

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

May 2, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Myers: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you, 36 grade seven students from John Lake School in Saskatoon. They're seated in the Speaker's gallery and they are accompanied by their teachers, Barry Hill, Norma Remple and student teacher, Stuart Harris.

I would like the Assembly to join me in welcoming them to the legislature and wish that their tour here is informative and their trip back home is safe. And I would like to remind them that I will be meeting with them later for pictures and refreshments.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Sale of Former SGI Head Office

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister in charge of SGI.

Mr. Minister, on Thursday last, the last sitting day, in fact, I reminded you that you had given us three inconsistent versions of Mr. Miller's participation, each inconsistent with the last, and each more incredulous than the last.

Mr. Minister, I asked you for version number four, reminding you that an affidavit had been signed by Mr. Lovell and Mr. Bulych, who had no interest in the matter, no personal interest in the matter, swearing that version number three is simply not accurate.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, will you give us version number four, so that we may begin working on it?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, ever since last week, the members opposite have called for investigations into the alleged wrongdoings of this transaction.

For some time now, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to this Assembly that we had nothing to hide. My officials of SGI have indicated exactly the same thing. The business individual, the businessman that these members opposite have been slandering for some time, had nothing to hide.

Mr. Speaker, last week in this Assembly, on a couple of occasions, I offered the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite a complete review of my files. That offer still stands, and they have not taken up that offer as of this date. They have been, in this past week, Mr. Speaker, grandstanding. My files are available. My files, Mr. Speaker, are available to the members opposite. They have not come to review them. The media has come to review my files and have found nothing — nothing — within those files, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to this Assembly today that I would welcome an investigation. Mr. Speaker, I would welcome an investigation. But there is nothing in the files that indicates or warrants such an investigation. There is nothing to warrant that, Mr. Speaker.

But I will say to the member opposite, I will say this to the member opposite, that if he has any evidence that indicates, that would indicate, Mr. Speaker, criminal activity or wrongdoing on the part of anyone, then, Mr. Speaker, it is his duty as a citizen, it is his duty as a citizen, to take that information to the RCMP and to swear out that information, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — I say to the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, a further offer: that if he has evidence, as I said, go to the RCMP. If you don't have any evidence, then take a look at my files. Take a look at my files; take a look at the files at SGI. Take a look at the files at SGI, and if within those files you find anything that would warrant an investigation, take it to the RCMP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, my officials and my department, my office, will co-operate to the fullest to reveal anything that they may want to find within those files.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the minister in charge of SGI, and by way of preamble, while I'm not sure about the minister, I am very sure that his staff will have reviewed the files and there would be nothing there that would be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Just by way of comment, so that the minister will be totally forthcoming — and I am very happy to hear the minister saying he will be totally forthcoming — I ask this, Mr. Speaker: it is well known that the member for Regina Centre was the subject of a legal action launched by plaintiffs represented by the firm of Wilson, Drummond, Findlay and Neufeld. Will the minister confirm that the Drummond of that firm is the same person that he appointed corporate secretary to SGI in 1982?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, they were not. I am, indeed, very surprised at the Leader of the Opposition. They were not only satisfied to slander those business people in this community, but now they are resorting to slandering not only myself — and I'll take it — but the officials of SGI, with a comment like he has just made. Mr. Speaker, I find that totally unacceptable. Yes, I will confirm that the Mr. Drummond is the same Mr. Drummond that was appointed to the SGI board of directors as a corporate secretary.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — A further supplementary to the minister, since he's being very forthcoming. Will he confirm that Mr. Drummond is also a director of a company called Lebaron Developments Ltd., which has two directors, of which the other is Paul Rousseau?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — It's absolutely amazing, Mr. Speaker. That information was tabled with this Assembly. I've declared that information. He has been a partner of mine for many years. Yes; and again I would like you to make that kind of a slur on those individuals, outside of this Assembly. That's where it belongs, where they have a chance to defend themselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I have never hidden anything like that, and

that's just 'cause of kinds of aspersions coming from you . . . (inaudible) . . .

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I think I don't need a lecture from the minister of what is a slur. I am asking simple facts, and I ask you again: are you confirming that Mr. Gary Drummond is your business partner (and you've confirmed that); and that he is the same Drummond of the firm of Wilson, Drummond, Findlay and Neufeld, that acted for the plaintiffs in the action against Mr. Shillington; and the same Drummond who you appointed as corporate secretary of SGI?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — I'm surprised that the Leader of the Opposition resorts to these tactics. Yes, I've confirmed that. I would ask the members opposite, or I will indicate, Mr. Speaker — I'm not allowed to ask questions in this Assembly — our investigation has revealed other information that I think should be forthcoming, as well. I know what an investigation by the RCMP will reveal in this particular issue in this case. But it will also reveal where the members opposite have been getting their information.

Mr. Speaker, it will indicate that the information has been coming from the defeated NDP candidate who happens to also be a brother-in-law to the member sitting opposite. That's where the information has been coming from, where they've been picking it from their client. And the information has been coming forth from a client, that they brought on to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I know the member is not talking about . . . While pointing at me, he wasn't talking about me, since I don't have a brother-in-law who lives in western Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — My question to the minister is this: if he wishes us to have free use of his file, will he raise any objections if we make public any material which we find on that file?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I made the offer last week. I indicated there was some information to be confidential; it was available to you, available to you. You will understand why. I am not going to reveal names of the people who made offers. I'm not going to reveal that information. I think the Leader of the Opposition accepts that and understands why I wouldn't do that. Those people negotiated in good faith.

Now you have obviously discovered some evidence. From the information that you're providing today — the questions you are asking — you obviously have evidence of some sort that I don't have. I say this to you, Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite — and I refer to the member from Regina Centre — if the member from Regina Centre is so confident, and has that kind of evidence that he has been withholding that he has not taken to the RCMP, Mr. Speaker, I call for that member's resignation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. If the members have questions, when they get to their feet, I'll be pleased to give you the floor. But until that time the member that has been recognized is the Leader of the Opposition. Give him an opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take it that the minister confirms that if I found information on that file which I thought should be public, he would reserve the right to veto my publication of that information. That's what you said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right.

Do you confirm that I will not have free right to make public the information I find on the file, if I think it ought to be made public?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely incorrect. That is absolutely incorrect. I offered, in good faith, my files to the Leader of the Opposition last week with certain conditions; the conditions being the business community, the business people that negotiated on these transactions. And I think that he understands that.

But if — and I say this again today — any wrongdoing that you find within those files, I will not veto. You can take it . . . (inaudible) . . . whatever you like.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — I challenge you, and I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order! Order! When the Speaker is on his feet in this Chamber, there is to be silence, and the next member that breaks that is going to have to leave the Chamber.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to renew my questions. I'd like to ask a new question to the minister in charge. Obviously the information on the file is not going to reveal wrongdoing in a total sense. Obviously not. If it had revealed wrongdoing, obviously, I believe, the minister would surely have acted.

What I am asking is: if it reveals a conflict, if it reveals a conflict with other evidence obtained elsewhere, affidavit evidence which is filed by well-known businessmen, can that information be — all of it — sent to the RCMP or whoever is the appropriate authority, to be investigated? because that is where we are, Mr. Minister. We have your story, you say supported by your file; we have two affidavits of citizens who dispute your story. Surely you agree, Mr. Minister, that there ought to be a further investigation of those clear conflicts of testimony.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I can't let that go by. Mr. Speaker, every time that I had indicated I would table something in this legislature, I have done so. That is more than the member from Regina Centre can say. As of last night, there were no affidavits tabled in this legislature which he indicated were going to be tabled last Thursday. As of last night, they were not there.

But when I table them, I table them the same day and the same time when I say I'm going to do it. So let's not have any of that nonsense. Let's not have any of that nonsense, because your word is really not very, very good these days.

To answer the Leader of the Opposition's question: I have indicated that any material within my files that would indicate wrongdoing, combined with any material that he may have that he feels warrants a further investigation, that he feels should be investigated by the RCMP, then I put the onus back on the Leader of the Opposition this time, Mr. Speaker. And I say to him that if he finds that information in my files combined with the information that he has, it is his duty to take it to the RCMP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Minister, I ask you again very simply: do you not feel that it is your duty to investigate? Where you say that no offer was made, indeed, the two particular businessmen in question were never shown around the building — that's your story — they have contradicted it with two sworn affidavits. Do you not feel that that calls for an investigation on your part?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I have gone through these files. My officials have gone through these files, step by step by step. I am prepared to do that in this legislature, step by step by step. I've tabled documents that they've asked for. I will go back to 1980, if the members opposite want me to do so. If they are talking about this kind of wrongdoing, Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite is talking about the kind of wrongdoing that I discovered in 1980, where they received an offer for that same building of \$1 million, which was \$150,000 more than the appraisal, a written offer — a written offer — that they refused to accept because it arrived late and was not accompanied by a deposit. But they did not pursue it. But that's the kind of wrongdoing that we're talking about. I don't know.

What I'm saying to the members opposite, I will take it again with the Leader of the Opposition, step by step by step. I will provide everything. I've indicated I have nothing to hide. My officials have nothing to hide. And if they can discover something within those documents and within the documents that they have, combined together, then it's his responsibility to take it to the RCMP. I cannot find anything.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Very well. Another question to the minister, and I will ask essentially the question I asked last time and got no answer to. My question is this: you have advised the House, through documents you filed, that your officials did not show Messrs. Lovell and Bulych that building in September? Lovell and Bulych file an affidavit saying that building was shown to them in September and certain discussions were held. Do you not believe that when you receive an affidavit which contradicts what you file in this House, absolutely and without possibility of being other than in contradiction, that this calls for further investigation by you?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, following question period, I have a bill that will be taken to this Assembly in committee of the whole. It shouldn't take very long. Once I'm finished with that bill, Mr. Speaker, and it should take 15 minutes or so, I invite the members opposite — all of them if they want, or the Leader of the Opposition — to come to my office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of allegations and slanders and slurs that we've been hearing in this Assembly now for the past few weeks. The member from Regina Centre refers to a cover-up. The member from Regina Centre does not have the courage, does not have the courage to go outside that door and make that same allegation, and go and say it out there, that I or my officials or anyone else are covering anything up. Say it out there. And then we'll let the courts decide who's telling the truth and who's not telling the truth. Let's go to court on this . . . (inaudible) . . . Take it to court. Put up or shut up; one or the other.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I have accused you of a cover-up in this Chamber and I've accused you of a cover-up outside the Chamber, as any member of the media can tell you, Mr. Minister, and I'll accuse you of a cover-up anywhere. My question, Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I did, and I will continue to until you fulfil your responsibility. My question, Mr. Minister, is: will you not admit that where an investigation involves the Crown, it is the tradition of this House that the request for an RCMP investigation of a matter involving the Crown comes from the so-called Minister of Justice? will you not admit that that is a tradition?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, definitely not on his say so, because I don't believe there's any credibility in anything that member has been saying.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I challenge that member to go outside of this Assembly and to cast . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Proceed.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — I offer, and I challenge the member from Regina Centre to make the same allegations of a cover-up outside, not just including me as a minister, but that includes my officials. Because if there is a supposedly a cover-up as he's indicating, it involves all of the people at SGI. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to the people working at SGI to have those allegations and that slander and those slurs . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, will you not admit that if you have additional information on this matter, you have a responsibility to make it public in this House? Mr. Minister, will you not admit that when you refuse to disclose information you admit may be relevant, Mr. Minister, you're covering up, and that's what I'm accusing you of now. I'll accuse you outside 'till you come clean, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, there wasn't even a question to that statement. But it has become more and more obvious to me and to the members on this side of the Assembly that the member from Regina Centre is withholding information and evidence. That's become very evident to me because I will not — not! — succumb to your demands, not succumb to your demands. But you obviously have information. You have information. And I say to you that if you can't take that information that you supposedly have to the RCMP, then it's incumbent of you to resign your seat in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you purport to be satisfied with the situation on the basis of a telephone call made by your officials. In fairness to Mr. Lovell and Mr. Bulych, they put their comments in an affidavit. Mr. Minister, do you not believe that those affidavits merit some further investigation by you? Or are you satisfied to dismiss what's in an affidavit on the basis of something apparently given third-hand through a telephone?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has a very short memory. In all fairness — if he wants to talk about fairness — in all fairness to the individuals that he has been slandering and casting aspersions on, business community, how fair is that to them? They were prepared to take you to court where they would be under oath. They were prepared to go to court, under oath, to provide any evidence, and you didn't want to go.

You don't have the courage to make those accusations outside of this Assembly. And you have lost all your integrity, all your credibility, because we're quite prepared to see the decision made by the courts, but you weren't prepared to go. The two businessmen that you have been slandering wanted to be in court with you, and with your people that you are referring to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Why not, why not?

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Increase in Grain Freight Rate

Hon. Mr. Garner: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this House of this government's deep concern about the recent federal announcement that the grain freight rate for the 1984-85 crop year is to increase over 30 per cent from last year, and over 50 per cent from two years ago.

This provincial government has always stated its strong opposition to farmers paying more for shipping their grain. On February 22, Mr. Speaker, 1983, nine-point resolution which was unanimously adopted by this Assembly is proof of our commitment to Saskatchewan's agriculture community. Yesterday we reaffirmed that commitment by sending the following telex to the Minister of Transport in Ottawa, addressed to the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy.

The recent announcement to increase freight rates by more than 30 per cent for the crop year '84-85 comes at the worst possible time. This is another financial blow to Saskatchewan farmers, not yet recovered from the prospect of lower initial grain payments.

These increased freight costs (Mr. Speaker) are due to farmers having to bear the full cost for shipments in excess of the 31.5 million tonne ceiling. (Mr. Speaker) Our worst fears have been realized. Farmers are being penalized for success; a \$60 million penalty for production efficiency. We have repeatedly objected to this ceiling. Now as an interim measure, and until the entire act is reviewed, we respectfully urge that you simply remove the 31.5 million tonne ceiling from the legislation. Signed (by the) Hon. Eric Berntson; Hon. Lorne Hepworth; Hon. Jim Garner.

As a government, Mr. Speaker, we will continue our strong representations on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers, to ensure that they are not penalized for their efforts to increase grain exports for the benefit of the whole Dominion of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I think this just points out the concern that the Government of Saskatchewan has regarding the new, increased costs for the '84-85 crop year that will be passed on to the farmers in western Canada, penalizing them. And I think it's very important to point out the farmers are being penalized for being good farmers and running good farm operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the three ministers' statement — Mr. Berntson, Mr. Hepworth, and Mr. Garner — signing this telegram and the concern they have for the increase — the cost that the farmers are going to effect on that grain that is over the 31.5 million tonne ceiling.

My concern is: when you're sending a telegram, why they didn't, in this telegram, tell what the true costs are. We'll likely sell a little bit more wheat than 31.5 million tonnes this coming year, Mr. Minister. We'll likely sell a little more than that.

If you go down into southern Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister, there will be a lot of farmers that will not reach that maximum in the coming crop year. My concern is: why didn't you mention just one word about the real increase, the real increases of 30 per cent increase in their freight rates, the increase that you fellows let slip by when you let the Crow rate go? The whole business started when you let go on the Crow rate.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of this minister to come into this House with this telegram, when at the same time they passed an indirect tax onto the farmers of Saskatchewan with their fuel tax. Are you not aware, are you not aware . . . ?

And this is not a debate; this is an answer to the telegram and the ministerial statement they made on the increased cost on grain freight rates, and part of that increased cost is \$60 million worth of tax to the railway locomotives that are going to be passed onto the farmer s- \$60 million by this government. And that is hypocrisy to the highest degree.

This government says on one hand, we're concerned about the ceiling, the 31.5 million tonnes that very likely will not be reached in this coming crop year, when the farmers are putting their crops in this year and seeding. It is dry. We're having trouble. And yet they're levying us with a tax of, according to the Canadian Transport Commission . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. I believe, in response to ministerial statements, you have to stay with the items within the statement, and you're exceeding that by a considerable amount. I'd ask the member to get back to the statement.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the Minister of Highways and Transportation has given me a copy of the telegram . . . (inaudible) . . . This telegram talked about the increased costs farmers are facing in relation to the grain freight rate.

The grain freight rate is made up of three components, Mr. Speaker: (1) the 30.5 million tonnes; (2) Crow rate being gone; and (3) the third component of the grain freight increase this year is the \$60 million that we are going to have to pay . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member is straying from the statement. You're just repeating the same things, and I rule that you are off the statement.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, the one item of the freight rate increase that the minister has suggested is serious, I agree with 100 per cent. I think the ceiling is a direct component. I wish he would have included in his telegram the entire package that's really hurting. Express to the farmers of Saskatchewan how much they're losing on the freight rate increase because of the 30 million tonnes, and I'll show you that's one-third of the increased cost; less than one-third.

The two-thirds of the increased costs are other items that this government, for intentional reasons, has failed to address. You have failed to address the costs that are really affecting the farmers. And I think it's serious. They expect more from a government like this than a hypocritical statement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Help for Saskatchewan Farmers re Crop Insurance Premiums

Hon. Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with great pleasure that I make the following statement on behalf of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation:

The Government of Saskatchewan recognize the problems that many farmers are having with operating funds for the 1984 crop year. In acknowledging this, and the fact that these persons need crop insurance at this time more than ever before, I am pleased to announce that the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation will be extending a helping hand to those persons who have been unable to pay their past premiums as a result of the problems in the farm economy.

The field staff of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance will be contacting those persons to advise them of procedural requirements. For some of these distressed people it will mean that their banking sources will now extend operating capital, undertaking that crop insurance will be in force on their farms.

We have answered the requests of many farmers and farm groups that were to have their 1984 crop insurance contract cancelled because past premiums were not paid by April 30, 1984. Thus many would be cut off operating funds. This one-year plan will help literally hundreds of Saskatchewan farmers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — I would thank the minister of crop insurance. I'm sorry he didn't give me an advance copy, but I would thank the minister in charge of crop insurance for making this announcement today. He acknowledges that there are hundreds and hundreds of farmers in Saskatchewan that can't pay their premiums, and they weren't able to pay their premiums last year, and that the loan program, the emergency loan program, will also apply to crop insurance. I was expecting that that would be the case. I think when the person is looking for a loan guarantee that he can include his crop insurance as one of the costs, and that that will apply. I appreciate the minister's comment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — I would ask the minister to introduce his officials, please.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I will. To my right, my deputy minister, Paul Robinson; to my left, the executive director of the public employees' benefit agency, Mr. Allan Palmer; and behind me is Mr. Ken Orr, the executive secretary of the public service superannuation board.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, referring to clause 2 and to the new section 47.1: can the minister explain why the package offered to the public servants under this bill is less favourable than the package offered to most of the Crown corporation employees under the various proposals put forward to them? I'm specifically thinking of the proposals offered to Sask Tel and Sask Power in 1983.

I will ask a specific question on this: — with respect to severance pay, it is my understanding that the Crown corporation employees got two days pay per year of service, but the public service employees are getting one day's pay per year of service. Would he care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the simple answer to the member's question is, simply, that we're talking about Crown corporations versus the government; we're talking about different times; we're talking about the take-up of the Crowns last year being somewhere between 80 and 90 per cent; and, I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the plan is totally voluntary. There is nothing on anyone's part to force anyone into retirement, but it is an opportunity for those who want to take any early retirement, to do so at this time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I'm sorry I didn't catch your answer as to why the severance pay proposal is one day for public servants, and two days per year of service for the Crown corporation employees.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's part of the package that we're offering now. And what we offered . . . There are other variances and other differences between the two bills, between the Crowns, and the one that is being offered today to the public service. We feel that

the package that we are offering is a good one. As I indicated earlier, we're talking different times, we're talking Crown corporations versus the government public service, and the fact is that it is voluntary.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I'm well aware of the fact that it is voluntary. Ordinarily one would assume that the Crown would have the same interest in having employees take early retirement from, let's say, Sask Tel, as they would from the Department of Highways, and that, accordingly, a different formula wouldn't ordinarily be suggested.

You're saying that the time is different. What, about the difference in time, has caused the difference in the offer?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, again, part of the original question that I answered applies again, and that is that they're certainly on different times. One was last year and this is this year. This is 1984 — certainly different than 1983. Added to that, as I indicated as well, earlier, that under the Crowns we experienced an 80, 90 and higher percentage take-up of the offer. And we didn't feel that we wanted to see an 80 to 100 per cent take-up of the retirement offer — early retirement.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I noted, for example, that someone who worked for Sask Tel, who was 55 years of age, could take up the offer if he had 20 years of service. And someone in the Department of Highways — or if I may use another example, the Department of Telephones — could take up the offer only if he were 55 only if he had 25 years of service.

Do I understand your answer to be that the rate of take-up in the corporations was very high, and you wanted to have a somewhat less attractive package, so that the rate of take-up would be less by the public servants?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, I mean, we feel that the package is attractive. The indications of that attractiveness, of course, is the take-up of the offer. Certainly we did not, and I repeat again, as I indicated earlier, we did not want to see an 80, 90, or higher percentage take-up of this offer. However, as I say, the package is somewhat different than what the Leader of the Opposition is indicating. It is an attractive offer for a person, an employee, who wants to take early retirement.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I don't want to get into a semantic argument about whether or not the package is attractive or not. That, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. I am comparing it, and I'm saying it's less attractive than the Sask Tel was. And I am asking the minister whether he confirms that the Sask Tel package allowed two days pay per year of service; the public service one allows one days pay per year of service. Will he confirm at least that those facts are right?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why the Leader of the Opposition is trying to make a comparison between the offer to the Crown corporations and the offer to the public service. Certainly I will confirm that there are variances between the two packages. Anyone who reads can see that. The package of the Crown corporations last year offered certain benefits. The package that we are offering this year offers certain benefits. We have had a reasonable take-up on it so far. I'm not sure of the figure. I suppose I can get that if the Leader of the Opposition wants it.

But again, as I say, we're certainly not looking for the 80, 90, or 100 per cent take-up of the offer. The package that has been submitted is very attractive. But we have no intentions of making the comparison with the Crown corporations. On the same token, we have no intentions to compare it with other industries or corporations within the private sector, for example.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I don't know why you're fencing on this. It's a fairly simple question, and I tried to break it down very simply. If you want to say that you won't answer any questions that compare the one in your bill with, let us say, the Sask Tel one, say you won't answer any questions. But if you will answer some questions, don't stand up and say it's attractive — all this sort of thing.

It's a very simple question, this one, now. Will you confirm that under the Sask Tel plan, the persons who retired got a severance pay of two days pay per year of service; and under the one in the bill, you are offering one days pay per year of service? Will you confirm that, without telling me that it's an attractive plan, and you don't want pick-up, or you do want pick-up, or whatever?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, yes.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I ask the next question, then. Will you confirm that an employee of Sask Tel would be able to retire at age 55 with 20 years service, thus age plus service equalling 75; whereas someone in the public service who was age 55 would need 25 years service, thus age plus service equalling 80? Will you confirm that the plans are different in that respect?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition indicating that I'm fencing, and he's going to spend some time, obviously, going point by point by point by point, and I'm not interested in making comparisons between the two.

Certainly, I confirm. Exactly. It's in writing. It's there in front of him. It's information that was there last year for the bill that was put through for the Crown corporations, and this one is a . . . (inaudible) . . . one. It's totally different, and I'm not interested in making comparisons. It's attractive; it's one that the public service can accept or reject. We're not suggesting . . . It's voluntary. They can do what they want.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, it's reasonably obvious that I am interested in making comparisons, and the minister can either answer the questions or refuse to answer them. I understand that the answer that you give is: yes, the age-plus-service combination for people age 55 involves 20 years service with Sask Tel, and 25 years service with the public service. If that is not accurate, I ask the minister to say so when he answers the next question. And the next question is: does your plan provide any supplementary pension of up to 10 per cent for a likely period of time, or for life, as the Sask Tel plan did?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, no.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I won't pursue this further except now to turn to subsection (3) of the new section 47.1, which is enacted by section 2 of the bill:

The option provided to employee pursuant to subsection (2) may only be exercised effective on or after April 1, 1984 and prior to May 2, 1984 . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I have an amendment to a previous section in section 47, if I'd be allowed to read it.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Okay. What I'm saying is in order, because we're on . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, you went to (3), and I've got to read for 2.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Okay. But we're on section 2 of the bill. But I'll take whatever you say.

Mr. Chairman: — Amendment by Mr. Rousseau, section 2 of the printed bill, amendment

subsection 47.1(2) of the act, as being enacted by section 2 of the printed bill, by adding:

pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement as a result of job abolition or after payment

in the second line.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, am I right in assuming, therefore, that the first few lines of the new subsection (2) will read:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an employee who has not received a severance payment pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement as a result of job abolition, or pursuant to clause 14.4(a)
...

Is that where we're inserting it?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — What is the effect of the House amendment?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, the amendment is designed to provide for the exclusion of an employee who has received a severance payment pursuant to the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement. In other words, he has the choice, as I understand it, of receiving the severance payment from one or the other, but not both.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Are there any classes of employees who have received these severance payments as of now, and therefore will be shut out from opting for earlier retirement, but who would have had the option had the House amendment not gone through, or had not been proposed?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, Mr. Chairman, not that we're aware of.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I turn now to subsection (3) and note that:

The option provided to an employee pursuant to subsection (2) may only be exercised on or after April 1, and prior to May 2, 1984.

Is it proposed that those dates be changed?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — No, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Have people been given an option, the right to exercise in an option, prior to today? I think today is May 2. Are they busy acting on this bill?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, they are busy acting on this bill. I'm advised that there are in excess of 150.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, as you may recall my words when the matter was dealt with in second reading, I suggested that the restrictive nature of the periods during which the option could be exercised might well present some real hardships for some public servants — some who would like to take early retirement, but who need some time to put their own economic house in order before they exercise the option. You are permitting them to opt immediately or on October 1, 1984, but at no other times.

I am going to propose a House amendment, the text of which I have sent to you saying:

immediately, that is, after April 1 but prior to May 2nd (the one that's in the bill now); October 1, 1984 (the one that's in the bill now); April 1, 1985, (that would be essentially one year hence); and October 1, 1985 — which would in effect give people two other dates to opt. And I have selected April and October because April 1 is the beginning of a fiscal year and October 1 is the beginning of the union contract, and basically you have selected those periods, as well.

I can understand your desire not to leave this as a dangling option forever, because it is an offer to deal with a specific situation, as you say, at a specific time. I do suggest to you that to require people to forego any option for early retirement, unless they can accept it before October 1 or on October 1, 1984, is a shade difficult, and I ask you to consider the extending of the period in the manner in which I have suggested. And accordingly, I move that . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Mr. Blakeney, we have to vote on, agree to the amendment by Mr. Rousseau before we go to yours. Is the amendment by Mr. Rousseau agreed to?

Amendment agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — For the reasons already indicated, I move:

That section 47.1(3) of the Act, being enacted by section 2 of the printed bill, be amended by striking out “effective on or after April 1, 1984 and prior to May 2, 1984 or on October 1, 1984” in the second and third lines and substituting the following:

Effective (a) on or after April 1, 1984 and prior to May 2, 1984; (b) on October 1, 1984; (c) on April 1, 1984; or (d) on October 1, 1985.”

Mr. Chairman, I so move.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, earlier the Leader of the Opposition was making comparisons between this particular bill and the package that we are offering under this bill with that of the package that was offered to the Crown corporations last year. And I note that he didn't mention the benefits of this one over the Crown's of last year, in the sense that this particular bill gives the public service employees six months to decide, all the while the public service offering a counselling service or counselling facilities for the superannuate. So we feel that . . . and the Crown corporation bill, or early retirement package, only allowed for three months.

So, in fact, what we have here is a bill that provides double the time for the take-up of the early retirement. So we feel, Mr. Chairman, that six months is sufficient, and that we would not want to get into additional time beyond that six-month period. So I would urge the members to vote against this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, just before we end discussion on this bill, I would ask the minister to comment on whether or not he proposes to either bring in amendments to this bill which will deal with the annual cost of living allowance for superannuates or, alternatively, bring in another bill post-haste dealing with the annual cost of living allowance for superannuates.

I am of the view that it would be appropriate, legally, to include it in this bill. I am not going to move the amendments, since clearly these are money amendments and would, in all probability, be ruled out of order by the chairman.

But I am asking the minister to consider this either as an amendment or as a new bill. He will recall that bill last year, Bill 85, provided for an annual cost of living allowance for superannuates of

\$19.20 per year per year of service for the superannuates, and \$11.50 per year per year of service for spouses of deceased superannuates, and \$1.90 for the child of the surviving spouse, and so on.

Since the bill is to be effective, no doubt, on May 1, since last year's bill was to be effective and operative on May 1, it is not too soon to think about bringing it in. And I urge the minister, therefore, to give consideration to bringing in this bill which, I suspect, will be made retroactive prior to the day when even notice was given in this House.

And I think it's a relatively important matter — I think we all would concede that — and superannuates are, understandably, I suppose, concerned and would appreciate an assurance from the minister that a bill would be brought in forthwith to deal with this.

And if he can give us any information as to the contents of the bill, that is the amount per year per year of service, if that formula is going to be repeated. That also, I know, would be appreciated by the superannuates.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Chairman, yes, we will be bringing in the bill very, very shortly. The House Leader has it in his files . . . to a matter of days. The bill is effective — so, in fact, will be retroactive to — May 1st of 1984, and I want to give all the superannuates my assurance that it's forthcoming and will be here very, very shortly, and it will be effective May 1.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for that. He will perhaps know that in, I think, in perhaps 1980 and 1981, it was announced in the Speech from the Throne in November and, accordingly, when it is neither announced in the Speech from the Throne or the budget, and it doesn't hit the order paper by the 1st of May, there is some apprehension, particularly at a time when there is discussion of restraint. So I thank the minister for his assurance, and I know it will be appreciated.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I move the amendment be read a first time now, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Mr. Speaker: — The member needs leave. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, we left off last day, and one of the areas that we were discussing in some detail was the youth unemployment in Saskatchewan. We referred you to a document, a leaked document earlier last fall, and that particular document outlined probably four or five different principles within it. And I maintain that it really includes the basic principles of your government's policy.

Summarizing it, I want to indicate, Mr. Minister, that in that document it indicated higher levels of unemployment will become socially acceptable. It indicates that youth unemployment rates will probably remain at record levels in 1984. It indicated that the procedure was to have a holding-tank approach, where more and more people would be put into institutions of learning to keep them off the unemployment lists.

This here document also indicated that part of the policy for discussion was to discourage certain women from entering the labour force. The government policy to have increased tuition fees to relieve the financial responsibility of education as a responsibility of the government.

The last day when we addressed this issue of employment for young people, particularly, we indicated our concern. That leaked document you denied as being your policy. And subsequent to that, you delivered yet another statement of your policy, and what it indicates in that document is that Saskatchewan never developed a significant recession.

And if we go on in that document, and I asked you the present rate of unemployment among our youth 15 to 24, you indicated that there was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 21,000 people in that age group unemployed. You indicated that the unemployment rate among the youth is 18.4. And in this document you say there is no recession, and you go on in your statement of manpower policy to indicate youth unemployment could hit 20 per cent mark by the 1980s.

I want to ask the minister: is that the prospect that the young people of this province have with the present policies of your government — 18.4 per cent unemployment, 21,000 unemployed? And so I want to refer to a few more statistics which come from your own document.

The labour force of the 15 to 24-year-olds has fallen in the past year from 115,000 to 112. The number of employed 15 to 24-year-olds has also fallen from 96,000 to 92,000, Mr. Minister. But the number of unemployed in this age group has increased from 19 to 21,000 — 18.4 per cent.

And I want to say, Mr. Minister, that it doesn't entirely rest upon your portfolio but, as the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, I want to address on behalf of young people across this province their deep concern of what they are, in fact, encountering, having left the university campus and having worked and completed the course.

I have found young people across this province who have applied and applied for jobs, and have no opportunity of obtaining a job.

And so what I am addressing to you, Mr. Minister, what is the basic policy? If you are saying there is no recession here, then is the 18.4 per cent and the 20 per cent unemployment in this youth group, is that the acceptable policy? Is that what the young people of this province have got to look forward to?

I'd like you to outline, in some detail and some specifics, how you are going to address that crisis

that exists here in Saskatchewan, and give to our young people some hope for the future. I'd leave it at that for the time being, but I want you to specifically outline your government's and your department's approach as to how you are going to address this very significant problem of high unemployment among our youth.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, there were quite a few points touched upon in the remarks made by the hon. member for Quill Lakes, so I'd like to address a few of them.

First of all, the document to which the hon. member keeps referring and says I "go on to say" or "the government says" — I didn't write it; the government didn't write it; the politicians didn't write it. One individual in my department prepared one preliminary document, as has been well documented. The press, in fact, had a copy of the final document. One person wrote it. One person passed it along through the hoops, and it got no further than a meeting of officials within the department. And like I said before, I'm probably the only person in Regina who hasn't seen this document, because the department didn't let it go any further than one small committee when it was written, and the person who wrote it was told he was wrong in several of the assumptions he made, and certainly wrong is some of the comments. And I have frequently disassociated myself from the ones which I considered scurrilous.

Now let's take a look at one or two specifics. You've said now what are we doing because we're going to try and keep women out of the work-force — we're trying to keep women out of the work-force . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says that's exactly what we wrote in our document, which we didn't write.

Mr. Chairman, pardon me, I'll get back to the topic. There are several facets of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower programs that have the potential to benefit women. We have a pre-trades training for women. We're reviewing our institute admission policies to increase accessibility to women, particularly women with families. We're involved with the national training program, with pre-employment training for women.

In our institute expansion, we're implementing a philosophy of competency-base planning which will be of major benefit to women, particularly women with families, so that they can progress at their own pace; we'll have continuous entry and continuous exit from the programs.

We have a technology assistance program. The Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program which is aimed to take education and training out to rural Saskatchewan, is of major benefit to women who because of family situations or geography, perhaps can't come to the institutions, so we're taking the courses out to them.

Distance education — I recently announced that we were involved in a distance education program as a nurse refresher course. And of course, within my department, we have the women's services branch, and we've been through that one before, too.

Specifically, what we are aiming for women right now are: our pre-trades training program; the review of the institute admission policies; the national training program; the technology assistance program; and the work through our women's services branch.

The 18.4 per cent I indicated as youth unemployment figures we were given, also include a large number, Mr. Chairman, of students who registered with CEC (Canada Employment Centre) in anticipation of seeking summer employment. So that figure has been exaggerated. That figures has been exaggerated.

A couple of other points. Some things that became clear last fall when the officials in my department were working towards policy for the future, was that if we didn't take action, if we didn't address some of the problems we have today, we would be facing high youth

unemployment right through the 1980s. Let me refer to a couple of articles, Mr. Chairman. I'm taking this one from *The Toronto Star*, as it appeared in the April 27, '84 edition of Star-Phoenix. And it says, and I'm quoting:

It is no accident that the highest rates of unemployment for both men and women, in all age groups and all regions of the country, are for people with little schooling.

Further on, it says:

. . . the fact that they don't have Grade 10 makes them ineligible for most of the technical training courses being offered . . . across the country.

Yet as the technological revolution takes hold, Canadians will require high levels of education to remain productive members of society and do the increasingly complex jobs the economy will demand.

He says:

The federal government used to provide funding for educational institutions and income support for individuals to upgrade their basic education so that they could move on to more specialized technical training. But Ottawa has backed away from this, devoting an increasing proportion of its training budget to skill-specific courses and on-the-job training. A void has been created, whereby people needing income support while upgrading their education to grade 10 or higher, are told they are out of luck. And the provinces, which are constitutionally responsible for such basic education, have generally refused to fill the gap.

Except, Mr. Chairman, in Saskatchewan, where we announced a program recently, Saskatchewan schools development program, specifically aimed to fill that particular void.

One other point, looking ahead to the end of the 1980s — and I've quoted this before, and I know we've been checking around here for a couple of weeks, so some things have been gone over more than once — April 2, 1984, *Leader-Post*, an article by Roger Sauve, an economic consultant located in Regina. And the heading is:

Youth group's size dwindling

Saskatchewan's 15-24-age group. 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.

Statistics Canada has released.

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

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.

Though 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.

Further on he says:

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

Specifically, I will run through some employment initiatives currently under way with this

government. One, Access Youth Employment — responsible department, my department. Opportunities '84 — responsible department, my department, aimed at youth looking at somewhere close to 4,000 jobs. The BASE, the business administration science and engineering student program for industry, being looked after by my colleague from the Saskatchewan Research Council — a one-year program. The Saskatchewan Employment Development Program — another program aimed at creating 1,500 jobs. A New Careers Corporation, and this one being looked after by Parks and Renewable Resources, another 200; the Saskatchewan Skills Development Program, joint venture, my department and that of my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, looking at 3,500 jobs; the Industrial Incentives Program under the auspices of Economic Development and Trade, a breakthrough by Social Services rehabilitation services division in Regina.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, what I want to specifically ask you: do you feel that your actions and the programs which you have alluded to will, indeed, provide university students and students coming from the institutes and other youth of this province, a fair opportunity of being employed this summer?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, Opportunities '84 is aimed at creating close to 3,000 jobs this summer. Yes, I'm confident that those 3,000 jobs will be filled.

One other point I'd like to make to the hon. member on that is that the number of applications we have had from employers, right off the bat, exceeded 1,500 and they were asking for positions for some 10,000 students, which would indicate to me that some place out there to be filled are 10,000 jobs by those employers. We are subsidizing some of them, not all of them.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, will you agree that if the economy is sufficiently well in gear and growing, that the business community will offer jobs and that these makeshift types of jobs that you are purporting to create are really artificial and, in fact, not many additional jobs will be created unless there is a turn-around in the general economic climate of this province? It's dependent — surely you will agree — that if jobs are going to be created, the jobs that will be created because the business community needs them and no subsidization program will, in fact, give a solid base of job creation.

And I want to read a statement in respect to that from the chamber of commerce in analysing it:

The details of two job programs to be run by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower have been announced. One of them, Opportunities '84, is the same as last year's (and they go on to describe it).

The second program provides a subsidy to businessmen of \$2.50 per hour, a little more than half the minimum wage.

It says:

If the economy shows signs of growing, those figures maybe come close (that is the estimation of how many jobs — the 2,600 jobs and the 1,000 jobs). But if the economy shows little or no growth, or even some backsliding, few of those jobs will be created.

And that's the factor that I'm indicating, is that this government has not initiated any constructive job creation projects. In fact, you have cut back in the public spending of university buildings; you've cut back in the construction of other public buildings. Any public investment to get the economy going is foreign to your philosophy. What you are merely doing here is creating minimum wage jobs for our young people to have offered to them.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, in the event that (and I have already) a large number of students

who have been writing to me, have been phoning me, and they have applied for everything that they thought they could fill. And there are young people marching the streets, still looking. What I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, can I have them directly contact your office and since you have a very large staff . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, quite a large staff, very large staff, I'm going to ask you, Mr. Minister: can I have them refer their concerns to you, and will you intervene in helping them to obtain employment, because many of them are at a last resort? They have searched. They have tried to get these minimum wage jobs that you have created for them and they can't even get those. I'm asking you: will you make that offer to the youth who are having difficulty that they can contact you directly and that you will help to intervene and provide jobs for them?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — My very large staff, Mr. Chairman, consists of two secretaries and two ministerial assistants, as the member well knows, which in many cases is far, far less than the types of staff our predecessors in the previous administration employed and also, I may say, at considerably less money in the case of my staff.

Let's take a look at Opportunities '83 — total number of students employed by sector: business, 1,269; farm, 825; local government, 489; non-profit organizations, 569; others, 278 — quite a considerable number of people who have found jobs.

Yes, I will say that we have to look at the economic climate, not just of Saskatchewan, perhaps not just of Canada — the whole continent in the western world — in the context of employment. And as the hon. member well knows, that is the responsibility of the federal government to foster the type of economic climate which is concomitant with full employment.

I'd like to quote from the magazine *Chimo*, just a few things that some very respected people have been saying. The first one is Robert A. Bandeen, chairman-president, Crown Life Insurance Co., says:

Significant structural change in the Canadian labour market has taken place, and demography suggests the baby boom already has been absorbed by the labour market.

And further on, talking of jobs — job creation, and where we're going, labour market analysis, it says:

We need to pick winners to concentrate on emerging industries like computers and electronics. We need to invest in our human resources, retraining people to work in the sunrise industries.

And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that, to a large extent, is what we have been doing in trying to provide job experience to young people so they can compete in the job market, and particularly through the Saskatchewan Skills Development Program.

One other written by an M.C. Dobrin, executive vice-president, legal and corporate affairs, Steinberg Inc. It says:

Only businessmen encouraged by government-created climate and left to do what they are training and equipped to do, can develop the enterprises, expand the production, and create the demand which are the job mechanisms society is concerned with.

And I submit that is absolutely accurate.

I would like to quote from another one — Marie-Josée Drouin, executive director, Hudson Institute of Canada. It says:

Time and time again studies have pointed to the paucity of adequate training programs in Canadian corporations, and to the few working relationships between corporations and educational institutions.

If our education system (and this is a quote here), which incidentally eats up a large share of provincial budgets, does not adequately prepare our workers for the requirements of the Canadian labour market, we are only postponing the problem by focussing all our attention on the job training. As to the retraining associated with job displacement, new forms of agreements must be sought together by unions and corporations to enhance the role and responsibilities of the corporate sector in retraining.

And, Mr. Chairman, we have responded to this with retraining: SITAC (Saskatchewan Industrial Training Advisory Council) which reports directly to me on the issues concerned as they analyse the future job market and identifying the retraining needs as they see them for this province.

I should finish with one more short comment. Russell E. Harrison, chairman, chief executive office, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce:

Upwards of three out of every four new jobs in recent years have come from the small-business sector of our economy, especially in the service industries. That trend will continue and should be supported by private and public agencies.

And further on:

Quick fixes really do not fix anything. Ultimately they simply waste scarce resources.

Mr. Koskie: — I would hope that young people of this province, who are seeking employment, are listening to you. Because I would expect what is being said by the many that I contact that this government has failed them. This government portrayed, during a campaign, that we can be so much more. We can participate in this wonderful new society that was going to be built.

And today, a stand-up opposite, and you defend 18.4 per cent unemployment among the youth, 21,000 young people unemployed. And they bring forward a document which says that it's going to increase to 20 per cent in the '80s. That is the future that this government offers to the young people of this province. I think it's a disgrace, and I think that the young people of this province are disappointed, and disappointed in the efforts of this government, and the callous disregard for our young people who will be the builders of a society for tomorrow.

Again I want to say, Mr. Minister, lots of money for the oil companies to take out of this province, but very little assistance to the business, the small businessmen of this province, which built this province. And very little assistance to our young people of this province. That's the sorry record of this government.

And I want to turn specifically to youth employment program, and I want to, first of all, ask you: can you give me a breakdown for last year of Saskatchewan Opportunities '83 by constituency, the number of people that participated per constituency across the province?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman . . .

An Hon. Member: — Stand up.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I want to remind the hon. member from Shaunavon, the only height worth measuring is the height from here to here, and that makes you a small midget.

No, it's not a fair comment and I shouldn't be frivolous, Mr. Chairman. I was asked a very serious question, and I intend to give a serious answer.

What we were asked for, in reality, was a comparison around the constituencies to see what disparity, if any, existed between PC constituencies and NDP constituencies. So in Opportunities '83, the number of projects, the number of projects approved in PC constituencies was 264. The number of projects approved in NDP constituencies was 269.

The amount of money approved in PC constituencies as it went out, expended was \$317,158; NDP, \$308, 370. Number of students in PC constituencies was 374; the number in NDP, 448.

An Hon. Member: — Did you get that?

Mr. Koskie: — No, sir. I'd like the minister, if he can, though, what I specifically asked — or do you just give the cumulative effect? But can you send over . . . I'd like you to send over a list of the particular constituencies, the number employed, and the amount of money spent in each of the particular constituencies of the province — the specific information I want.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I can give the comparison of the six I used. It would take some time to pool the rest, the type of specifics you have asked for.

Mr. Koskie: — Really, Mr. Minister, when we get in here and ask you to send it over to us, because you have the cumulative effects, now you say you can't do it. Are these imaginary figures that you're giving us? You must have had the particular constituency in order to add them up and come forward with this information. Where is the documentation? That's what we're asking for. Or is this information that we can't have, also? Why can't you sent this over?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I think the record will demonstrate that I have been very forthcoming in providing all information for which I was asked. If we are being asked for 64 constituencies, with all of that particular information, that will take some considerable time to pull together. If we want the six comparables that I used on this, that's not difficult.

Mr. Koskie: — Obviously you had the information in order to get the grand totals. There's no way that you couldn't have had it. Now to say that you're going to have to have a considerable time doesn't really add up, Mr. Minister. And I'm asking you, are you prepared, and will you send us that information? That is, every constituency in the province, the number of young people that were employed through Opportunities '83, and the total amount that was spent; the number of projects in each of the constituencies; and a breakdown as to how it was spread in between the various qualifying groups. That type of information I want.

And you should have that breakdown because right on the application, which is rather a little strange, you have "for office use only" — you have for reference that you have to find out what constituency it is. And so what I want to do, I want that information. When can you provide it?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, two points in response to the hon. member's question. The information I'm reading from is a comparison of six seats; opposition six, government seats. I have no hesitation in providing whatever information I have.

The specific information requested, detailing constituency by constituency, is a matter of public record which I am perfectly prepared to find, compile, get it over to you, when we can put it together. That's public record. Why would I want to conceal it, in any case?

Secondly, the other point to which the hon. member alluded. He held up the application form and he said, "Right on here, 'for office use only,' it says constituency." Yes, it does, because we want to be fair and make sure there was an even distribution among the seats, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koskie: — Fairness will be in the statistics. That's right. A breakdown of the constituency basis, not your cumulative figures, which I, frankly, have difficulty in accepting. And so I ask you to send, send the information as I have requested, and as soon as possible.

I want to ask the minister, in respect of the Opportunities '83 and Opportunities '84, can you indicate to me, who, in fact, are the personnel that is administering this program?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for leave to introduce some guests.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my pleasure to introduce through you, and to members of the Assembly, 45 grade 12 students from the Yorkton Regional High School in Yorkton. They are in the grade 12 law class. There are not 45 in the west gallery; some have taken the tour of the Legislative Building. I would just like to welcome them to the Assembly. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Ed Magus, and I hope that their stay in Regina and the legislature is educational, and they will receive a lot of information on what goes on in the legislature. Have a good stay, and a safe trip home. We've had pictures taken, and it's been a pleasure seeing you here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to also add my good wishes to the visiting group from Yorkton. As the minister has indicated, there's 45 of them. I would like to extend my personal welcome to them, along with the legislature, and introduce them to the legislature. Because there is some people from my constituency, as you well know that Yorkton borders the great constituency of Saltcoats, and therefore some of them are transported into Yorkton. Watch out, Yorkton, you'll probably be a suburb of Saltcoats one of these days! I hope they have an enjoyable stay also, and have a safe trip back. And take it easy on your teacher; he must have ear plugs. Have a good stay here, and I would ask the company to give them a royal welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Saskatchewan Opportunities '84, the temporary staff brought in for this: Jim C. Peterson, program director; Bob Ritchie, Helen Wettstein, Margaret Shienbein, Cathy Gorman, Roberta Luzny (I'm sure no relative; I don't know).

Mr. Koskie: — Can you indicate whether an individual by the name of R.C. "Scotty" Livingstone is involved in respect to the approvals of these Saskatchewan '84 applications, and can you advise me whether a Reg Forsythe is also a part of a clearing centre for this non-political assignments of Opportunities '84?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The gentlemen in question are employed as consultants to government in general. They are not employed in the approval process, if that was the question.

Mr. Koskie: — I think, Mr. Minister, you indicated that there was a Jim Peterson that was involved. I wonder if the minister could give us the qualifications of Mr. Peterson.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, may I have one second to look for a resume or some other information?

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, in respect to the applications that are forwarded in — and I'm not alluding to the fact that businessmen are not honourable; I agree that they are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is not a change. I want to ask the minister, though, that here you have an application that is filled in, submitted — and what verification do you have in respect to the protection of other employees? I have had contact with some people who have lost their jobs very recently, who have worked in cafes, who have worked at \$4.50 an hour, who have worked close to minimum wage.

And what I'm asking: have you got a system in place which at least will protect those who are already employed? In other words, that an employer cannot simply choose to release a person which they had in the employment and then to seek someone for the qualification period here and merely get the assistance from the government but no job is really created. Statistically, under jobs opportunity is, but the fact is that the other person has been put out of employment.

What I'm asking is: is there any verification of this to the extent that it's not happening? Because I think we could, in our caucus, verify a number of instances where there is certainly a strong indication that that is exactly what's happening. And that is very, very unfortunate, and employers can have it their way today. I talked to another individual this morning and I asked him how the employment circumstances were out there: 138 applications he has put in for employment; four children to feed; no jobs.

So what I am asking: while you are purporting to create jobs, what is your verification that, while creating some qualifying under Opportunities '84, that others aren't losing their jobs?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, if you or members of your caucus have specific instances where you feel that this program has been abused by someone, I would be more than pleased to have them sent to my office, and they will definitely be investigated by my officials.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask you then simply, leave the specific example aside, I want you to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Shut up, will you? I'm on the floor. Either I have the floor or he keeps quiet, Mr. Chairman. Do I have the floor? Do I have the floor and the attention of the Assembly, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: — You have been recognized. The member from Quill Lakes has been recognized.

Mr. Koskie: — . . . (inaudible) . . . prepared to keep some order in the House when I'm trying to question the Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Chairman: — I think that if we conduct our conversation this way instead of that way, I think we can keep order. And so I recognize the member from Quill Lakes.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was certainly a proper ruling, and I appreciate it because this is, indeed, a serious question which I am pursuing, and I've asked the minister not for us to have to go out and find all of the cases where there, in fact, can be abuses or potential abuses. I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, what, in fact, is your safety valve? And the people who have jobs that are near or on minimum wage could in fact be the victims of others getting jobs under this program. Surely there should be a safety valve.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, there is a safety valve. When the claim forms come back at the end where they are claiming the money, there's a declaration on there that says they did, in fact, create the job. Once again, I make the offer in all sincerity. If the hon. members are aware of abuses in the program, we certainly want to clean them up. We want to run the finest program possible. I give you my word, if you give me some specifics of problems we'll look at them. We think we've got the safety valve. We think we've got it covered off.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, there are a number of people that are concerned, and what I'm asking you: would you be prepared to put an ad in the papers, in the weeklies and the daily papers, indicating and advising people who, in fact, feel that they have lost a job due to the operation of say, Saskatchewan Opportunities '84, that they can contact your office, or an employee of your office? You have done it with respect to agriculture, and I am asking you: will you, in fact, give the public of Saskatchewan an opportunity — the young people, who, in fact, could be a victim of a program which you purport to say increases employment — an opportunity to directly contact your office?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'd like to refer back to the brochure put out under the auspices of my department, and I will give a specific answer. Mr. Chairman, I won't be as rude as one of the other members who say, "Then you shut up," to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. I'll just stand and wait for him to finish his piece.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'll continue. Under number 5 in the brochure it says: "Project eligibility." And one of the statements says, Mr. Chairman, "Projects will not result in the dismissal, lay-off, or reduction in hours of any existing employees."

If there is an abuse, the officials in my department will be pleased to check them. The phone number for the contract for the program is clearly on the back of the brochure.

Mr. Koskie: — I suppose, Mr. Minister, what you're saying is that every individual in Saskatchewan who had a job and may have been aggrieved is walking around with this here document in their pocket. Obviously that's what you're saying. That is how concerned you are here today. This *Jobs For Students — Students For Jobs*, this goes out to the employers. That's who're primarily interested in this. And what I'm asking you is a simple question: will you set up some avenue with your office to provide the opportunity to any young person or employee in Saskatchewan who have been aggrieved — and I've set forward the situation of how he may be aggrieved — that he can, in fact, directly contact your office or a particular officials in your office in order to raise that concern? Will you put ads in the paper setting out how that aggrieved person can get some grievance?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, to date we have had no indication of abuses. Further to that, further to that I'd like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that copies of the brochure were available in all the constituency offices, all CEC centres who distributed them to students, plus they were available at the universities, the technical institutes, and through the community college system. So they were very widely distributed.

Mr. Koskie: — Obviously what the minister has said: that he will not provide an avenue to the person that may be aggrieved. That's precisely what he said, and I'm not going to pursue it any further. But just that the people of this province and the young people should, in fact, know that this government program is not really working in their interest.

I want to conclude this and say, Mr. Minister, I have given you every opportunity, every opportunity, Mr. Minister, to come forward and to give some hope to the young people of this province. And I want to say, Mr. Minister, with 21,000 unemployed between the ages of 15 and 24; with 18.4 per cent unemployment of our young people; with people out in society looking desperately for jobs; with your own document stating that there is going to be a continuation of 20 per cent unemployment . . . I want to conclude by saying that the economic policies and the

directions of your government have been a disaster to the young people of this province.

And certainly you have provided them with no hope, and the young people of this province . . . Despair is what is happening. And I think you should be certainly ashamed of trying to justify what your own projections are, that there's going to be some 20 per cent unemployed in the '80s. We had, in this province, under the New Democratic Party, the lowest unemployment — 5 per cent — while other provinces were much higher. Today what we have done is raise that unemployment to 9.4 per cent for the general public.

We were, in fact, number one, but it took the Tories not very long to, in fact, destroy the record that we had built up, and the hope and the opportunity for young people. And today the Tory government is indeed saying, "Twenty per cent unemployment in the future for our young people is their hope." Can you, Mr. Minister, give any hope to those young people other than the rhetoric and generalization that you have said?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can give hope to the young people, because we care. We're concerned. We're delivering programs. We increased the number of training places. There are more kids in universities. We've got more employment programs than they ever dreamed of having, so yes, they can look forward to the future under our government with some confidence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Deputy Chairman. Mr. Speaker, pardon me, Mr. Minister, I have some concerns about the seriousness of the provincial government's commitment to actively overcoming the socio-economic barriers faced by Metis and non status Indians of this province, people who wish to utilize the province's adult education institutions. I would like to address those concerns to the minister responsible for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.

But, first of all, Mr. Minister, I want to indicate to you, and to the members of this Assembly, and to the people of this province, that we must not lose sight of mind, we must not lose sight of the fact that in the native community in this province, under your government, under your government's policy and administration, things for the opportunities for the native community have deteriorated.

We have, in northern Saskatchewan, unemployment that would be classed as a national disaster in Regina, should this happen in communities like, cities like Regina and Saskatoon and elsewhere in the southern part of our country. If this would have happened in those areas, your government, the Devine government, and any other government, would classify these as national disasters.

Unemployment in northern Saskatchewan today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Mr. Minister — in northern Saskatchewan we have unemployment as high up as 95 per cent. Right — 95 per cent unemployment under your government, under your government's administration. It wasn't ever 95 per cent under the former government. It was never, ever 95 per cent unemployment in northern Saskatchewan under the former government. I can state that very clearly and very factually.

Mr. Minister, as well, we should not forget the fact that under your government, your administration, welfare has gone up 50 per cent in northern communities. The communities are isolated. They have been abandoned under your government. They have been excluded from your government's policy and your government's administration. Where are the opportunities that the former minister, or the minister for the now defunct department of northern Saskatchewan, talked about — the economic self-sufficiency programs?

Just the other day, and I'm quoting figures from Statistics Canada, provincial statistics, that unemployment is skyrocketing in this province, and it is a national disaster in northern

Saskatchewan. And the facts are here; the figures are here. I have, just the other day while questioning the Minister of Justice . . . I have with me a document indicating that the 1983-84 statistics for native people incarcerated in the provincial jails is up by 63 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — 63?

Mr. Yew: — 63 per cent! I'll read it out, the sentence: "We now have in the provincial correctional centres (or jails) 7,338 native inmates." But it's 63 per cent. It states that in 1983-84, natives comprised 63 per cent of all admissions to the provincial correctional centres, for lack of a better word for jails. "Correctional centres" is really a hundred-dollar-word for the word "jail."

No, Mr. Minister, we must not forget, and we must not lose sight that those are deplorable situations in the native community. When we have 95 per cent unemployment, when we have no opportunities for the native community; when we have welfare rates going up as high as 50 per cent; when we have native inmates incarcerated in the provincial correctional centres as high up as 63 per cent — we must not lose sight of that fact, when we're talking about policies, programs for people that are disadvantaged . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I was never in power . . . To the member for P.A.-Duck Lake, I was never in government. You just wait until the 1985 election, when we oust you guys out of power, you'll see good positive programs in this province. I'll guarantee you that there will be positive programs for the native community.

Mr. Minister, you will be aware that, of an estimated 25,000 Metis and non status Indian adults in this province, more than 70 per cent of those people fall into the unskilled worker category. If the type of business that the government's open for business policy is attempting to attract does, in fact, ever materialize in a major way, those people would obviously not be able to participate, Mr. Minister.

On various occasions, through its general policy statements, the government has indicated that its primary concern is training Saskatchewan residents to supply skill shortage areas in the labour market. Despite the huge number of potential adult education and occupational training recruits among the Metis and non status Indian population in the province, only 570 Metis people and non status Indians are enrolled this year in post-secondary employment-related education and training programs. That figure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is down from a total of 634 in 1982-83, according to statistics provided by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, or a net decrease of 18 per cent, if you wanted to round it down in percentages.

Now, Mr. Minister, if we excluded those programs specifically adapted for Metis and non status Indian people from those figures, such as the SUNTEP program and the programs developed this past year by the Gabriel Dumont Institute under the federally-sponsored skills growth fund, then the province has witnessed a decrease from 533 Metis and non status Indian students in 1982 and '83 taking university and technical training, to 326 in 1983 and '84, a decrease, Mr. Minister, of 207 financially assisted students, or 39 per cent fewer in 1983-84. The minister will be aware of this decline, because the data was supplied by his department.

Given the minister's commitment to expanding student enrolment in the technical institutes, the minister should be startled — and I repeat, the minister should be startled — that as of January 18, 1984, there were only 75 Metis and non status Indian people to be counted amongst the approximate total of 20,000 Saskatchewan technical institute students. Only 75.

The minister might also be aware that, of the approximately 25,000 full-time university students in the province, only 364 are Metis and non status Indians.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the minister will also be aware of the exceptional success of specialized Metis and non status Indian adult education programs in which the design and delivery of

programming has been shaped by the influence of native self-determination.

I refer, of course, to such programs as the Saskatchewan Urban Teacher Education Program, better known as SUNTEP, which has significantly increased the number of Metis and non status Indian university students — of the 364 I referred to, 137 are enrolled in the SUNTEP program. The retention rate and successful performance measures of native students enrolled in SUNTEP virtually reverses the drop-out and failure rate of Metis and non status Indian university students in their regular university undergraduate programs.

If the minister is lacking knowledge of this program, I would suggest that he consult the independent assessment commissioned by the Department of Education which provides core funds to SUNTEP. The minister will also know that despite program funding levels well below the original request, the Gabriel Dumont Institute and the Gabriel Dumont Institute's three Saskatchewan training for employment programs, have also proven very successful to date. Clearly, clearly, specialized programs reflecting a high degree of native self-determination over their own education have worked in this province.

The minister would surely agree with me that these native-influenced specially adapted programs are required to overcome the well-known social and economic and cultural barriers confronting native people in the traditional mainstream educational institutions in this province. In other words, the minister would surely agree with me that native adults who have been alienated from the formal education through an unaccommodating school system, requires special incentives to try for a second time, as adults, to assess the mainstream labour force through employment-related advanced education.

If the minister views my comment about the unaccommodating nature of formal education in this province relative to native people, he might well reflect on the fact that on average, native people obtain only grade 8 education, far below the provincial average. And only 2 per cent of Metis and non status Indians in Canada have received any university education — 2.5 per cent, compared to the 26 per cent of the general Canadian population.

I hope that I can assume that the minister and his government shares my view that special incentives are essential within the province's educational programs to help Metis and non status Indians overcome the existing barriers to their equitable participation in adult education and in the labour force itself.

Native unemployment rates and low incomes are too well-known to recall for the hon. members opposite me. Yet it is, clearly, those statistical inequities that should be moved, that should move them to cry out for active intervention to remedy the injustices which the numbers indicate, and I've mentioned a few of them.

While it is my belief that the minister shares his view with me, a number of concerns have been brought to my attention by native educators and native students, particularly, which contradicts such a view. It has been suggested to me, Mr. Minister, that, indeed, the policies of the government are systematically eroding the limited number of special incentives for Metis and non status Indian adult students that have been put in place over the past few years.

It has come to my attention, Mr. Minister, for example, that in 1983 the student financial services branch of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, was instructed by treasury board to undertake a study of the student assistance programs available within Saskatchewan to assist treasury board in its consideration for the 1984 budgets.

The terms of reference of the study were to: (a) conduct an analysis of all student assistance programs in Saskatchewan and recommend specific proposals to eliminate program overlaps and disparities in funding levels, and (b) to strengthen needs assessments criteria, and (c) to assess the potential for linking financial institutions, financial . . . pardon me, financial assistance

to scholastic ability.

For recommendations of that study that I am concerned with resulted to the implementation of what has been called "a special incentives program for adult students." The purpose of the special incentives program, I'm told, was to amalgamate, under a single umbrella, existing programs for special needs students, such as the Canada student loan; the Saskatchewan student loan; the Saskatchewan . . . pardon me, the Saskatchewan student bursary; the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons; the NSIM program; NORTEP and SUNTEP.

I am concerned, Mr. Minister, that upon a careful examination of this revised financial support system, it will become evident that the province has significantly reduced its commitment to the provision of special incentives to Metis and non status Indian students in this province.

I have with me, Mr. Minister, several questions that I'd like to raise with you very specifically. And to begin the line of questioning, I would like to refer to the matter of the Saskatchewan student bursaries program in relation to the special incentives bursaries.

Could the minister provide the House, this Assembly, with a statement of the provincial budget allocation for NSIM students' allowances for the year 1983 with a comparable allocation of student financial assistance to Metis and non status Indians in 1984 in adult programs?

What I would require in the latter case is the total for 1984 of the actual expenditures on Saskatchewan student bursaries provided to the Metis and non status Indian students, and the expenditures over the same year for the special incentives bursary payments to Metis and non status Indian students.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, in the hon. member's opening remarks he touched on a wide range of topics, activities, background and, Mr. Chairman, I agree with most of what the hon. member has been saying. We know we have a tremendous problem in Saskatchewan, a socio-economic problem, as it relates to Metis and non status Indians and status Indians, too.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the hon. member that in this department we are taking those concerns very seriously. And I would like to reiterate a commitment I made to the hon. member on April 26 (I believe it was) that my door is open to you, sir, if you have specific questions, problems that you feel I or my officials can assist you with.

I also want to say I would appreciate, on occasion, hearing from you on some of those specific problems. The one you raised before was Gabriel Dumont. I have done an intensive inquiry into that particular situation, and I'm ready to give you numbers on that one.

Having said that, I should touch on a couple of points about employment statistics. StatsCanada inform us that they won't provide a statistical breakdown of the labour market in northern Saskatchewan. So we have some trouble with the particular stats there, or where they're located. And I'm sure the hon. member knows better than I do where they are, because that's his bailiwick. And I'm willing to listen to him on that.

But we have taken some measures to northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman: extension of the NSIM program and the northern careers development program into the North; creation of a northern manpower needs committee; and the labour market planning information branch has assumed the responsibility for labour market planning and information in the North. And, hopefully, we are going to begin to address problems that have been going on historically for a very long time.

We have to start somewhere, Mr. Chairman. The problems are not going to go away by themselves. They are going to need extensive government assistance.

Specific reference was made to the Gabriel Dumont Institute. I do have specific figures on Gabriel Dumont Institute, and the amount of funding that was received by the students. I took notice on a question from the hon. member in the House on April 26, and I was prepared to reply in question period with that information. I can also make it available, and will do so in writing, so you have that information.

To your specific recommendation — I believe it would be about self-determination and native programs, and you referred to Gabriel Dumont — we agree that where we find programs that work we should maintain them, support them, and encourage them. That is also why I did agree to fund the Kapachee Institute for this year, because where we find something that works, I think we try and help it along.

You specifically asked me for a breakdown of information. We can find that for you. We have all of the details, but not on one sheet at this particular moment. But at the very earliest opportunity, certainly within a few days, I can undertake to have that given to you. I can give you what we have just now if there are some other figures that you particularly want, but we don't have the whole thing put together as one package right now. But that will be done; I guarantee you'll receive that.

Mr. Yew: — Well, if the minister will assure . . . I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the minister has assured us, assured the House, and assured me that he will provide the figures — the information, the budget allocations — that I requested, right?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, the information the hon. member has required is . . . It would just take some time to put together. It would be my pleasure to have my officials put it together and deliver it just as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. Yew: — I, Mr. Chairman, have a question in terms of consultation. The minister mentioned, in his brief response to my presentation, the importance of native self-determination involvement. With respect to that I have a question regarding consultation, and it goes on, Mr. Minister, that it is my understanding that there was little, if any, consultation with native educational organizations, such as the SUNTEP or the Gabriel Dumont Institute, during the preparation of the report undertaken on the instructions of treasury board.

Could the minister tell the House why such consultation did not take place, when there is clear evidence that such organizations appear to have acquired significantly more knowledge of the needs of native adult students than has the department? Such a lack of consultation, Mr. Chairman, hardly jibes with the government's rhetoric of encouraging responsible grass roots input and involvement into policy-making processes regarding adult education.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, the report to which you refer was prepared prior to my assuming the portfolio. I'm advised that perhaps 10 meetings, approximately, took place, of the type the hon. member has mentioned. I'd like to point out that since I took the portfolio, the number would be in the order of 40 to 50 such meetings and consultations that have taken place.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Speaker . . . Pardon me, Mr. Minister, I would like you to address some of the questions raised by the representatives of the institutions I've mentioned, as this is a concern of the native non status and Metis students involved in these programs. Concerning this question . . . This question concerns the remission of loans under the new system.

A first year, post-secondary student may apply for 100 per cent remission of the Canada Student Loan, if he or she has successfully completed 60 per cent of the courses taken in that year.

A second-year, post-secondary student may apply for 50 per cent remission of the Canada Student Loan, if he or she is 60 per cent successful in his or her second year.

Third and fourth students are eligible for no remission whatsoever, and that's understood.

Representatives of the native institutions affected, and the students themselves, have indicated to me that they seriously question if there is any incentive to a program that penalizes students who experience failure in the first year. The students I refer to, Mr. Minister, in the main have not experienced educational success in the past. With no guarantee for the first year will be successful, and knowing if they don't succeed they will again be labeled failures and will owe the government money that most of them will never be in a position to pay back — this, Mr. Minister, is a double penalty situation that appears to confront the students.

Would the minister not agree with me that if the government is truly serious about correcting the injustices that have been perpetuated upon native people in the past and occur at present, if the government really does wish to see equitable native participation in the mainstream, then the government must fully support programs like SUNTEP that have proven successful in this regard? Would the minister not agree that the new system creates more disincentives and, in fact, is a step backwards — programs that we have referred to under your jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, perhaps I can start my reply by pointing out that Gabriel Dumont students make up less than 2 per cent of the students applying for assistance, yet they account for more than 5 per cent of the entire student assistance budget. I can break that down for you if you wish.

They receive Canada Student Loan of \$100 a week which, as the hon. member has pointed out, has 100 per cent forgiveness. It's non-repayable. Other programs, it would have to be repaid if they complete the first year or mostly the first year. In the second year it's 50 per cent forgiveness if it's completed. In addition they qualify for the Saskatchewan bursary of \$62.50 a week, and in addition, they can qualify for the SIP program — Special Incentive Program — for another \$100 a week. So the total assistance they would receive is \$262.50 a week, which I think is a pretty fair incentive.

Given that Gabriel Dumont — and the philosophy is to provide support systems as well as education — they have a very successful completion rate with their students. Of the 191 students enrolled in Gabriel Dumont, eight only did not get special assistance because it's tied to need. One did not apply. The other students are receiving that assistance. The total of the assistance they're receiving is \$1,394,630, and I think that's pretty sizeable assistance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I have been told, Mr. Minister, and I jotted some notes here, that some officials from your Department of Advanced Education and Manpower had given verbal commitments on repeated occasions that students in SUNTEP, and other Gabriel Dumont Institute and community college programs, would be eligible for loan remissions on the basis of a year of the particular program he or she was in, enrolled in. That commitment was made at the beginning of the revised system by the director of the student financial services branch. On budgetary terms, they were led to believe that if they were, for example, in the first year of the SUNTEP program and they completed 60 per cent of their classes successfully, 100 per cent of their first-year loan would be forgiven.

I have a letter in my possession, Mr. Minister, that suggests that, subsequent to a change in personnel in the student financial services branch, a different interpretation has been given to the rules governing remission. The students are now being informed that it is the student's actual year of adult or post-secondary study that will be the factor determining qualification for remission.

Under the revised interpretation, a first year SUNTEP student who has undertaken a year of upgrading and a year of technical institute training, but has been unemployed for three years, will not receive any loan remission. The House should be aware that the average native adult student is in his or her mid-twenties, and has dependent children with no other financial resources to fall back upon. If the new interpretation, Mr. Minister, is sustained, then surely the idea of special incentives is virtually eliminated from government policy towards that support of native adult students in this province. I ask the hon. minister if he will assure the House and the Metis and non status Indian students that the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower will live up to the commitments made by his officials.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, the commitment to which you're referring has been brought to my attention by officials of Dumont. It was one official, as I understand, who made a misinterpretation, if any was made at all, because I was not privy to the conversation. He is no longer in the employ of the department. Nobody knows exactly what he did commit to. However, whatever the situation, what you have outlined in the letter is the correct policy, and we have to abide by the policy. I'm sorry we can't change the policy based on a conversation of which I am not aware, that may or may not have taken place.

Mr. Yew: — But, Mr. Minister, that verbal commitment was made on several occasions. Certainly this should have been detected immediately by someone in your department.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — It may have been a unilateral discussion, one-sided discussion, that took place, but nowhere, may I say to the hon. member, is it documented in the department. This did apparently happen prior to my assuming the portfolio, but I have had the officials check it through. There is no documentation for it.

Mr. Yew: — I didn't say that it was documented, but I did specifically state that it was a verbal commitment made by senior officials of your department. And that commitment ought to be sustained by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, seeing as how the students had to convert to revised budgetary needs and plan for their courses accordingly.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, the actual interpretation was two years of remission on any program. That's our interpretation. The verbal one to which the hon. member is referring said it was two years remission to one specific program, and that is not accurate. It's two years, regardless of the nature of the program, but once a student has had two years remission, we can't extend it beyond that.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I would like to inform the Assembly that in anticipation of students dropping out of programs for financial reasons, a request has been made to the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower for an emergency loan or grant fund to ensure that adult Metis and non status Indian students who are performing successfully in their studies will be able to continue.

The staff of the Gabriel Dumont Institute and SUNTEP, who made this request, are concerned that the disbursement of the loan portion of the financial assistance provided in two instalments, one in September and one in January, will be exhausted prior to the completion of the courses.

I am informed that the response to this request, from officials of your department, has to date been negative. I am also informed that those making the requests were referred to existing emergency loan funds and bursaries which rather obviously do not fit the needs of native students.

I would ask the minister if the government is prepared to provide emergency loan funds in order to avoid student drop-outs for financial reasons. Given the fact that these financial difficulties are a direct consequence of the new method of disbursing loans under the revised financial support system that has proven to be so clearly inadequate, the disbursement of funds two times during

the year requires, Mr. Minister, that every student must stretch funds that are barely adequate, over 12 months. The irony of a government expecting such keen personal budgeting of special-needs students, when the same government has achieved new heights of deficit financing, boggles your mind.

I refer to your budget deficit of \$829 million. And you had the nerve, your government, your Premier, had the nerve to lay out to the public that your budget presented here on March 21 was actually a 20 per cent deficit-reduction budget. Hah; that is a laugh! I have to question the mentality of how that statement could be made publicly to the people of this province. And you expect the students themselves to budget accordingly.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I already indicated the students are eligible for \$262.50 of assistance per week of study. Now they're receiving the money while they go through the course. The loan is being disbursed in three payments in a year. By the way, they also don't pay tuition fees at Gabriel Dumont Institute, unlike the universities and the technical institutes.

The bursary payments are being made in the intervening months, so there is a regular cash flow to the students. The incentive is there. The money is there. The students are receiving, as I said earlier, 2 per cent of the students are receiving 5 per cent of the total money available. I think that's incentive, Mr. Chairman. We've changed the system so there's a regular cash flow to the students.

Now, if they're saying that that's still not enough, coupled with the fact that they don't pay tuition fees, I think we're doing quite well in this regard. And I think we're putting forward some good programs for those students in special-incentive programs.

Mr. Yew: — I wish I could believe what the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower is indicating to me, or trying to impress on me and the public, that there are special incentives.

I'll go on to my next question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you, as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, about your department's policy regarding the inclusion of Metis and non status Indian students in your department's attempt to significantly expand the seat capacity and enrolment in technical institute programs. Given the fact that there are only 75 Metis and non status Indian students in the institutes, it would seem obvious that a major and creative effort is required in this regard. Can the minister describe in detail the department's efforts in this area, and at the same time, indicate the consultation process that has taken place with the native educational organizations to ensure that native students participate in the government's ambitions towards native education?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, we do have, are in the process of establishing an access committee looking at technical institute access, not only for native non status Indians, Metis, but also women and . . . I alluded to those ones earlier, those particular issues.

I can't say there has been ongoing consultation, and as the member is probably aware, I have met, I don't know how many times — half a dozen, eight, ten times — with people from Dumont and people from AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non Status Indians of Saskatchewan) personally. I have met with them in my office and certainly the officials in my department have had ongoing meetings with representatives. And yes, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, we're listening.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. I understand, Mr. Minister, that you will provide to me, on behalf of the students that I have discussed the issues with, on behalf of the native institutions, on behalf of the native community, that you will provide specific information leading to funding support, special incentive support, issues that I have raised in this session of

estimates, that you will provide specific information within a number of days.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I've undertaken to do that. I give you my assurance it will be done. More than that, I'd like to reiterate once again to the hon. member, if there are any specific concerns, my door is open; please come and see me. If you have specific students where you feel there is some particular problem, the officials of my department are at your disposal, as they are at mine. We can take the files; we'll look at them and show me what the problem is or show my officials. We are here to serve.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, we are a long ways from resolving the issue of the native community participating in the mainstream of society, the social and economic mainstream of society. I have indicated to you the unemployment and the welfare rates that have sky-rocketed in many areas in this province under your government, under your administration, under your policy for big business. I have indicated to you that we have, in northern Saskatchewan, unemployment as high up as 95 per cent, with no hope for jobs, with no hope for the future.

This is very important that this is taken a note of. The welfare rates have gone up 50 per cent. Incarceration of our native people, of the native community, into jails is at a 63 per cent level. This is totally intolerable. This is something that members of this Assembly should take careful note of, and this is something that this Assembly should urge your government to recognize and do something about it, not just give lip service to those dire situations that are confronting the native community.

I would hope that the Minister for Advanced Education, the minister for Northern Affairs branch, the minister for the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, would see fit to initiate what was promised on July 16 of 1982.

And I have a copy of a letter that was given to the department staff of the former Department of Northern Saskatchewan, senior staff. And the people in the North were promised an economic self-sufficiency program, self-sufficiency economic program, economic development program, whichever way you want to put it. But to this point in time we have yet to see a concrete plan presented by your government, by your administration. And I would sincerely hope that something be done in this respect by this government.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I'm not sure that was a question, but I know it's a suggestion that the hon. member expects to be taken seriously. I would like to point out that we do believe that one of the ways we can overcome the problems is by training and education.

I give you my commitment that in this department, my officials, myself, will do our very level best to increase the amount of training and skill development that is available. We already have increased to some extent. We're planning on more.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I alluded to the topic of financing in the university, and particularly in respect to the operating grants. And I want to outline to you some of the background to the dilemma that is being faced, particularly by the universities.

We find that the University of Regina, the total credit hours enrolment increased by 9.8 per cent in the fall of 1982 to the fall of 1983. The University of Saskatchewan had an 8.3 per cent increase in the number of full and part-time day students in the fall of 1983.

I want to say that part of the severe pressures on both universities is really caused in part by the lack of employment that is being offered by your government. Last year, in 1983-84, the government finally provided an extra some \$800,000 to the universities. Although this, in my view, was an inadequate amount to compensate for the severe enrolment and cost pressures, again this year the universities are faced with yet another major problem. This year's grant

increase of 5 per cent is, in my view, quite simply not sufficient. On a per student basis, Mr. Minister, the real constant dollar value of providing funding will actually decrease, that is, after inflation, and the real per student grants, will, in fact, be down.

I want to say that there are headlines which indicate the serious financial situation at the University of Regina, where the president indicated that the university was close to bankruptcy, where there was a major deficit in the university's budget of over \$1 million. And I want to say that the University of Regina is being forced now to raise its tuition fee 9.3 per cent and, even so, I am told that it will face a deficit in 1984-85 of some \$700,000 on top of the 1.25 million last year. The University of Saskatchewan is also raising its tuition fee.

It seems to me that what we have here is the consequences of a very foolish approach to higher education. It's a short-sighted policy, and I think has very serious effects for the future and the benefit of our young people.

It seems to me that universities are essentially an investment, an investment in the education and the training of young people; investments in the advancement of medical and agricultural and scientific knowledge on which our future depends. But it seems to me that the underfunding that has been taking place, Mr. Minister, has had very negative effects on our universities.

Undergraduate teaching. I ask you: how can our young people be expected to learn, to train, for the tough job market of the future in overcrowded classes, with outmoded and obsolete equipment and inadequate libraries?

Graduate studies. Our graduate students' programs and professional faculties are being denied sufficient funds to prepare the new generation of doctors, engineers, and scientists which we need.

Faculty members. Research is being made to suffer because of the lack of funds, or preventing faculties from pursuing the basic research tasks that are an essential part of the universities, out of any university.

What I want to say, Mr. Minister, and I've asked you . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! The House has become rather noisy and I would ask people to . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, again for allowing me the opportunity to do the estimates. What I want to say, Mr. Minister, that the bottom line is simply this: there's severe enrolment and financial pressures are imposing extreme hardships on the students and the whole university community. And I say that this is, essentially, the misplaced priorities of your government and the insufficiency of funding.

And what I ask you, Mr. Minister, first of all: are you satisfied that the funding which you have provided to the universities is sufficient to provide a high quality education to our young people who attend our universities?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I remember we went through this one for a couple of hours last week or two weeks ago, and I guess we're going to be going through it all again. The student fees did rise. They rose \$88 a year in Regina, a decision made by the board of governors. They rose \$75 per year in Saskatoon, a decision made by the board of governors. And those institutions received a 5 per cent increase in their operating grant. The operating grant in this year is \$132.5 million to our two universities. In the last year of the previous administration, it was \$100 million. I would submit that \$32.5 million in three budgets is a very healthy and significant increase in operating grants.

I would also remind the hon. member that I have no input into the priorities of the university and where they choose to allocate and spend their funds. It is no secret, and I've said it before, that I have had individual faculty members and representatives of whole faculties approach me and say to me that they felt that the operating grants were not within themselves inadequate; it's just they felt that the distribution should have been handled differently within their institutions.

Mr. Koskie: — That's fine. I'm glad that you're saying to the university community and to the students who are attending higher education, many of them who have, as I have indicated before, great difficulties in finding suitable employment or job-oriented meaningful employment, I'm glad you're saying to them that you think that you have done a good job.

I remind you, Mr. Minister, that last year you came forward with a budget also, and subsequent to that, what you put into place was a special grant. What I want to ask the minister is: why the special grant? Why was it put into place last year? What factors came to view that you didn't know at the time that you were making forth the budget?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — As I understand it — and that came about under the auspices of my predecessor, who isn't in the House at the moment — there had been some discussion between the board of governors of the universities and hon. member regarding an enrolment supplement. It was to be an enrolment sensitive supplement as the hon. member, I'm sure, is aware, based on unexpectedly high enrolment.

Not only because of unemployment figures, but because over the last number of years the high school counsellors and the parents have been doing a tremendous job in advising our students to get as much training and as much education as they possibly can, because I quoted the figures earlier: the highest unemployment rate, the people with the lowest education.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister . . .

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.