants, and the circumstances surrounding both, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of this legislature, and that in the course of its investigation the committee call before it, as witnesses, Gary Miller, Mark Silver, Eric J. Neufeld, among others.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I did receive your correspondence just before noon today. But after hearing your case presented, I would like to have more time to review what you have said in the circumstances of the legislature, and in conjunction with the letters that you have provided me. And I will bring a ruling back to the House at a later time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, what I will be asking the committee for today is a motion for interim supply. The motion for interim supply will ask for (so it's clear, Mr. Chairman) two-twelfths of the spending of the proposed budget. I believe a week or so ago the minister of government services asked for interim supply and received interim supply of one-twelfth.

What we will be asking for in the motions today is two-twelfths which, when added to the earlier bill, will become three-twelfths of the budget. So that is clear. I believe the hon. member, Leader of the Opposition, had asked that question before.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have a series of motions required to be moved. The first one:

Be it resolved that a sum not exceeding \$511,526,240 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1985.

So that's one-twelfth from before, two-twelfths now, for a total of three-twelfths.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is from the Consolidated Fund and, in due course, we will have others, from the Heritage Fund and from the Special Projects Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The second motion, Mr. Chairman:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$511,526,240 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

That's that second part.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The third one related to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$127,145,180 be granted to Her Majesty on account for 12 months ending March 31, 1985.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Again, out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$127,145,180 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — This is out of the Special Projects Fund:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$5 million be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1985.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Again, out of the Special Projects Fund:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$5 million be granted out of the Special Projects Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move the committee rise and that the chairman report that the committee has agreed to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move that the resolutions be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and resolutions read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the resolutions be now read a second time and agreed to.

By leave of the Assembly, the said resolutions were read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall the committee have leave to sit again?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Later this day, Mr. Speaker.

APPROPRIATION BILL (Interim Supply)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That Bill No. 50, An Act to Grant to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31st, 1985, be introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second and third time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Rousseau that Bill No. 41 — **An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act** be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us is a bill dealing with superannuation provisions of public servants and seeks to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act. I had an opportunity to read the minister's remarks on second reading. I may as well not have availed myself of that opportunity, since the minister said remarkably little with respect to Bill No. 41.

The minister did not mention any plans he would have to provide for an increase in superannuation benefits to retired public servants and surviving dependants. And this has traditionally been the case and has traditionally been included in the amendments to The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

The minister indicated that we would have yet another Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act, of which he did not yet have a copy, but which was due to take effect a couple of days from now.

I simply want to say to the House and the minister that we will reserve the right to debate that issue when it arises. And I trust that there will be no request for a hurry-up dealing with this legislation which clearly could have been tabled in the House months and months ago.

By way of illustration, the provisions of The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act which increased the pensions of current superannuated, the reference to those bills was included in the Speech from the Throne in 1980, in November; the Speech from the Throne in 1981, in November.

It's a bill that the government knows it's going to bring in. And it is passing strange that this government neither mentioned it in the Speech from Throne nor has yet laid it before the House.

I will turn now to the specific provisions of the bill before us, which deal with basically an early retirement scheme for existing members of the public service. The minister did not explain why he had embarked upon this retirement program, or how it would work, or how it differs — and I think this would have been a key point — how it differs from the earlier retirement schemes offered to employees of Crown corporations.

We have knowledge of earlier retirement proposals introduced for SGI and for Sask Tel and for SPC. And it would, I think, have been very helpful to the House if the minister had outlined in general terms how this proposal for earlier retirement of public servants proper compared with the earlier retirement proposals outlined for employees of SGI and Sask Tel and SPC, all of which have been around for roughly one year. They were introduced . . . The details of them were made public in the late spring of 1983.

A number of questions arise, some of which may more properly be dealt with in committee, but some of them go to the principle of the bill. One of them is the very short time which people apparently have to opt into this bill. If we are going to provide an early retirement scheme, it seems to me that it ought to be available to public servants, not only to act immediately, and not only to have one opportunity in the fall, but to have some longer period — perhaps a year or two — to take advantage of the earlier retirement scheme.

There may well be many public servants who have commitments based upon their need for their current salary level at this time, but who would like to rearrange their affairs to take advantage of the early retirement scheme but can't do so with a lead time of a couple of months — would be able to do so if they were given that opportunity over a period of 24 months, say. That does not appear to be in the bill, and I am puzzled as to why some arrangement like that is not provided for in the bill.

There is no mention in the bill of any indexing for inflation. I would not necessarily have expected that to be in the bill. I would have wished that the minister would have indicated what the intentions of the government were, whether it was the intention that these superannuates would be dealt with in the same way as we have dealt with superannuates for a goodly number of years, providing them with an annual cost of living bonus pursuant to changes in The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act. That was not forthcoming, and I regretted that we didn't have that information at hand.

One other point I want to make, and that deals with the way that the bridge financing is proposed to be handled in the bill. The proposal essentially is that a payment be made to the employee from the time he takes early retirement until he reaches the age of 65, and that this will augment his income during this period; but when he is 65 he will not any longer have that type of bridge assistance.

I would have hoped that the bill would have contained an alternative scheme whereby the amounts might have been paid into a Registered Retirement Savings Plan, or like arrangement, so that the employee who leaves the government employ and takes other employment might be able to take that interim or bridge financing, and use it to augment the pension he will get at age 65, rather than having to accept it now during a period when he may be able to have alternative employment open to him, and have to take a smaller pension at age 65.

Those are matters which I would have liked to have found in the bill, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of comments with respect to a more detailed comparison of the early retirement schemes offered to Sask Power, Sask Tel, and SGI, compared with the one offered to the public service employees. I think it'd be more appropriate to deal with the particular comparisons when we get to committee. The bill is one which I will be supporting, and I believe my colleagues will be supporting. We would have wished that it had offered to employees of the government some of the benefits which were offered to employees of SPC, SGI, and Sask Tel.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I indicate that I will be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Mr. Chairman: — Is the minister ready to proceed?

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I'd like some specific information, first of all. And I was wondering if you could send over a list of all of your personal staff, and the amount that they're paid, and the particular position that they occupy?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman. Yes, I'd be happy to send that over to you just as soon as we dig it out. Hon. member, I should point out there has been one change since this was prepared. There is one addition to that.

Mr. Koskie: — And could the . . . If the change really reflects an addition, I wonder then if the minister would wither add that to the list which he is sending over or either indicate verbally what it is?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Hon. member, I'd like to point out that there's one change. There will be two changes: one person has moved to a different office, and one person is on leave of absence without pay. And I have to add one name to this as a ministerial assistant, and I'll make that change right now for you, and I'll send it over, if that's acceptable.

Mr. Koskie: — Fine. I'll just wait for that, Mr. Chairman. I'll just wait.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the minister for the information. What I would ask the minister, if he would indicate, since he has been appointed minister, whether he has made any out-of-province trips since he has been appointed.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'm sure, as you are aware, that there has been some travel in the course of my duties and performance as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. There have been some necessary trips.

Mr. Koskie: — I wonder if the minister could provide me with, since he became minister, the number of out-of-province trips which he has, in fact, made. In each case indicated his destination and the purpose of the trip, and whether he would, in fact, name each person who accompanied him on government expense; and, thirdly, in each case, the total cost of the trip, separated according to the cost incurred in each of the following (that is, break it down for each): air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, and miscellaneous.

Could the minister provide that information?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, that information, the type of information, and pertinent information which you require, we will be able to provide for you in the usual manner in due course.

Mr. Koskie: — I want a clarification from the minister whether or not he will answer the specific request which I have, the specific question which I have related to him. In other words, are you going to answer the question as I put forward to you?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, as I indicated, there was some pertinent

information to which you are most certainly entitled and require; and that pertinent information will be forwarded in the usual manner.

Mr. Koskie: — I'm going to be specific on this because we've had difficulty previously in motions for return. And I'm going to specifically ask, and I understand the minister to have said that in respect to the particular question that I have asked, in respect to his out-of-town trips, that he will indicate the destination, he will indicate who accompanied him, he will indicate the expense, and that he will break it down — in each case, the total cost of the trips, separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous — just so that I am clear as to what the minister is committing himself. Would you confirm that you will, in fact, provide the information as particularized in the question that I've asked?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I believe there is a traditional manner in which this type of information is transmitted, and I certainly would have no intention of breaking with that tradition.

Mr. Koskie: — I would like to ask the minister: what is the tradition that you are following? What are you afraid to disclose? We have been through this before, and certainly what has happened is all ministers are being lumped into one cover-up. And what we're asking you is: are you prepared, as a reputable minister, are you prepared to give the information when the specific details with which we have asked? And if you are not, then I ask, I want to ask you for what reason are you denying that information?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, far be it from me to deny you pertinent and salient information. As I say, in due course, with the time-honoured traditions — and I think we went through it a couple of evenings — that information will certainly be made available to you.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to also ask the minister whether . . . since he, in fact, was appointed minister, whether he would name each person whose services were retained under a written contract, under which such person was paid, or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 a month or more, by or with your department; the date on which each written contract was entered into; and, three, the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; and the experience and the qualifications of each person retained under contract; the duties of each person retained under the contract; and, six, a copy of each written contract.

This deals with people who you have hired under a personal services contract. And if, indeed, you have any individuals in that category, is the minister prepared to provide that information?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, you said since I was appointed minister. And I'm very seriously trying to recollect who, in fact, I may have appointed under contract. And I'm actually not certain anybody has been appointed by me under contract. But that would be made available in due course and through public accounts.

Mr. Koskie: — Well once again, the purpose of estimates is a process that we are able to get immediate information. And what I'm asking . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just a moment, I'll ask the questions. What I am asking here is: why are you denying to provide that type of information to this legislature?

I have had no explanation from the minister why he is denying this legislature information which he has.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'm advised that the people who were on under contract were there prior to my assuming the portfolio.

Mr. Koskie: — Well then, I will amend my statement, and I will ask you: will you provide the information of any person who has been employed under a personal contract since May 8, 1982, up till the present, and to provide the information as I set out in the specific question relating to your term of office? Are you prepared to provide that information, or are you going to continue the cover-up of information which, indeed, this Assembly deserves to receive, and it is our responsibility, I think, in estimates, to know, and to be able to advise the public as to how the particular funds are being spent.

And so I ask you: are you prepared to provide the information as set out in the initial question during your tenure of office, and substituting for that since May 8, 1982, a list of all those who are on personal service contracts, and the details of those contracts and as set out in the sub-items that I gave to you previously?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, there is no attempt to cover anything. I believe there's a format, a traditionally accepted method whereby that information is made available. The pertinent and salient features of the information which you require will be made available due to that format.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I just want to say, Mr. Minister, that in following the format which we have clearly indicated, what there is is an attempt here to conceal the expenditures for out-of-province trips by the ministers of the Crown. There is no other reason for not providing a breakdown of the expenses. There's no conceivable reason for it. You have indicated that you are prepared to provide us with the global amount. What our contention on this side is, that if indeed you are able to arrive at the global amount, you obviously know the individual items. And accordingly, what we want is the breakdown.

And if you have nothing to cover up, I don't know why you should be lumped in with other ministers who apparently deem it necessary to continue this basic cover-up of information which we are entitled to.

So I'm asking the minister, are you, in fact, prepared to provide the specific information that we have been requesting?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'm looking at a Saskatchewan Social Services return no. 60 on a motion of Mr. Taylor. And order of the Legislative Assembly was issued on March 25, 1980 for a return showing, and I'm just looking at the answer.

It said the Hon. Murray J. Koskie made one out-of-province trip to Toronto, November 13, 14, to meet with the Hon. D. Crombie and provincial ministers of social services. He was accompanied by — I won't name the official . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, there is no problem with it, I'm sure — by Ron Hikel, associate deputy minister, social services. The total cost of the trip was \$828.35.

Hon. member, that type of information, such as contained here, we will certainly make available to you.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to make it . . . I don't know why the minister would get up and refer to an order for return by Mr. Taylor, in respect to a trip that I took as minister of social services, because that's the specific information they required.

And what is more, I don't think that we, in opposition, want to judge or be judged on the incompetence of the opposition when they were sitting over on this side. And so we can't set the precedent as to what was being done and asked for previously.

I think we have an obligation, and we are indeed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are indeed . . . I'll tell you. You can laugh. You can laugh, but what I want to say, Mr. Minister, that we are very,

very intent on getting this information. But more importantly, I want to ask you why you won't give the breakdown of the expenses as we have been requesting. Why won't you?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well there were a couple of points that arose in what the hon. member was saying just now. He mentioned, first of all, an incompetent opposition when the PCs sat over there. They formed government, so they must have done something right. But apart from that, as you I am sure, as you I am sure, hon. member, had nothing to hide, I too have nothing to hide. And I too will give you the same information as you provided to us. I have no reason whatsoever to suspect your motives for the type of format used in your reply to return, and I'm sure you really have no reason to suspect mine. So I'll provide you with the same type of information in due course.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I'm not going to pursue this much longer, but I just want to indicate that the information that was requested when we were on the government side — we provided it. And there can be no other reason, no other reason why you won't provide this. Either you have something to hide, or you can come clean. This is your opportunity to break from the Minister of Justice who sat here the other night and refused to give pertinent information. Why do you have to go by the dictates of the Minister of Justice, or some of the other ministers who have been travelling around the world on somewhat suspect trips, while you, in fact, have been doing your job?

You have an opportunity to provide the information, to break from the cover-up, the cover-up which is being perpetrated on the House by some ministers. And I ask you, here is . . . No one is challenging your integrity, no one. And what I'm saying to you, why not, rather than just the global expenses, break it down as we have requested? What would be damaging in that information so far as you're concerned? Why would it be damaging to you to break down the specific global amount that you expended in out-of-province trips? What damage would do to you?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well Mr. Chairman, hon. member, thank you for clarifying that my integrity is not in question. I appreciate that comment. I intend to fulfil the requests of the opposition in due course, as per the established format, in the time-honoured tradition of the House.

Mr. Koskie: — I wonder if the minister could provide any consulting firms that were contracted during the course of the past year, who the consulting firms were, the purpose of hiring any consulting firms, and the total amount that was paid in each instance, if indeed there were any consulting firms hired.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, we are searching just now to look around, because the types of consultation we may have had would have been in the area of technical program development — program development related to institutes or community colleges or something similar. We'll attempt to see what we have on that for you.

Mr. Koskie: — I mentioned it the other day, and I want to turn to the more substantive issues, but can you indicated the reason for the demotion of Mr. Gil Johnson, who was the deputy minister of advanced education?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I didn't hear the entire question. I believe it was related to the previous deputy minister who has subsequently moved on to accept the position as chairman of the securities commission.

Mr. Koskie: — It had to do with that, and I asked you why he was demoted, why he was removed from the department as deputy minister, when all indications to me was that he was doing an excellent job in his discussions with the universities; had set up a liaison between your department and the universities; that a new era of co-operation was developing; and suddenly,

in your rather crude approach to the whole question of universities, it would appear that his style of dealing in a civilized manner with the higher institutions did not, in fact, correspond with your rather robust, and I would think, somewhat confrontational approach.

And I'm going to get to your approach to universities. But I'm asking you: did you have any particular reason for moving Mr. Gil Johnson on out of the department? Were you unsatisfied with the performance that he was providing to the department?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, the previous deputy minister, Gil Johnson, is a gentleman of high standing in this community. He is well respected. He certainly has my respect. I like the gentleman very much. He took the opportunity to take on a new challenge, a new position, and I wish him good luck in the position. I know that he's a competent gentleman who'll do a good job.

Mr. Koskie: — Well just to be a little more specific, are you going to tell me that Mr. Gil Johnson asked to be transferred out of the Department of Advanced Education? Is that what you're stating here?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, Mr. Johnson and I have a mutual respect for each other. I don't criticize Mr. Johnson, and I never will criticize Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Koskie: — Well can I ask you again: was it the request of Mr. Johnson to move on to a more challenging position, not as deputy minister of advanced education and manpower, but to go over and act as chairman of the securities commission?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman and hon. member, I imagine that question would be more properly directed to Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I'll ask you specifically. Did you request another person act as your deputy minister other than Mr. Johnson? Did you, in fact, make the decision that Mr. Johnson would no longer be the deputy minister while you were minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — As I already indicated to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, any separation that took place between Mr. Johnson and the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower was of a mutual nature. I had no problems with it.

Mr. Koskie: — Well you may have no problems, Mr. Minister, but I'll tell you that what you're indicating here is not, I don't believe, shared quite as enthusiastically as what you indicated by the other party to the departure.

What I want to ask you to give me a list of any persons that have been fired in your department during the last year. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Never mind. I'll ask the questions. Not you. Your turn will come. Your turn will come.

I want to know the number of persons, if any, that were fired during the past year. I would like to have a list of the individuals which you ruthlessly disposed of in the high traditions of compassion that this government has been showing to employees of the government. So I'd like to know the list of all those that may have been fired. And I'd also like a list of those that were transferred out of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'd be very happy to provide that information for you. I will get it prepared in written form of all people who have left the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. Hon. member, was that since I became minister, or since May 8 of '82? May 8 of '82. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, we will undertake to list that for you.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to turn, Mr. Minister, to your basic relationship with the university. And I know you were not long in the office before you raised some eyebrows and some deep concern among the university, particularly at the University of Regina. And I recall when you made these comments and I want to follow it up with some of the concerns that have been expressed by the university faculty association. But the heading here in the *Leader Post*, third page is, “The U of R Has No Room For Any More Students.”

And you are reported to have said:

If they (universities) are so busting at the seams, why isn't the timetable reflecting it? Walk around the building and look at the doors with the timetables and schedules of the rooms, and then show me that every room is busy every teaching hour of the day, said Maxwell.

Is that your concept of the ultimate of an efficient operating university?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. If the members of the opposition wish the question answered, we'll have to have a little order.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'll yell so we can overcome all the rest of this. The utilization of 71 classrooms at the U. of R. averages 70 per cent. The utilization is 70 per cent. It's under 50 per cent in certain times of the day. That was the point I was trying to make.

Mr. Koskie: — Well having now explained it, do you think that you were justified in marching around the campus and indicating to them that every room . . . You say:

Walk around the buildings and look at the doors with the timetables and the schedules of the rooms, and then show me that every room is busy every teaching hour of the day.

Is it, in fact, your perception that every room should be filled 100 per cent of the time? What was the particular point that you were trying to make — because it wasn't really grasped very well by the university faculty association. Could you be more articulate and explain what you were getting at?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — If I recall the specific conversation from the report . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sorry, I can't hear you. Give me that again . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . About 54. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should get back to the issue of . . . (inaudible) . . . although I much prefer the little exchange with the members on the benches.

I think I've forgotten what your question was.

The specific question to which I was responding at that time, if I remember correctly, was, and this is going back a long time, one gentleman in the media had said, “The university needs more buildings and they need another floor on top of the education building. They need more space. They're short of space, and we have to get into a building program.” And I was pointing out that I don't think we should be getting into a building program on the campus of the University of Regina.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I want to just pursue a little further here these words of wisdom that were echoed by you, and you go on to say:

I don't want to know how many committees they (the professors) are on. I don't

want to know all their preparation time and marking time, because some of that should be done on their own time, like it is with school teachers. I want to know how many hours they spend in the class-room teaching students for seven months of the year which they work.

There are some people who do not teach at all. Now we're either running teaching in institutes or we're going to be strictly doing research for some individuals. How would you feel if your kid got turned away from the Faculty of Education and then you find out guys (professors — guys, you know) are only teaching eight hours a week?

What I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: what, in fact, do you feel the university role is in education? Because here you have narrowed down to the extent that they should be in the class-room and they should be teaching constantly, and every room should be filled, because that's what you're saying. And so what I'm asking you: what do you perceive the role of education to be, and the role of the professors at the various campuses?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, take two or three things first. I made one slip — just one — when I said “work”. I meant “teach.” So I take responsibility for that word. The rest, let me reply to that.

The concept, the role, of the university — let's take a look at that. As a former faculty member at that particular institution, the University of Regina, for about three years, I'm well aware that there are more facets to being a university professor, instructor, or lecturer than teaching. In fact, in the contract for the faculty associateship there are four areas laid out. And in the contract it says an instructor may be required to do one, any, or all of those particular functions.

One of the functions is teaching. Obviously, research is another one, and community service is a particular function which has been outlined and well defined. I accept that all of those functions are very important to the university, but that particular remark — unfortunately, you didn't get the questions that were asked, and you didn't get the punctuation marks that followed my comments, because it was done on a telephone and not face to face — but the particular part to which you're referring there on the teaching load, at that time we were being requested to find supplemental money for universities based on enrolment.

And the point I had made, which has escaped there somewhere, is that enrolment centres around the teaching function, because the students who go to the university, by and large, the vast majority of them, attend university to be taught classes. Therefore, the question begs to be asked: if we are going to provide more money for enrolment, it relates to the teaching function, what is a teaching function? And what is a teaching load? And as far as the utilization is concerned, there are times of the day where classrooms are utilized to 40 per cent and sometimes even less.

Mr. Koskie: — I'd like to ask the minister whether he had the opportunity of — subsequently to making these outrageous remarks — whether he had the opportunity to meet with the faculty association in order to better explain his lack of knowledge and his ignorance and whether, in fact, he has tried to bridge this gap of co-operation which existed so well before. And accordingly, I would like to know whether the minister has had any consultation with the faculty association to, indeed, explain his lack of understanding.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I have had meetings with individual members of faculty. I've had meetings with officials of the university. For instance, the one letter, I'll quote it again to you. I did meet in November with Ted Regehr and Alex MacDonald. Mr. Regehr, Professor Regehr, is the president of the Saskatchewan Association of University Teachers, and his letter says:

Dear Mr. Maxwell: On behalf of Mr. Alex MacDonald and myself, I wish to thank you for taking time to meet with us to discuss matters of concern pertaining to problems and challenges at our universities. We appreciated the candour of your questions and comments, and hope there will be further opportunities to discuss and search for acceptable solutions to those problems and challenges. We thank you for the interview.

Mr. Koskie: — Your comments were primarily addressed to the University of Regina. And for the record, I want to quote from a letter from the faculty association, which was addressed to you, and to indicate the basic concern that you caused to the faculty. And I'll quote in part. It says:

Dear Mr. Maxwell: On behalf of the executive and members of the University of Regina Faculty Association, I write to express our unequivocal rejection of the content and the spirit of remarks made by you as reported in the *Leader-Post*, October 11, 1983. Our reasons for rejecting the remarks' content are several.

First of all, you are factually wrong. University teachers are not engaged in teaching during seven months of the year they work. They are eligible for a six-week vacation after five years of service if they have a full-time appointment. Many university teachers have not taken the full allocation of holidays for several years since there is not enough time for them to accomplish all of their responsibilities.

But secondly, the remarks are remarkably ill-informed. Anyone familiar with university teaching understands that the number of contact hours in the classroom does not completely reflect actual teaching time.

And it goes on to expound on that, that it indicated how ill-informed that you are.

You are also uninformed when, following your Wednesday visit to one of six buildings containing classrooms, you observed that classroom space was unutilized one-fifth of the time. Some classrooms are not in use on Wednesdays. To conclude that university teachers and students are not productively engaged is nonsense. At this time faculty are supervising students engaged in departmental seminars, advising graduate students, and so on.

And finally (they indicate) it would appear that you are unaware that university teachers are required to engage in activities other than teaching.

And it goes on to say,

This is surprising at best. We must also reject the spirit of your remarks, since they do such a profound disservice to all who are attempting to ensure that the University of Regina continues to provide quality university education to all its students, be they full-time or part-time, Canadian or foreign, on or off campus, mature or high school graduates.

This is the spirit with which your confrontation and your basic ignorance of approach with the university solicited such comments from the faculty association at the University of Regina.

And I think the important thing here, Mr. Minister, is, one, your lack of knowledge, being ill-informed; and secondly, the brashness with which you approached the university.

And I think, secondly, the clear other indication that is developing here is that you have done away with the university commission which was a go-between between university and government. You've done away with it, and now what is happening is that the very

independence and the autonomy of the university is going to be dictated by the government opposite, just as it is happening over in British Columbia under another right-wing government. They have totally eroded the autonomy of the universities there under Premier Bennett, and this government is only one step behind.

So this is the concern that we, in the opposition and the public, see in the approach that your government is undertaking. First, to walk in on a confrontational basis and try to, in fact, decrease the high reputation of our university and the quality of our instructions on those campuses. And so what I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: is this indeed a prelude to your interference and further interference in the autonomy and the direction of education in this province?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No. And I would like, for the record — you quoted from a letter from Pamela J. Smith, URFA chairperson to me, which, by the way, was delivered by hand to my office, I imagine a copy of which was delivered at precisely the same time to the office of the opposition, because certainly a copy of that appeared in the newspaper the following day, and I had no time to respond to it. However, notwithstanding that, I had some communication with Ms. Smith, and I'd like to quote from her letter to me:

Your response, the additional information it contains, and the suggestions concerning future discussions, are appreciated. Not only is it my expectation that we will be able to develop agreement concerning the problems which confront universities, it is also that appropriate remedies can be proposed. Exchanges of this type are both welcome and essential. (Signed) Pamela J. Smith

Mr. Koskie: — That doesn't, in fact, detract from the very fact that you went and made a fool of yourself with the university community. And they, accordingly, addressed you of being ill-informed and your comments not justified. And that's the conclusion, and they headed you off, and you had to backtrack.

But what I'm asking you here, Mr. Minister: is it the intention of this government, since it's done away with the university commission, is it in fact your intention to further involve the government in the direction of the universities?

And you can do that in two ways, and we'll come to it. And one way is the control of funding, but more precisely, by the elimination of the commission, there is no buffer. And your actions seem to indicate that that is indeed the direction you're going.

So I want to ask the minister: what guarantees are you prepared to give us here that the autonomy of the universities will not — since the commission has been removed — will not, in fact, be decreased? And that the quality of education, which we in Saskatchewan have long cherished, and the reputation of the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina has been held in high esteem across this nation. And certainly we are concerned that someone with the tenacity, but the lack of knowledge will, in fact, interfere with the local autonomy.

And so, since the commission is gone, what assurances can you, in fact, provide to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that your next step is not further control of courses, the nature of studies, the ratio of professors, what the professors are going to be doing, because that seems to be what you're addressing — that there are a number of faculty members there, unless they're teaching, they shouldn't be around. So this is of concern to us, and I wonder if the minister can give some assurance in respect to that.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well first of all, Mr. Chairman, it was the subject of space I was addressing, not the faculty members. On the subject of autonomy, academic freedom, I think — and I'm not the first minister who's occupied this position who's said it — that we have to differentiate academic freedom and accountability, and certainly, each of those institutions has, and must have, their own systems of accountability which meet the needs of the public and the

needs of us as legislators.

I want to indicate to the hon. member that we provide, almost without exception, our funding to the universities on an unconditional basis. We provide funding, and then leave it to the university to determine the appropriate use of those financial resources in terms of teaching, research, community service, or whatever.

And those words weren't penned by me originally. I was quoting from *Hansard*, page 3538, May 26, 1980. Those were the words of Doug McArthur, and nothing has changed since then.

Mr. Koskie: — It's rather surprising that the minister would stand up and say that nothing has changed. Obviously something has changed, because we did have a university commission which was, in fact, a buffer between the direct interference of the government with the affairs of the university. And you stand up here and give improper information. Obviously it has changed, and what I'm asking you is: what safeguards have you really built in? And what assurances can you give that since the commission has been done away with — which, in our view, was the buffer between the two essential bodies, the university and the government, sort of an independent analysis of the needs of the university and an assessment of their needs. Now what you have has removed that and so what I am asking you: what have you got in substitution which will, in fact, guarantee the academic autonomy of the universities?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, first of all, and talking about being ignorant of the universities or not understanding how universities are run, I'd like to point out that, having had more than one meeting with each of the boards of governors of the universities, and several private meetings with the presidents and other officials, they are quite impressed by the fact that I have a very good understanding of the bicameral system which operates in our universities.

As regards the universities commission, I don't like to disappoint you, hon. member, but the two boards of governors have indicated, and the chancellors and the presidents, on more than one occasion, that they're very happy there is no more universities commission.

And in terms of the latter part of your remarks, we intend to follow the university act as it is written, and I contemplate no changes to it in the immediate future.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to turn to your manpower policy. I am sure that since you are the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, I would hope at least that you have, in fact, looked at the issues for Advanced Education and Manpower. I would think that you have done some survey in respect to the manpower needs in the future, the nature of the type of jobs that will be available, the prospects of jobs for our young people. And I would like, as the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, I'd like if you would outline some of the issues that you have seen in so far as you review of the manpower policies to be adopted by the government.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly. As the hon. member is probably aware, one of the most imprecise sciences over the years has been accurate projection — accurately being able to prophecy what the future will hold in terms of jobs and the job market.

In the last 30 or 40 years or so the total knowledge of mankind has doubled in that one period alone. We've been facing tremendous technological advances which, in some cases, are necessitating that people will, through no fault of their own, become obsolete or redundant because the skills they have, and the skills they have acquired, are no longer necessary. And one of the issues that we've been looking at is retraining, upgrading, and looking at our existing work-force, and trying to make sure that those people with the age of 25, or 30, or 40 years old are not being told, "I'm sorry, but you're obsolete, because the skills you acquired, we don't need them any more." What we want to do is make sure that those people are given a reasonable opportunity for retraining. To that extent we do have within the manpower division the labour

market planning information branch.

Now having said that it's been an imprecise science over the years, we do think we've made some strides in that regard, hon. member. We think that we have a good branch who are trying to take a look at the labour market analysis, and they are trying to provide the type of information that we require, so that we know what type of courses to provide, either through the community colleges, the technical institutes, or the Saskatchewan Schools Extension Program. As you are well aware, we don't tell the universities which subjects or courses they teach, but we do have some liaison in that regard.

We also have together just this last year, I formed the acronym, SITAC, the Saskatchewan Industrial Training Advisory Council, who report directly to me. The object there is to bring in people who are being, shall I say, the captains of industry who can identify for us some of the things they see happening within their individual areas. There is some labour representation on that too. The types of things they're doing is identifying where they see their industry going, what type of people they will require in their industry, what type of training is going to be required, and how many people they will need. So these are some of the ways in which we're looking at the problem.

Mr. Koskie: — I was wondering, Mr. Minister . . . That's a general outline of what you're looking at. I wonder if you could be a little bit more specific, and to basically outline what you see, the particular future, for young people entering the job market here in Saskatchewan. Can you indicated those areas which you feel that they should be directing their talents to, in order to fit into this new high-tech society?

There is certainly a major concern among our young people of Saskatchewan. Certainly, there has been additional funding for the institutes, and we give you credit for that. But there's masses of people, Mr. Minister — many, many young people — who are going and taking your technical training, only to come out to return home after graduating. And I can give you instances of people in my constituency, young people who went and did exceedingly well, came home, graduated, went back into the cities — the major cities of Saskatoon and Regina — and have searched for jobs, only to find that there is no openings for the training, the particular training that they have taken.

And what I am asking you, Mr. Minister, if you can perhaps outline in a little bit more detail, and more specifically, what you would be recommending; the types of courses that our young people should be taking which will guarantee them — whether it's in technical schools or in universities, the type of training that you see in this new technological society — those courses which would be most beneficial.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, that was an excellent question and it's on the tips of many tongues in Saskatchewan. It was a far-ranging question. So I'm sorry, but I'm going to have to take a couple of minutes to try and respond to it. I don't know how specific I can get, but you can bring me back to it, and as we move along I'll be as specific as I can.

First of all, within the manpower division, we are trying to cater also to special interest groups. We have the native services branch, the women's services branch, the youth services branch, labour market planning information branch. Those groups are also listening to SITAC, as I mentioned earlier, because they're the people who are giving us some indication of what they think the job market is. There's no point in us, as the member, the hon. member correctly identified, churning out several thousand people in one trade, and then we find that they're either going to be obsolete, redundant, or that job just . . . There's no market in that job. That's so correct.

Which brings us into another thing, which is counselling. And we're making a big effort to get into the adult counselling field, not only through the technical institutes — the universities

handle their own — but also through the community college system, which is a fine system and it's a perfect vehicle for that particular avenue to be explored in Saskatchewan.

There is, courtesy of CEIC, a federal designated list of jobs which they've identified as being the types of jobs of the future, the types of areas we should be moving in. And some cases are pointing to the high technology courses, the things like computer assistant design, computer assistant management. At the other extreme, away from a highly technical type skill, they're pointing to a shortage of short-order cooks some place down the line.

The hon. member is correct. There are people who are taking courses, they finish, they graduate, and then they find that given the current economic situation not only in Canada but in the western world, in fact, probably more so in general, that things are pretty tough to find jobs.

But in that regard, I would like to quote from an article I picked up in the *Leader-Post* of April the 3rd of this year by Roger Sauve. It says: "Youth Group Size is Dwindling." I'll just point out a couple of points on it. It says:

The number of people in the 15 to 24 age group peaked in the early 1980s at about 184,000, but has since dropped by 4,000.

Further down:

. . . anticipate that by 1991, the decline will have exceeded 22,000.

Further on:

The implications for labour markets are noteworthy as young people available for entry-type jobs will decline by some 15,000 from today's level (and that's extremely significant). Although the idea seems to be inconceivable in the current economic environment, a youth labour shortage is likely to develop in the second half of the 1980s. This will cause intensive competition to obtain young workers.

One other point:

The secondary school age population has already peaked and will decline by 25 per cent by the late 1980s.

If these figures which are being used from Stats Canada are correct, and I for one certainly have no reason to doubt them, going back to what this gentleman, Mr. Sauve, has said here: "A youth labour shortage is likely to develop in the second half of the 1980s," then I would submit that at no time is it more important, at no time is it more vital to make sure that our young people are receiving as much education and training as they possibly can to take advantage of that situation, as it will arise in the late 1980s and the early 1990s.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I would have . . . I appreciate the minister reading from an article from the *Leader-Post* setting out the future for our young people. I would have thought that the minister would have done an analysis in his department. And perhaps he did, and perhaps he's ashamed to bring forward the document.

Because I want to refer to a document which was, in fact, prepared by the *Issues for Advanced Education and Manpower*, and it's prepared for the discussions with the Hon. Grant Devine on August 8, 1983. And there are some critical assumptions in the next 10 years. And what it says, there will be changes in the mix of industries making up Saskatchewan economy.

And I suppose before I go into it in more detail, I should ask the minister: are you aware of the particular document that I am referring to? I better start with that. It's entitled *Issues for*

Advanced Education and Manpower, prepared for discussion with Hon. Grant Devine, the date is August 8, '83. Are you familiar with that?

The first critical assumption then, is that there will be changes in the mix of the industries making up the Saskatchewan economy. Can the minister elaborate on essentially what you have analysed in respect to that mix of the industries? Have you done an in-depth analysis of where segments of the labour force will have to be shifted? Have you attempted to determine what portion of the labour force will, in fact, have to be retrained? I'd like your general comments in respect to that.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, delighted to comment on two or three topics you raise there. First of all, the document issues, dated August, the so-called . . . I imagine this is the so-called leaked document. I was gone the weekend the so-called leaked document came out. I came back late Sunday night and heard nothing about it till Monday. It was leaked very, very smoothly on a Friday, just in time for the weekend media, at a time which was no coincidence where I was out of the city — in fact, out of the province. So it wasn't exactly a, not exactly a coincidence that happened.

Also I would submit, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't a coincidence that that early draft of a final document which was, oh, prepared in October some time for the Premier, that early draft was, in fact, written by someone in the department who was an OC appointment under the previous administration.

Now that's fine. I have no objections to that whatsoever. The gentleman is still there. The gentleman is still there, although I certainly took exception to some of the comments he made in some of his so-called critical assumptions. But I should point out that that gentleman was not appointed by me; he was not appointed by this administration. And it has been subsequently pointed out to the gentleman that his thinking may, in fact, reflect the socialist thinking of a few years ago; but it certainly is not in line with our thinking . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I won't give names.

Further to that however, hon. member, I will send over to you a labour market overview. You were asking for some specifics, and I see no reason why I can't share this with you. So we will send you the labour market overview, and if you are interested in getting a copy of the CEIC designated list to which I referred earlier, I'll certainly make sure that we undertake to provide that for you as well, because that, in part, does tell us the labour market future in Saskatchewan, as well as other areas, if that is satisfactory to you.

Mr. Koskie: — I think what we have seen here by the minister is one of the cheapest shots at an employee in his department, that he would stand up here and single out one individual employee. And I think that really indicates the nature of this individual that calls himself today the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Stands up here and a document which expresses, undoubtedly, undoubtedly, the position of the government, but which is embarrassing to the government. It expresses certainly what is in reality happening in Saskatchewan. And here he stands up in the legislature and assails one of his employees to get himself off the hook.

One of the interesting features of this report which you are denying now is the fact that higher levels of unemployment will become socially acceptable, while training capacities and delivery modes will need to be flexible and adaptive to meet occupational and other types of training demands. I take it you are denying the validity of that statement. I would ask the minister: do you agree that there is throughout the country a development, nurtured by many Tory governments across this country, that high unemployment is indeed socially acceptable? And is this the future that you're holding out to the young people of this province?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you once again, hon. member, for

giving me the opportunity to comment on this particular subject. The document to which you referred, the one dated in August, was a preliminary draft, as I said earlier, done by one individual. I haven't assailed him. The gentleman is in no way being chastised. He's still there. He's still working. He's still employed by the department. He wrote it, not I, sir. That's the point I want to make. And not only did I not write it but it certainly does not reflect either my views or the views of my colleagues or the views of this government.

As to the part of the acceptability of higher unemployment levels, I would like to refer the hon. member to the budget speech of my colleague, the Minister of Finance. The measures which were contained in that budget to stimulate the economy and to create employment opportunities do not sound like acceptance of high unemployment, not only to me, not only to my colleagues, but not to anybody else in Saskatchewan either.

As you well know, some of the statistics have shown that latterly we've had the lowest unemployment rates across the country. And I could dwell at some length on unemployment figures over the last 10, 12 years, but I'm sure you don't want me to delay proceedings.

Mr. Koskie: — I'd like to ask the minister whether he feels that he, or his government, have been doing an adequate job in curbing the very high rate of unemployment among our young people. As you will know, the rate of unemployment is in the neighbourhood of 15 to 17 per cent among young people. The steps that have been taken — and we'll be getting into some of the programs — the Opportunities '84. I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, whether you feel that your government has really been doing an adequate job in providing meaningful and permanent employment to the young people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, again that was kind of a far-reaching question. So with your indulgence I'll take a minute or two here to respond. Let's take a look at participation in Saskatchewan's labour force. In 1971 it was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, in 1971 it was 55.3 per cent. In 1981, the participation rate was 63.5 per cent, which is an increase by 8.2. In 1983, Mr. Chairman, 65.2 per cent, an increase of 1.7 per cent. A 10-year average participation rate increase per annum was 0.75 of 1 per cent. In the last two years, that average participation rate increase per annum is up to 0.85 per cent. So yes, I would say we've been doing something. Yes, we've been doing something positive. Yes, we've been doing a good job.

Let's take a look at Saskatchewan's labour force. From 1971 to 1981, average annual increase, 8,200 per annum. From 1982 to 1983, however, the average annual increase is 12,000 per annum. If you take August '83 over August '82, it actually showed a 22,000 increase as compared to Alberta at 17,000 and Manitoba at 16,000.

The May '83 increase over May '82, 11,000 people more were employed. August '83 increase over August '82, 19,000 more people employed. And that was the largest increase for any month in one year in the last 14 years or so.

Unemployment in Saskatchewan in '71 through '77, lowest rate in Canada. In '77 through '82, second lowest in Canada, to Alberta. In '82 to March '84, the lowest in Canada; March '84, second lowest, only to Manitoba. And if I may dwell for a moment with statistics and unemployment figures that had been released, and were discussed in the House a week or so ago, the figures that were used were for the week ending March 17, which was prior to our budget coming down, and which would have showed 19,000 jobs in that budget.

The labour force at that point showed 463,000 in March of '84, as compared to February '84 at 459. So we'd had an increase in our labour force at that point. The employed went 419,000 in March '84 as compared to 418,000 in February of '84. So in actual fact I think we have been doing a good job, and I think we're continuing to do a good job.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask the minister: in March of '84, how many young people were

unemployed in this province? How many young people under 25 were unemployed?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Pardon me for the delay in replying to you. I wanted to make sure I was accurate, and wasn't going to give you a misleading figure. It would appear that figure would be 21,000.

Mr. Koskie: — Could the minister also relate that into the rate of unemployment in a percentage basis among the young people of this province — the rate of unemployment in the province. The rate of unemployment in the province, the latest under Canada statistics was 9.4 per cent. And what I'm asking you: what is the percentage of unemployment as it relates to young people, where you say there are 21,000 of young people unemployed?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Again, Mr. Chairman, not wishing to mislead the hon. member, I took a moment to make sure I had the right figure here. It would appear the unemployment rate in that age group as of March of 1984 was 18.4 per cent.

We'd like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that we know right across the country the highest unemployment rate is in the youth group with the lowest education. And that's why my colleague, the hon. member, the Hon. Minister of Social Services, co-operated with my department to come up with programs meaningful to try and upgrade for those groups, to try and give them some education, make them employable, because that's the business of Advanced Education and Manpower — employability. Also why we're in the employment youth access program, Opportunities '84, and those kinds of things.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I just want to ask the minister. He has brought forward some interesting figures, which of course we have, and that is that there are 21,000 young people unemployed, 18.4 per cent, and he has stood in this Assembly and said that he is satisfied with the efforts of this government.

How can you, in fact, justify that your efforts have been meaningful to young Saskatchewan people when just about one out of five of them are unemployed? And the only form of employment which you do is a holding-time type of employment. It's not career oriented.

What you're doing is, on your Opportunities '84 and '83 are makeshift jobs to try to make it look as though you're creating jobs.

An Hon. Member: — They work for six months so they can go on the federal government's unemployment . . .

Mr. Koskie: — That's precisely the effort that is being done. If you think your effort is satisfactory, Mr. Minister, with those statistics, I guess one has a different view about what the young people of this province should expect from its government and from the co-operation of government and business.

But certainly we have had a very serious problem developing, and that is among the young people. And I would have thought that you would have gotten up and acknowledged the major problem that exists and indicate some concrete ways in which you are, in fact, trying to address it. But you use a bunch of statistics and you slough it off as though it's just fine. And I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan think it's fine. And above all, I certainly think that the young people of Saskatchewan are disenchanted with the efforts of this government.

Therefore, I simply ask you: have you anything . . . What are the specific areas that you are addressing to bring down this extraordinarily high unemployment rate — 18.4 per cent? What specific plans have you in respect to taking the 21,000 people off unemployment? What is the direction? What hope do they have? What hope do they have with you as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, one point first of all I should make: at no point did I use the word “satisfied” with high unemployment. We’re not satisfied. The government isn’t satisfied. Nobody across the country is satisfied when there’s a high unemployment. So that, you know, it would be silly to say, you know, that I’m satisfied we have high unemployment.

It is a major concern to this government and to all governments across Canada. However, this government, within my department, has established a youth services branch. Strategies fall into three broad areas for the youth service branch. The first one, job creation — specific job creation; secondly, transitional programs — and I’ve already touch on those. We’re co-operating with the Department of Social Services in that regard.

And thirdly, career development. And something we’re really, really going to have to address especially with the younger age group — is the need for solid, good career counselling, not just in the high schools, but into the technical institutes, the community colleges, and counselling for all young adults, to try and steer them in the correct directions from the information we gather from our labour market analysis.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I would like to talk just for a moment . . . You mention a joint program between the Minister of Social Services and yourself that is going to go some distance towards alleviating the problem of 18.4 per cent unemployment by retraining people. I wonder if you can tell me where the shortage of trained people exists in the province of Saskatchewan. Can you list out whether it’s in construction, or whether it’s in teachers? Where are you going to train these people to work? Which is the area where there aren’t already thousands of people waiting where you may train these people to stand in line, but that’s all?

Tell me, if you can, the area where these people under 25 should go once you train them to find jobs. Because from what I’m hearing is the simple fact is in Saskatchewan, with 8.4 per cent unemployment across the piece, that it doesn’t matter what you train them to do. There simply aren’t jobs. And I would like you to detail what you’re training these people to do.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The hon. member raises a good point if he says there just simply aren’t jobs, there just aren’t jobs anywhere. Because I don’t believe that there aren’t jobs. And when we look at things like the service industries, for instance, we find that there are jobs. And we think that it’s far better — as I’m sure you probably deep down believe also — to try and take the people and give them a competitive edge and try and help them in a transitional stage to become employable into some of the service areas or some of the northern things that we’re talking with — tree planting and so on. I think that’s an excellent idea and I don’t see why you would want to really disagree with that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I disagree for this reason: last night, when we went for supper at a café in Regina, one of the waitresses came to our table and informed us that she was losing her job, that she was being let go. She had worked for two years at minimum wage in a café in Regina, but she was being let go. And, Mr. Minister, the reason that she told us that she was being let go is because the company who owned the café was hiring someone under your program in order to get money out of the government. And they were letting someone go, who had a permanent job, and I say that’s where the people are going to find jobs, because the incentive is there for employers to lay people off, so they can hire someone under your program.

And I want you to get up and tell this Assembly how you are creating jobs. What you’re doing is shuffling people. You’re taking some off welfare — that’s true. And you’re letting them work for six months, so they will become the problem of the federal government and qualify for unemployment insurance. And this game you’re playing has been tried in other provinces. It’s been tried in B.C. with some success in getting the burden off the back of the provincial government and putting it onto the federal government.

And this is a good game for governments to play, but I can tell you it's not a fair game for the people who are being laid off to become part of your shuffling and rotating of people around and around.

It's not a fair game either for the taxpayers of Canada, because you're not saving them any money. They pay for these people to be unemployed whether they're on unemployment insurance or whether they're on welfare, and you're intelligent enough to know that.

What I would like you to do is to be man enough to stand up in this House and admit that you and the Minister of Social Services and your Premier are playing a mean and vicious game in trying to avoid the responsibility that you have and put the onus on the federal government and play games with people, like the waitress I tell you about who is being laid off and will have to go on welfare, in order that someone will be eligible under your plan.

And you still haven't told me where these jobs are, Mr. Minister. And I'll tell you why you're not doing that. That's because there are no jobs, and you're creating employment by putting other people out of work, and I say that's unfortunate.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, thank you for raising that particular point and if, about the waitress, if you would be kind enough, hon. member, to raise that with me either in my office or your office — it doesn't matter where to me, I won't stand on protocol — if you would get together with me later I'd be very interested in looking into the details of that. Because the two programs, specific programs, in my department — Opportunities '84 and Access Youth Employment — clearly say, clearly say to employers they cannot, they cannot drop someone from a job to pick someone up in our program in a subsidized position.

So, hon. member, if you would bring that up with me later, I'd be more than delighted to check it out for you, and I thank you for bringing it to my attention.

I'd like to point out your reference to UIC is not six months or 24 weeks. In fact, they are eligible, and it's a regional basis, people become eligible after 10 weeks in some area, and that's certainly not our intent.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I agree that they become eligible after 10 weeks, Mr. Minister, and that will probably be the average length of your job creation programs. What you're doing, very obviously, is trying to alleviate the statistics that are embarrassing you, like 62,000 people on welfare. And you are doing that by creating a job that will put that person back to work, where an employer will lay someone off. They won't come onto the welfare statistic; they'll go onto unemployment insurance. And, yes, for political face-saving you've solved part of your problem.

But for those people who have worked for two or three years and are being laid off in order that someone can come in on your goofy program, it simply isn't fair. Nor is it fair to the taxpayers of the country because they are being . . . They are paying the taxes whether they're paying it to the federal government for unemployment insurance or whether they're paying it for welfare. And I would like it to be known that this is the reason you are carrying out this program.

You mention the service industry, Mr. Minister, that there's lots of jobs in the service industry. In your monthly statistical review, April of 1984, which you will have a copy of, you will see under the "Employed labour force by industry," in the service industry in 1983, at this time last year, there were 131,000 jobs. This year there are 128,000.

How can you say to this Assembly and expect the people of the province to believe you when you say that there are many thousands of new jobs in the service industry. These statistics indicate . . . These are your statistics . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, believe this. You wrote it.

The member for Moosomin who is in his usual goofy mood, and a good reason why he can't get into cabinet, he can't even run a dairy barn. He can't even read his own report. And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to comment on how you say there are so many jobs in the service industry when your own statistics show that there are 3,000 less.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I didn't say there were thousands in the service industry. I said we anticipate more in the service industry. I didn't say there were thousands. And looking seasonably over the summer, that is a time where traditionally it does improve.

As a matter of fact, and as you probably well know yourself, hon. member, one of the reasons that statistics increased unemployment was post-Christmas, when we had the seasonal lay-offs of people from the service industry . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order, order! Allow the minister to reply.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One other point I'd like to make to the hon. member . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! Allow the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One thing the hon. member touched on that really hurt me was talking about political face-saving, when what we are really trying to do is make an honest attempt to create jobs for students this summer, for young people, and to help people on welfare.

I was accused of taking a cheap political shot earlier, which really is not my style in any event, and then to be called vicious and mean because, as a government, we're doing something for young people. That really hurt, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I don't intend for this to be in any way personal. What I'm doing is reading from your statistics. I believe that you're honestly trying to make an attempt, but not succeeding, at creating jobs in Saskatchewan. And that would be borne out by the statistics — that 18.4 per cent of those under 25 are without jobs.

And I'm not laying it on you as an individual that you are responsible. I think it's the attitude of this government, the open for business philosophy that you would bring in all these foreign companies, and they would solve your problem. Well until you admit that that is a failure — mickey mouse programs to create unemployment by picking up leaves or painting fences — this isn't how employment was ever created in any province in Canada.

And if you look at employed labour force in Saskatchewan between 1983 and 1984, April — these are month to month in different years. It's not taking into consideration the summer, but the statistics will remain the same, and you look under, let's say, construction. You will find that last year there were 22,000. This year there are 20,000. This is in construction. And if you look in transportation, communications, you find that there were 31,000 last year. This year there are 30. If you look in finance and real estate, there were 20,000 last year. This year there are 19,000.

Mr. Minister, your programs of, and I call them mickey mouse programs because that's what they are, will have no impact on these people who don't need training. Mr. Minister, the people who were in construction, the 2,000 who have lost their jobs, don't need to be retrained. They know how to work in a construction area. They know how to build buildings. And I say to you that what they need is meaningful employment. They don't have to have upgrading.

The university students who have been looking for a job for two years — the problem isn't that they need more training, or that they're not qualified to work. The simple fact is, is that 21,000 young people, the majority of them are trained and skilled, but there is no work. And you may

find 1,000 of them who don't have grade 10 and you may upgrade them, but I still question what are they going to do after you get them grade 12? Where are the jobs? Where is the job for a 20-year-old who has grade 10 and you're going to upgrade them to grade 12? What do you expect him to work at?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, one thing we're really not interested in performing with is a band-aid approach, a band-aid approach to providing short-term, temporary jobs. And that's why our programs are in 24 to 30 weeks. What we're doing is putting . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, the hon. member for Regina North West, on whose behalf are you speaking today?

What we're looking for is a long-term investment in people and a long-term investment in our youth. And I would say that the vast majority of the youth, especially those on social assistance, have less than a grade 10 education. Our program, with social services, the Saskatchewan Skills Development Program, are directed at the long-term. We're trying to increase their education so we can allow those to obtain an increased job opportunity, and secondly, also the opportunity to go on to further training.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I'm going to leave this point after asking one more time if you can give a list of the areas that you would see someone who has a grade 10 education now, your program will upgrade them to grade 12. Where should they go, and where will they line up? Behind the university graduates, behind the technical school graduates who can't get a job, who have been looking for two or three years. Where are these jobs that this person with the new-found grade 12 is going to go to find employment? Like it's nice to talk about job creation and job programs, but the statistics that you print would indicate, Mr. Minister, that your government — not you personally — but your government has been a miserable failure in creating employment, meaningful employment in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The point . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! The Minister of Advanced Education.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's unfortunate we're getting into these wrangles here because the hon. member is actually making a good point and a sincere point and we're in agreement, in part, on what he's saying, as long as he recognizes that to a large extent we inherited a lot of these problems. The economic management of the country is the bailiwick of the federal government, and the economic climate which they have created has pervaded across everybody else. The economic climate which we inherited from the previous administration — and I've no intentions of dwelling on the past — the hon. member for Quill Lakes pointed this out, really, it doesn't serve a lot of purpose. I could stand here all day and say, look at all the things they did when they were in office. I don't think it's serving any point.

I think the point that we want to get across is: we're concerned; we're serious about it; we intend to address it. Through our Saskatchewan Skills Development Program, I'll point out that our basic education — we're talking grades 5 to 10 here, not the post-grade 10 — 2,100 participants; community based, 300 participants; pre-employment, 700 participants; core subjects, 400 participants. And if we're talking about lining up behind unemployed university graduates somewhere, as a government we don't recruit those people.

But what we can try to do as a government is to try to provide a counselling service or a career service some place along the line where we can find out from labour market planning information, labour market analysis, what kind of direction we should be going in and what kind of training we should be asking people to take.

But, hon. members, you know, we can't force people to take any particular type of training. What we can do is try and find out . . . And I don't think you were in the House earlier when I was

pointing out to the hon. member for Quill Lakes the anticipated decline in the youth numbers in the next five to seven years is 25 per cent, and indeed many of the economists are forecasting we will have a shortage in that age group of people ready to go into the workplace. And we would like them, at that point, to have an advantage and to have some training, so they can take place into 1990 in the workplace.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, I find it interesting that you would say that this is a problem that has gone on for a long time, this unemployment problem. I want to differ with you. There are now more people unemployed under the age of 25 in Saskatchewan than there were in total in 1980 and 1981. These are facts, that there wasn't a problem with youth employment. Even in the late 1960s and when we were in the last recession, when I graduated from high school it wasn't a matter of whether I got a job or not. It was simply a matter of where you got a job, and you know that.

Today there is a new unique problem that we haven't seen in young people since the 1930s, where one out of five people under 25 cannot find employment. And, Mr. Minister, I think it is partly a problem of attitude, and it's a problem of attitude of your government. When you send your ministers around the world, and I don't disagree that you should try to export and that you should try to get people to come in and do business. But the total belief of this government that somehow the big business from outside the province — and your Deputy Premier has been in Saudi Arabia for three weeks, either trying to sell off something or trying to get them to come here to develop something — does one thing. It gives a signal to the small-business people in Saskatchewan that you don't have confidence in them.

The service industry — which I quoted to you where there are 3,000 less jobs this year than last year — would indicate that you don't have confidence in the small business. And, Mr. Minister, it's getting to the point where they don't have confidence in you — that you believe that the engine, as the finance minister likes to talk about, is not big business, but are the people of Saskatchewan who have developed this problem, and who when the recovery comes, when the recovery comes, it will come from within. It will not come from ministers flying around the world to New York or to Saudi Arabia or to Paris or to Germany, trying to get people to come in and solve our problem.

Because if they come in, they'll come for one reason. They'll come for the reason that they'll come to make a 20 or a 30 per cent profit like the oil companies have come and are making 30 per cent profits. I don't blame them. Who wouldn't come here if you give them those kind of a deal?

Wouldn't the farmers do well if you didn't have to pay income tax? Wouldn't small-business people do well if you had a holiday on your taxes like the oil companies?

And I'm not criticizing the companies. I think they're doing well. I agree they are doing well. But I'll tell you, who the hell wouldn't do well when you have a holiday . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! I'd ask the member from Shaunavon to retract that statement.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I apologize for using strong language, but I'll tell the minister that if you created the image in Saskatchewan that you believed in the farmers and you believed in the small-business people as much as you believed in the oil companies and large companies from out of the country, then we would have a recovery in the province.

And I'll tell you, if you don't do it, if you don't get back to the roots where the people are, then it won't be you that brings the province out of the recovery, and it may not be us either. But when the recovery comes in Saskatchewan, it won't come from the Saudi Arabias, and it won't come from New York. It'll come from the Frontiers; it'll come from the Yorktons; it'll come from the

Prince Alberts and the Reginas and Saskatoons. And if you don't do it, you won't be around long enough to see it happen. And I'll tell you that . . . And it may not be us either, I'm not saying that. But for a government who talks about local people, the indications of your ministers of flying around the world and then not telling anyone where they are spending the money, is not giving the confidence to the people of Saskatchewan that is needed to get the province rolling again.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — First of all, in reply to the hon. member, I wasn't sure if there was a question coming out of that, but I would like to say that I do believe in the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! Would the member from Regina North West please listen to the debate.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying to the hon. member, I do believe in the farmers of Saskatchewan. I do believe in the small businesses of Saskatchewan. And what's more, I've got a lot of faith and a lot of confidence in the youth of Saskatchewan, and always did in the years when I was either teaching at university or as a high school principal. I have got a lot of faith in them, and I'm optimistic about their future — more than optimistic, I'm excited about their future.

There was reference to a big bulge of young unemployed. Mr. Chairman, we experienced a baby boom for which the previous government did not allow. We have allowed for it. We've established youth services branch. We are trying to come in with programs aimed at those young people — technical institute expansion. I've indicated earlier the decline — 25 per cent in the next five or seven years. I think we're taking the right measures. I'm not saying we're satisfied. Can you ever go far enough in this regard? We're doing our best. We are committed to the youth of Saskatchewan. We'll be doing our best.

Mr. Koskie: — I referred the minister to a report in which he lambasted one of his employees for having made. And he sent over the labour market status report. And it's rather interesting, because when you read through this it's not much different, only worse. Do you know what it says? It says that youth unemployment could hit 20 per cent mark by the late 1980s. Now that is the future that he is offering to the young people of this province.

Here we have a province where there is need for the expansion of construction, of university buildings, of public buildings, and this government has absolutely refused to put any public money into those much-needed resources. Instead, what they have offered to the people, the young people of this province, a makeshift type of job creation, merely trying to keep them off of the statistics. You see young people . . . I saw last summer, if you could believe it, a subsidized young fellow working cutting grass along the CPR with a scythe. That is the job type of job creation that you're handling. That's what he was doing at 105 degrees in the shade. Cutting grass with a scythe, and subsidized by one of your great programs.

I have seen good, employable men walking with their highway costumes to alert traffic, walking around down the ditches with plastic bags and with a stick on the end picking up paper. That's the type of jobs that you have been offering.

This government has turned this economy over to foreign investment. They have turned it over to the big outside capitalists. That's what they have done. They have given holidays to the rich, to those who have no stake in this province, and I'll say to you, Mr. Minister, the consequences that are being paid is the suffering of our young people, and many other Saskatchewan people. This is where it's at. You have refused, as a government, to infuse some money into the public sector, into the universities, into schools, into hospitals, into an infrastructure at a time when there are people crying for contracts. Instead, what you do, as is evidenced, you go and get a contractor from British Columbia which goes bankrupt and leaves our subcontractors in dire straits.

I don't think, Mr. Minister, that you can stand and be very proud, because your own statistics indicate that the future for Saskatchewan young people is 20 per cent unemployment continuing. I ask you: who is going to bring us out of this disaster for the young people of this province? Who are you depending upon to bring you out of it? Is it the oil companies? Is it the investors from Saudi Arabia or New York or Texas? Or is it going to be the people of Saskatchewan — the small businessmen and the farmers who've built this province?

Can you outline to us here how this disaster that we are facing under your administration for the young people, is going to be corrected?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, the labour market overview, to which the hon. member is referring and the one he was sent, is the scenario of what would happen if we were not taking the types of measures we're taking now and the types of measures we intend to take in the future and the types of measures that were contained in the budge.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — All right, Mr. Minister. You are taking actions. Will you provide to us then, and outline of what you think the unemployment rate will be in the mid 1980s among young people? Give us your projection and what is acceptable to you.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay everybody's time by rummaging around here for files and so on. I'm just going to quote from memory that we do anticipate . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Allow the minister to make his comments. The minister of continuing education.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Advanced Education. If the economists are correct, the downturn will be 25 per cent fewer people in that age group by 1990.

Mr. Shillington: — I want to reflect the concerns expressed by my colleague from Quill Lakes. You people took over a province where the unemployment rate was virtually zero. By and large, those who were unemployed were not employable. We have a situation today in which unemployment is the overarching concern among young people, by any standard. Ask what young people are concerned about. It's: "If I get a job."

As my colleague, the member from Elphinstone, has said so aptly, this is the first generation which has said, "If I get a job." Your generation and mine said, "When I get a job." During the period of time this government has been in office, the mood has completely changed. And I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the approach of this government is woefully inadequate.

You have not come up with any new programs. What you have done is brought up, is resurrected a few programs which the NDP used to have when they were in office to deal with an unemployment rate which, as I say, was virtually zero. You have nothing very new, nothing . . . (inaudible) . . .

And it should not just be a matter of concern, Mr. Minister, to the 20 per cent of the young people who are unemployed. It should be a matter of concern to all of society, because I think it is affecting the attitudes of young people. It is affecting the attitudes of young people. I think they were approaching life in general with a different attitude.

They should know, Mr. Minister, they should be assured that their plight is the primary concern of the older generation. The actions of this government to date in being too little too late, I think, have convinced many young people of the opposite, and that is that higher rate of

unemployment is becoming socially acceptable. And I wonder where we heard that phrase from: a higher rate of unemployment is becoming socially acceptable. It was a planning document prepared by your government. You may or may not admit you accept it, but I tell you that the actions of the members of treasury boards do suggest that that is what you believe, that a higher rate of unemployment is becoming socially acceptable, and it's not a problem which you have to deal with.

And I tell you, Mr. Minister, this is the overriding problem in our society today among young people, and it should be yours. I know it isn't, but it should be.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, unfortunately — and I can sympathize with the problems because I know all of the members — there are not many of them in the opposition and they have to run in and out for constituency business. I accept that. But unfortunately, I've been over and over two or three of these points already.

The hon. member from Regina Centre wasn't in when we talked about the document, and I told you who wrote that document. I didn't write it. These politicians didn't write it. Premier Devine didn't write it. A gentleman you appointed as a special adviser to one of your ministers wrote it, and it doesn't reflect our thinking. It reflected his thinking, and he was told that, and that was an early draft in August. There have been subsequent drafts rewritten reflecting our point of view. So let's just get that clarified once again.

Now, we are focusing on a provincial strategy for job creation. Let me run through it again.

One, short, medium-term job creation initiative. Example: Saskatchewan Access Youth Employment, the Employment Development Program. In '83-84, 6,600 person-years of jobs created, expenditure 41.2 million.

Number two, creation of atmosphere to create economic growth and thus permanent long-term jobs. Example — example — and he said, "What are you doing?" The venture capital program, the Industrial Incentives Program, tax reduction for manufacturers and processors. Benefits: we encourage investment, stimulate the economy, create long-term permanent employment.

Three, provision of training opportunities to ensure a skilled labour force. Example is expansion of the training seats at technical institutes by 40 per cent between '83-84, '86-87. The Saskatchewan Skills Development Program — and that's already been dealt with.

So how can he say we're not doing anything when we're putting all these programs in place?

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you've had a whole lot of programs, none of which have succeeded in making a dint in the problem. Last year you had a tax program, supposedly to give grants, to give tax concessions to people who hired new employees, which had a negligible impact. I don't know a soul who took advantage of the program, and it was, in fact, a flop.

Mr. Minister, the programs which you've got this year are going to be equally unsuccessful. Mr. Minister, you have had a series of programs. They've failed. And I predict, Mr. Minister, that the programs which you now have are going to be no more successful. The problem is you are attempting to put band-aids on problems that require radical surgery.

I see the minister shaking his head. I realize you don't believe it, but I'll tell you there's an army of young people out there who do believe it, who believe that something fundamentally different needs to be done. And I suggest, Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Minister, you might try, instead of bouncing up and down like a jack-in-the-box, Mr. Minister, you might try reading your own document.

You say that the planning document . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You say, Mr. Minister, that . . . No, I'm reading Jim Coutts, who says exactly what James Laxer said. Mr. Minister, I want to read

from the document, which I gather you provided us. You stated that the document which said that unemployment is becoming socially acceptable is not your document . . . (inaudible) . . . were some weird, wicked, bureaucrat whom you are ever ready to jump on, the people who work for you. Mr. Minister, I want to read from your own document which says:

Youth unemployment could hit the 20 per cent mark by the late 1980s due to a structural inability to compete for scarce jobs.

This doesn't exactly sound, Mr. Minister, like a rallying cry to declare war on youth unemployment. You are admitting that the unemployment rate is going up and is going to continue to go up for the balance of the '80s, and that is not exactly a rallying cry to declare war on youth unemployment. That is what you should be doing. You should be declaring war on youth unemployment. You should be coming forth with some programs which are different instead of trying to dress up programs from the former administration which were designed to deal with a very different economy. You are using yesterday's solutions to deal with today's problems. Your predecessor in office failed miserably, Mr. Minister, and so are you.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, let's take two or three things here. First of all, the baby boom, which you knew about, did nothing about, didn't . . . (inaudible) . . . and let it go. You knew you were going to have all these unemployed youth, and you didn't lift one finger to do a thing about it. Not one finger. And you know something? I, for one, don't mind standing up in here and saying, "I inherited your problems," but Mr. Chairman, I'm going to be part of the solution. I'm not going to be part of the ongoing garbage that we had to tolerate for the 10 years . . . (inaudible) . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — If the member had been bothered to be in the House, instead of sitting drinking coffee outside, if he'd been in here, he would have heard that question answered already; has been answered several times. He says, "You've got no new programs." What were all those things I just read out if they weren't new programs? They're new to us. They're new to you. They're so new to you they're right over the top of your head.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:06 p.m.